Table 4-5. Individuals

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
3-1	Delta infrastructure is fragile, and allowing areas WHERE IT MAKES SENSE for flooding to restore wetlands, filter water, and increase storage is prudent and necessary.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
3-2	Disrupting farmers' and other local Delta residents' lives in order to drill a tunnel to ship more water to big ag monocrops in the south San Joaquin Valley does not makes sense.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including impacts on agriculture and local communities and proposed mitigation. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.
3-3	Southern California is way ahead of us in water conservation projects. All parts of the state should be investing in more of these projects rather than pouring our tax dollars into a	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see response to comment 3-2 regarding the State Water Project and background information on how water supply has been developed and managed in California, the project's purpose and objectives, and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
5-1	Are you all idiots? Why ruin the delta when it will never be able to keep up with the growth.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project to the Delta is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and has evaluated the potential environmental impacts on the Delta. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, Chapter 9, Water Quality, includes an evaluation of potential impacts on water quality and concludes that project impacts would be less than significant. Please also refer to Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, for the impact analysis regarding growth. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
5-2	Just start sucking water from OCEAN, it's rising. I don't care what it costs people who build where there isn't any water. Start putting money into desalination and quit killing the environment!!!	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding desalination, the alternatives screening process, and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer for to response to comment 5-1 regarding the EIR's analyses of potential significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
6-1	There's big money to be made with the proposed project. Most will be sucked out of water consumers and, yes, taxpayers. Can you make this happen without opening the floodgates to profiteers among corporate stakeholders? If not, the project should not go forward.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about project costs.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
7-1	At your earliest convenience, please email me, or provide me with a link to download, copies of the following three (3) references cited in the DCP Draft EIR: (1) Volume 1: Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report-Central and Eastern Options. May 2022. Sacramento, CA. (2) Volume 2: Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report-Central and Eastern Options. May 2022. Sacramento, CA. (3) Volume 1: Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report-Bethany Reservoir Alternative. May 2022. Sacramento, CA. (Attached is an excerpt from the DCP DEIR Chapter 37 [See Attachment 1], wherein it lists these three references.)	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information, copies, and weblinks within the comment period.
7-2	[Attachment 1: Page 37-47 from DEIR that includes references requested by respondent.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
8-1	Subject: How can we even THINK of this project? We are in A DROUGHT and need to place priority on that. Building a tunnel without water? Such a waste of taxpayers money. PLEASE WORK ON PLANS TO HELP CALIFORNIA DEAL WITH THE DROUGHT!	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please also

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change, including drought. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
9-1	would it be possible for you to mail the Brochure to me? Having difficulties with eyes and computer, so paper is better.	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information and paper copies within the comment period.
10-1	Based on a review of the recent draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
10-2	My objections to the plan are due to the environmental concerns raised by the EIR, including an enormously negative impact on wildlife and plant species in the Delta such as the Delta smelt, chinook salmon, steelhead, San Joaquin kit fox, and tricolored blackbird, among many other protected species that already endangered and will face extinction due to an increasingly unhealthy ecology.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment as a result of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project (please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources). The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and plant species are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for additional discussion regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
10-3	The tunnels will also cause harm to the health of humans due to increased contamination of municipal water and wells for the millions of rural and urban residents living in the five Delta counties. The tunnels plan fails to prepare for potential	The Delta Conveyance EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts on surrounding communities. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding water quality. Please refer to Chapter

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	increases of carcinogens and other dangerous cancer-causing byproducts.	25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, and Chapter 26, Public Health, for analyses of hazards and hazardous materials impacts and impacts on public health and surrounding communities, respectively. As described in Chapters 25 and 26, potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Chapter 8, Groundwater, for the analysis of potential impacts on groundwater quality, which were determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, a health risk assessment was conducted for all alternatives and analyzes potential cancer and non-cancer health hazards associated with receptor exposure to diesel particulate matter. The results are presented in Chapter 23, Impact AQ-6, which was determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. For Alternatives 2a and 4a, Impact AQ-6 identifies that DWR would provide financial assistance for air filters to residences impacted by construction of Intake A, which is the only location identified in the EIR where predicted health risks would exceed a local air district threshold (see Mitigation Measure AQ-6).
10-4	Communities that depend on fishing will also face food and health insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury, in fish and wildlife.	The Delta Conveyance EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts on surrounding communities. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding water quality. Please refer to Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, and Chapter 26, Public Health, for analyses of hazards and hazardous materials impacts and impacts on public health and surrounding communities, respectively. As described in Chapters 25 and 26, potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Chapter 8, Groundwater, for the analysis of potential impacts on groundwater quality, which were determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, a health risk assessment was conducted for all alternatives and analyzes potential cancer and non-cancer health hazards associated with receptor exposure to diesel

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		particulate matter. The results are presented in Chapter 23, Impact AQ-6, which was determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. For Alternatives 2a and 4a, Impact AQ-6 identifies that DWR would provide financial assistance for air filters to residences impacted by construction of Intake A, which is the only location identified in the EIR where predicted health risks would exceed a local air district threshold (see Mitigation Measure AQ-6). The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding impacts of the project are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Chapter 26, Public Health, and Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. As shown in these chapters, analyses conclude that all impacts would be less than significant for groundwater and water quality and that significant impacts identified on fish and aquatic resources and terrestrial biological resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Changes in water operations under the project alternatives would have very little effect on Delta fish tissue concentrations of methylmercury and selenium, relative to existing conditions. As described in Chapter 9, Mitigation Measure WQ-6 would be implemented with the goal to minimize generation of methylmercury within new tidal habitat, which would further reduce the potential for an increase in methylmercury in fish tissue of study area fish. Chapter 26, Impact PH-3, describes that operations under the project alternatives would not increase existing health risks related to the consumption of fish in the study area. Additionally, construction and operation of project alternatives would not increase bioaccumulation of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		pesticides and methylmercury in fish that could affect human health, and this impact was determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 29, there would not be a disproportionately adverse effect on environmental justice populations in the study area as a result of fish, wildlife, or water quality effects, the project would not substantially affect recreational and subsistence fishing for minority or low-income populations, and no public health issues related to subsistence fishing by minority and low-income populations would occur.
10-5	There are alternatives to the Delta Tunnels that are much less environmentally destructive, such as improved water efficiency programs for both urban and agricultural users; increased funding of water recycling and groundwater recharging projects; conversion of pollution generating farmlands to more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation; repair of Delta levees to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise; increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants and restore ecosystems; and installing fish screens at the south Delta pumps to reduce impacts on marine life.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, and supporting appendices regarding the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, including the No Project Alternative. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development and screening process. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
10-6	The Delta Tunnels won't produce more water or improved conditions for the environment in the Delta. It will have the opposite effect. We are living through a climate emergency, with California's long-term drought and water supply shortages a central concern for residents statewide. We must respond	Please refer to response to comment 10-5 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	with smarter and more environmentally balanced solutions. The future of humanity depends on it.	to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives considered in the EIR.
11-1	I reviewed today's DWR Press Release regarding the Draft EIR but did not see any information regarding the availability of the modeling data used to quantify the benefits and environmental impacts of the proposed project. To assist my review of the project and Draft EIR, could you please make available to me, in electronic form, daily flow, export, reservoir storage and water quality data (from CalSim3 and DSM2) for all the key Delta and Central Valley modeling locations, for each of the Delta Conveyance alternatives, including the existing and No-Action alternatives at the various levels of development (2020, 2040 and 2070). Per Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, page 4-6, the proposed project and project alternatives would be operational far into the future, so the project proponents also provided a comparison of conditions in a longer-term (50-year) future timeframe as well. • Existing conditions (2020) vs. No Project Alternative (2070) • No Project Alternative (2070) vs. proposed project alternative (2070) Can you please make the data available in DSS format so that I can review the CalSim3 and DSM2 operations in detail. Thank you. It is my understanding that the CalSim3 modeling was performed for the 94-year period (1922–2015). Per Appendix	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for modeling files, additional information & data, and weblinks within the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	5A, page C-13, DSM2 was run for a 94-year period from water year 1922 to water year 2015, on a 15-minute timestep. Specifically, I need the following CALSIM output data: • Reservoir storage volumes (end-of-month) for all the major Sacramento and Trinity Basin reservoirs as well as San Luis Reservoir and New Melones Reservoir. • Monthly and daily Delta inflows at all key Delta boundary locations • All Delta exports and diversions (monthly and daily) • Delta outflow (Required, total and surplus) • Any related operations data such as monthly and daily QWEST, X2, OMR, E/I Ratio, and barrier operations (south Delta, Delta Cross Channel, and Clifton Court Forebay, etc.) I would also like all available water quality data, in particular salinity, at all key Delta compliance and analysis locations (from the CalSim3 ANN model and from DSM2). Of particular interest are the key urban intakes in the Delta, as well as Mallard Slough, Jersey Point, Antioch, Vernalis and Port Chicago. With respect to the DSM2 modeling and any other Delta model, I would like the following output data: • Tidal flows and velocities (15min) at locations upstream and downstream of all proposed North Delta intake locations, at the Old and Middle River compliance locations, Chipps Island, Jersey Point, Rio Vista, Three-Mile Slough, above and below and in the Delta Cross Channel and Georgiana Slough, Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs, and other key Delta channel locations. • Corresponding hourly tidal elevation data, including	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	upstream and downstream of tidal barriers and gates, and at the drinking water intakes within the Delta • All water quality data (EC), e.g., at all the D-6141 compliance locations, all Delta drinking water intakes, all X2 compliance locations (surface EC) To help me determine which files represent which flows, exports and storage volumes, could you please also email me the applicable CalSim3 and DSM2 node channel schematics, aka grids, (with modes for the proposed tunnel and different nodes for SWP and CVP exports) for the Delta Conveyance modeling. It is also important that these data be made easily available on a website for all members of the public as part of the CEQA public review and comment process.	
12-1	I'm all for the project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support for the project.
15-1	I am requesting a extension of time for public review and comment on the huge EIR (environmental impact report) just released, as 90 days is not enough time to review the document and provide public input. We all need time to read the document and 90 days is an unjust amount of time for a community with limited internet and no way to obtain a printed copy.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period and the availability of the Draft EIR to Delta communities. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public review and comment.
15-2	It's [the DEIR] also not translated into any other language but English - which is also wrong.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding document translation as well as Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		comment, including to environmental justice communities and non-English speaking people.
16-1	I am here to request an extension past the 90 days allotted to review the Delta tunnel EIR 90 days is not enough time to allow us to read through this document and to let others in the community also review it. Please extend this time period for our community. Thank you	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
17-1	Hello Carrie! We are beginning to review the Delta Conveyance Project EIR and would like to obtain the DSM2 modeling files for the model runs that are presented in the EIR. Could you please let us know how we might access those? Please copy my colleague Chi-Yu Lin (cc'd).	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for modeling files within the comment period.
18-1	I oppose this project. A few short comments. It is obvious that this project is too big, intrusive and destructive. It is obvious that Money is the intent of this project. Destroying our delta to get water is stupid. Greed will make you very stupid.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project on the Delta is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and has evaluated the potential environmental impacts on the Delta. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
19-1	Thanks, I found no contact names or info on the DCP website, but may easily have missed it, given all the pages it has. Any contact advice would be appreciated. I've been asked by the Delta Counties Commissioners to review the DEIR. I keep seeing this comment about how the DCP would have captured an additional 230 TAF during the wet end of last year. E.g., https://water.ca.gov/News/Blog/2022/April-22/Big-Storms-Dry-Spells-Demonstrate-the-Need-for-Improved-Infrastructure#. Do you have any documentation describing that calculation that you could share with me?	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period. The hypothetical Delta Conveyance Project diversions for water year 2022, as mentioned in the comment, were determined using actual daily operations in the Delta. When actual export operations were maximized by physical or regulatory constraints (e.g., Old and Middle Rivers [OMR] requirements) and there was additional water above what was needed to meet D-1641 water quality and outflow requirements, hypothetical diversions were assumed to occur. Those hypothetical diversions were

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		then limited by the bypass criteria for the Delta Conveyance Project diversion, pulse protection operations when flow criteria were met at Wilkins Slough, the available water above what was needed to meet D-1641 requirements, or the maximum diversions under the SWP water rights permit.
20-1	Are the CalSim models for each of the DCP scenarios available? If so, please provide the models, inputs, and output files for review.	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for modeling files within the comment period.
21-1	I've been in touch with the owners of the property located on 9521 River Rd Sacramento CA 95832 and they plan on listing this property soon. I noticed their property is close to the planned Intake A and I was wondering if the state has any interest in buying it? Please let me know if there would be any interest.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the property acquisition process.
23-1	I want to make note of my preference for the no-build alternative for this project. Northern California and the Delta are also experiencing drought like conditions and cannot afford to lose the water that provides ecosystem to countless species and provides water for agriculture and infrastructure throughout the area. If there was an abundance of water, the construction of this system alone would be a massive environmental impact. The amount of water left in the Sacramento area after the melting of each annual snowpack is reduced and dangerously low. We are also providing water throughout the state to ever expanding orchards, there is too much demand for what little resources we have left.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for a description of how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically Delta Outflow Criteria to meet State Water Board D-1641. In addition, Chapter 3, in the section titled Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria, provides information regarding how the project would be operated to minimize effects on aquatic species. Please also see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, for evaluation and analysis of the No Project Alternative. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, which describes potential changes to surface water resources that could result from implementation of the project, and Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for the analysis of potential significant environmental impacts of project construction and operations on the resources mentioned in the comment and proposed mitigation measures, particularly Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
23-2	Get your water elsewhere, there's an ocean right next door.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR.
27-1	My name is [commenter name] and I live near Lambert Rd and I-5, in an area that will be impacted by construction of the tunnel. I have reviewed a number of the maps in Appendix 24A dealing with local noise, vibration etc. impacts of construction. I have not reviewed the entire lengthy EIR.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
27-2	It appears that none of the residences on Kestrel Lake Road have been included as green "dots" representing residences in any of these maps [EIR Appendix 24A].. There are at least 4 residences along this road, which parallels I-5 on the west side, north of Lambert. These 4 residences are from about .5 mile north of Lambert to nearly 1 mile north. We own the properties at 11600 Kestrel Lake Rd (our residence) and 11590 Kestrel Lake Rd (a rental). I am worried that our homes will not be considered as impacted if they are not on your maps.	The commenter is correct that the structures at 11600 Kestrel Lake Road and 11590 Kestrel Lake Road are not depicted in the sound level contour figures in Appendix 24A, Sound Level Contours. As a result of this comment, noise analysts reviewed these locations to determine if they lie within the study area or if analysis is required to evaluate potential increase in noise levels due to the project. These two properties are located about 1 mile north of Lambert Road and 700 feet west of I-5. As such they are within the project study area for noise and should have been shown in the figures; these properties were unintentionally omitted. Noise analysts reviewed modeling results and mapping to determine if these addresses are within predicted sound level impact contours for any of the construction scenarios. The modeling results indicate that sound levels during construction and operation would not exceed sound level limits at these properties. The Final EIR has been amended to include the locations of four residences on Kestrel Lake Road in the noise contour maps in Appendix 24A. The added residences are visible on Figures 24A-1a, 24A-1b, 24A-2a, 24A-2b, 24A-3b, 24A-3c, 24A-4a, 24A-4b, 24A-5a, 24A-5b, 24A-6b, 24A-6c, 24A-7a, 24A-7b, 24A-8a, 24A-8b, 24A-9b, and 24A-9c.
27-3	Please amend these [Appendix 24A] and any other maps in the EIR indicating residences and their impact by this project.	Please see the response to comment 27-2 regarding project noise effects at the addresses referenced in comment 27-2. The Final EIR has been amended to include the locations of residences on Kestrel Lake Road in the noise contour maps in Appendix 24A, Sound Level Contours.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
27-4	Please add these [11600 Kestrel Lake Road and 11590 Kestrel Lake Road] to the number of impacted residences in appropriate parts of the EIR.	As described in the response to comment 27-2, the analysis determined that these locations would not experience noise impacts due to project construction. Accordingly, these residences were not included in the numbers of impacts reported in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, of the EIR.
27-5	Please include all of us [landowners on Kestrel Lake Road] in any future notifications that may occur when construction begins.	All persons, organizations, or agencies that commented on the Draft EIR will be included on the project notification list. In addition, landowners adjacent to the project are included on the project notification list.
28-1	That's correct. Thank you!	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
28-2	Congratulations on getting the DEIR out the door! That is no small task and I hope you are both able to breathe a little now that it is done.	This comment is a general statement of support for preparation and public release of the Draft EIR. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
28-3	I spent a little time looking around the website, but I did not see a link to download model files and results for the DEIR. Are the models available somewhere I can access them? We are starting to get questions about what was analyzed. It would be great to have an opportunity to review the models and then schedule a time to discuss with you both.	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for modeling files within the comment period.
31-1	This story [Exhibits 1, 2, and 3] of the benefit of the DCP, if it had been operational last winter, was repeated a number of times during the rollout of the DCP and picked up by most news coverage. The numbers seemed awfully high to me. We had one exceptionally brief storm in October and a December that provided a lot of snowfall, but not so much rain. To get 236 TAF with a maximum pumping capability of 6000 cfs would require	The numbers cited by this comment [Exhibits 1, 2, and 3] were generated by DWR using the operations criteria described in the Draft EIR applied to the hydrology at the time (winter). Please refer to the following tables in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, which describe the circumstances under which the project can divert water from the Sacramento River: Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria; Proposed North Delta Diversion Bypass Flow and Pulse Protection Requirements; North Delta Diversion Bypass Flow Criteria (sub-table). In addition, the figure titled Seasonal Diversions in Chapter 3

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	20 days. After reading the proposed operations of the project I couldn't make the math work out. The proposed operations (see figure 3-37 [Exhibit 2] below) have limitations that no pumping is allowed in October and November at river flows under 7000 cfs and from Dec-April no pumping at the NDD can happen at river flows below 5000 cfs. There are complicated rules that govern how much bypass flow is required when those minima are exceeded, but it would be very rare to be able to use the full 6000 cfs capacity of the project under the conditions of last Winter. The proposed operations of the NDD are summarized in figure 3-37. The full 6000 cfs capacity is only available at flows over 35000 in December-April and at flows over 20000 in October-November[.] By my estimation there are only about 17 days in the 6 months from October through March when flows would have permitted anything more than low level pumping of 900 cfs. One of the two peaks in December would doubtless correspond to the 'first flush' protection when young winter-run salmon are expected to be in greatest abundance at the NDD site and so those days would be off the table. In short, I cannot see any basis for the scale of benefits ascribed to the project if it had been operational last winter. If I have miscalculated or erroneously read the DEIR please guide me toward the light.	graphically depicts how the project would operate. Finally, as described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections of existing standards and as prescribed by the federal and state environmental permitting process.
31-2	[Exhibit 1: Excerpt from DWR blog post titled "Big Storms, Dry Spells, Demonstrate the Need for Improved Infrastructure and the Delta Conveyance Project" published on April 20, 2022.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
31-3	[Exhibit 2: Screenshot of part of Figure 3-37, Seasonal Diversions, from the DCP DEIR.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
31-4	[Exhibit 3: Graphs of flows (cfs) between October and March for the Sacramento region from www.cbr.washington.edu.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
33-1	In regards to the Delta conveyance project, A lot of questions concerning the EIR and the projected cost of this project still remain as major questions for me. Since there is no guarantee that this project will benefit the environment, farms or the population of California, I will still remain as a NO vote on this project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, Chapter 1 describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
33-2	It is a multi billion dollar expense with no guarantee that the state will be out of a drought at anytime in the near future, so where does the extra flows of water come from that will be needed to make this tunnel viable? We presently aren't even getting enough precipitation to fill up our reservoirs each year.	Please see response to comment 33-1 regarding project costs, purpose and objectives, and the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of how the Delta Conveyance Project would modify the State Water Project to include north

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Delta diversions for the purpose of restoring and protecting the reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Delta consistent with the California Water Resilience Portfolio (California Natural Resources Agency et al. 2020) in a cost-effective manner. Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for more information regarding water supply and potential changes to water availability in the study area.
33-3	The wildlife and fish population are presently suffering because of lack of water flows, so where is this extra water coming from and where will it be stored in the spring/summer months?	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to response to comment 33-2 regarding water supply and availability. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for impact analysis about fish and aquatic resources. As described in Chapter 12, all potentially significant environmental impacts related to aquatic species would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for the evaluation of impacts on terrestrial biological resources, including habitats and wildlife. As described in Chapter 13, all potentially significant impacts analyzed would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
34-1	This project should be dismissed. There is no need to spend all that money to double down on this horrible idea, especially since the delta is so low that salt water has started intruding. What you need is desal plants.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project implementation, including project costs.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
34-2	Honestly, I've stopped caring about the drought. I can't take you seriously. You keep allowing building down in southern California without a guaranteed way of providing water to them and when Disney was approved to build a lake in the middle of the desert, you lost all credibility. It is clear you are as corrupt as Mulholland was and you only serve southern California interests. We need an agency to advocate for northern California's needs.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. As described in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, public water agencies (PWAs) throughout California are already pursuing local supply resiliency projects such as recycling, groundwater recharge, storage, and conservation to reduce reliance on the Delta to meet future needs. DWR does not have authority over

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		these local supply resiliency projects. Please also see Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, for a discussion of actions PWAs are taking in their service areas and under their authorities.
34-3	I, personally, will use all the water I want without regard for the rest of the state. It's better to use it up here before it even gets down to southern California so it can stay in the environment it was intended.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
34-4	If this plan were to go through, it should be ENTIRELY funded by only those in southern California that receive the water.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and financing, which would be provided by project beneficiaries that use the water, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
34-5	I remind you of your mission statement: To sustainably manage the water resources of California (by building lakes in the desert during long standing droughts?? In what other ways are you being sustainable? What small percentage of the water being sent, is actually being recycled? If you don't have the authority to make them recycle the water, then you can't manage anything. You're just a water broker and you only serve southern California interests. Again, we need another agency here to protect us from you.)	Please refer to response to comment 34-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 34-2 regarding the State Water Project and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for information on various state, regional, and local water supply planning efforts and the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to these efforts. Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
34-6	I remind you of your mission statement:	Please refer to response to comment 34-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, response to comment 34-2 regarding the State Water Project and how water supply has been developed and managed in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	in cooperation with other agencies (what if northern California agencies no longer want to cooperate? Would you then just take it?),	California, and response to comment 34-5 for information on various state, regional, and local water supply planning efforts and the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to these efforts.
34-7	I remind you of your mission statement: to benefit the state's people (where is the benefit to northern California? We're drying out and burning up. The trees are drying up and either burning, getting beetles or being cut down which dries things out further. Less trees and less moisture in the environment means less rain, causing further droughts.)	Please refer to response to comment 34-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 34-5 for information on various state, regional, and local water supply planning efforts and the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to these efforts. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
34-8	I remind you of your mission statement: and protect, restore, and enhance the natural and human environments. (How are you protecting, restoring and enhancing the NATURAL environments? Northern California is drying out and becoming a desert itself - fix that!!!)	Please refer to response to comment 34-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, response to comment 34-5 for information on various state, regional, and local water supply planning efforts and the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to these efforts, and response to comment 34-7 regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
34-9	In the meantime, sea levels continue to rise and the Colorado River and the Delta are drying up. Stop destroying what little is left and get the water through desalination plants. If those people living in southern California are more concerned with their views on the coast and are shooting down the desalination plants, then they should pay 2 or 3 times the cost for water until they get more reasonable. You're destroying the entire state for a small sliver of wealthy people. You should be ashamed.	Please refer to response to comment 34-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, the alternatives development process, and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 34-7 regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change, and build climate resilience in response to impacts of climate change, such as sea level rise. The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project to California is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
35-1	Congratulations on the completing the DEIR! The Sites Project Authority is interested in reviewing the CalSim models used in the DEIR.	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for detailed modeling information within the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Could you please share these models? Let me know if I should contact someone else to make this request.	
37-1	I hope this note is finding you doing well. Congratulations on getting the DRAFT EIR out! A real milestone. I just submitted comments to the Salinity Barrier Draft EIR for Jacob McQuirk!	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
37-2	Would it be possible to receive a hardcopy of the EIR? Jacob was able to get me a copy of his and it helped so much in making a review more efficient for me. It would be greatly appreciated and I will share it with others here on Bethel Island and with the San Joaquin Yacht Club.	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for hard copies within the comment period and mailed flash drives to requesters.
37-3	I will be out of the country starting this week until 9/15. So lots of most of my effort on this will be after 9/15. Have a great weekend!	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
38-1	We are residents of the Delta and want to go on record as OPPOSED to the Delta Conveyance Project - by this name or any other. This project is still dependent on rainfall to provide sufficient water to be diverted. Construction and operation have the sure potential of causing irreversible and uncontrollable ecologic harm. And it will harm the communities, residents, visitors and businesses, which reside and depend on the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding water supply. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for impact analysis about fish and aquatic resources. As described in Chapter 12, all potentially significant environmental impacts related to aquatic species would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for the evaluation of impacts on terrestrial biological resources, which describes that all potential impacts analyzed would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, and Chapter 16, Recreation, for impacts on socioeconomics and recreation, respectively. As described in Chapter 17, the potential impacts analyzed are not expected to result in adverse

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		effects. As described in Chapter 16, the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
38-2	Spend this enormous amount of money on desalination plants which are not dependent on fluctuating rainfalls to provide clean water to the areas needed.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and financing.
38-3	Put an end to these preposterous proposals [The Delta Conveyance Project], which the voters have said "no" to, over and over, again.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
39-1	Thank you for the reply regarding a hard copy form of the EIR. I totally understand that it is a very big document or set of documents. Of course, the size even makes it harder to consume, understand, and comment upon. I just reviewed the EIR for the Salinity Barrier, which DWR was about to provide a hardcopy, and it really made the job of reviewing and commenting so much easier. It would be great even if there was a hardcopy available regionally for people to visit and refer to, that would be great, perhaps at libraries or something like that. Alternatively, we'll all try to deal with all these documents and sizes to consume and comment.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the availability of the Draft EIR at public libraries and DWR's office in West Sacramento. In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for hard copies of the EIR within the comment period and mailed flash drives to requesters.
39-2	Lastly, I know this is probably not your responsibility area, but Carrie and Graham are copied on this email so I'd like to say that it is extremely disappointing that the public meetings will be by Zoom meeting. This is a tremendous disservice to the Delta community that has lots to say and should be given the opportunity to do so directly to the decisionmakers attentive and listening. This is just another step in the lack of trust between DWR, DCA and the people of the Delta community. Forever it has been said that the community will have an opportunity to state their positions openly, and now it's going to be on a 2 hour zoom meeting, for everyone to make their statements. This just seems much too convenient for the state agencies forcing this down the throat of the people in the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings held during the public review period for the Draft EIR and the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public review and comment.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
40-1	My name is [commenter name]. I have past certifications as a Water Quality Analyst Grade 3, a Water Treatment Operator Grade 3, and a Registered Environmental Health Specialist.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
40-2	The State of California has circumvented the democratic process by not allowing a public vote on the twin tunnels or the new single tunnel project. A previous proposal, the Peripheral Canal, was rejected by voters in 1982.	As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, the section in Chapter 1 titled Intended Uses of This Final EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
40-3	After at least 16 years of trying to develop an Environmental Impact Report there is still no approved plan. Although the plans fail to reflect in-the-field realities tens of thousands of pages have been produced without a single asset being developed. That alone should be a huge red flag.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a detailed explanation of the history and complex issues that have led to the development of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts dating as far back as the early 1960s are described under the section titled Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts. Text under the section titled Current Planning Effort explains that the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) was directed by DWR to develop the preliminary design concepts for the project facilities and alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR.
40-4	The initial and faulty premise that dewatering the delta would magically restore it is erroneous. To quote researchers and Delta experts, Drs. Lee and Lee ‘there is no delta in the world that has been restored in this manner."	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the project’s purpose and objectives, including DWR’s continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws, including those intended to protect water quality and fish.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The commenter's assertion that the project would dewater the Delta is not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of CEQA impact determinations on all resources evaluated in the EIR, including surface and ground water resources in the Delta. As shown in this table, the analysis in the EIR concludes that most significant impacts, particularly those related to aquatic biological resources (Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources), would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
40-5	Although labeled The Bay Delta Conservation Plan, at one point, there was no intent to restore the Bay or Delta. This became crystal clear when the State dropped the 8 billion dollar restoration portion of the plan. Organizations planning a water grab do not care about restoration.	Please see response to comment 40-3 regarding the history and complex issues that have led to the development of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Chapter 1, Introduction, in the section titled The Bay Delta Conservation Plan and California WaterFix, describes the past planning efforts related to the prior project of BDCP/California WaterFix.
40-6	Tunnel proposals have wasted money and time for the state, the water districts, and the environmental groups who have opposed them over time. Hired hands contractors have gotten fat even though they've have failed miserably to produce anything of value. Water districts that have already spent millions of dollars are left holding empty bags. Taxpayers have been defrauded of millions of dollars that should be refunded.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and costs to taxpayers and costs to water districts that contract with DWR for a supply of water from the SWP.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
40-7	Further evidence of poor planning is the gap between what the State says the new tunnel will cost and outside economic predictions. Though cost would certainly go up during construction the cost of 16 billion dollars is unworkable for a pipeline that may have no water in it during periods of drought.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments related to project costs. Please see Appendix 6A, Water Supply 2040 Analysis, which describes water supplies expected under a 2040 climate change scenario and identifies anticipated long-term average annual SWP deliveries under dry and critical water year conditions.
40-8	Environmental protections for the plants and animals that make California the most biologically diverse state in the country must not be compromised. The collapse of the ionic native salmon populations is just one of many reasons to expand protections not eliminate them.	The EIR describes the environmental setting and study area for terrestrial and aquatic biological resources; analyzes impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the Delta Conveyance Project (project); and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The findings of these chapters are that the environmental impacts of the project are less than significant after mitigation. Chapter 1, Introduction, describes the relevant federal and state laws and regulations protecting biological resources as well as the review, approval, and consultation requirements that DWR will be required to comply with and may be necessary to implement the project. The project does not alter these protections for any species or habitat. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the permitting and consultation requirements of the Endangered Species Act.
40-9	The strategy so far seems to be based on confusing the public with a slick marketing campaign combined with the false hopes that the opposition will give up. I can tell you right now that is not going to happen.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, for information regarding public outreach requirements under CEQA, notification methods about the Draft EIR, and the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
40-10	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Unsustainable farming practices including the growth and expansion of pasture lands, nut tree acreage, and alfalfa farms instead of row crops that can be plowed under after harvesting.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding crop choices. As discussed in Common Response 12, current and future crops choices by agricultural operators are largely driven by market forces which can be highly dynamic; crop choices are effectively private business decisions which are not under DWR's authority and hence outside the scope of this EIR analysis.
40-11	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Over pumping of ground water basins resulting in dry wells and significant land subsidence.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is not a groundwater management project. The focus of the groundwater assessment in Chapter 8, Groundwater, is to disclose localized construction- and operation-related impacts on groundwater and groundwater resources that could result from the project. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).
40-12	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Groundwater contamination rendering water unusable for many applications.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is not a groundwater management project. The focus of the groundwater assessment in Chapter 8, Groundwater, is to disclose local construction- and operation-related impacts that could result from the project. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
40-13	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Discharge of pollutants to surface waters from farms, industry, the military, and the general public.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources including water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality.
40-14	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Too much reliance on dams and reservoirs when more modern solutions for water storage and distribution need development.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The project does not involve construction or expansion of any dam or reservoir. It is intended to protect water supply deliveries by the SWP to its customers.
40-15	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Water diversion from north to south is excessive.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
40-16	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Flow regimes not properly managed at critical life cycle times to protect trout, salmon, frogs, and many other species.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.
40-17	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Climate change, air pollution, and drought remediation underfunding.	Please refer to response to comment 40-16 regarding DWR's commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change, including concerns about future sea level rise. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. The EIR also addresses environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.
40-18	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Lawn, golf courses, and nonnative water guzzling plants and trees depleting reserves.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
40-19	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Shutting out the broader scientific community when evidence against the project is presented.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project as well as the use of best available science, including communications with the scientific community, in preparation of the EIR. DWR has developed a robust public education program to keep interested parties aware of the development of the Delta Conveyance Project and inform them about the need for the project. DWR conducted a scoping period in 2020 to solicit input on the scope of the project; has developed information materials including videos, fact sheets and blogs; held a series of informational webinars in Summer 2021; and developed information

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		pieces to help guide reviewers on the content and information contained in the Draft EIR.
40-20	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Government officials like Brown and Newsom, who are lawyers not water experts, making decisions which will affect current and future Californians.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
40-21	Besides the tunnel project being a bad idea I would ask you to consider how California has managed to get itself into such a mess in regards to water policy. Here is a "dirty dozen" though certainly not comprehensive: Campaign contributions (really bribes) from lobbyists who will profit if the tunnel is built.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and is beyond the scope of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
40-22	In summary I would ask you to reject the tunnel project as just another mistake in managing water resources that will make current conditions worse like concentrating toxins and worsening other existing problems. Please put a permanent halt to the wasting of financial and other resources that would be better used toward building a more resilient water supply.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition of the project. The comment assertions that the proposed project would worsen water quality and other environmental issues are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an evaluation of potential impacts on water quality, which concludes that the project impacts would be less than significant without mitigation. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
47-1	How are you?	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
47-2	At one of the EIR meetings, there was a discussion about the current order of rivers that feed into the Clifton Court Forebay. Do you think you can help me out?	In regard to the portion of the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period.
51-1	This comment is being submitted to the Delta Conveyance EIR mailbox in opposition to the project and in support of the "No action alternative".	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.
51-2	The Mississippi River Basin continues to have an abundance of water, water is required for farming, farmers need to move to the Mississippi River Basin. The Colorado, Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins continue to be in a severe drought, there is no longer water for farming in the West. The climate has changed.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
51-3	[Exhibit 1: First screenshot of Question and Answer dialogue box from Zoom webinar that contains respondent's questions and comments.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-4	[Exhibit 2: Second screenshot from Zoom webinar that includes Question and Answer dialogue box with respondent's comment.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
51-5	Thank you for reading my comments and studying the embedded images.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-6	This is my 40th letter to the California Water Commission (CWC). Please add this comment to the 19 May 2021 agenda item 10 Climate Change and the Delta. I have been fishing, swimming and boating in the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta for forty years. I built a new boat last year during the Covid lockdown so I could go Mokelumne and Sacramento River salmon fishing but I could not leave my house in August and September because the wildfire smoke covering California was so thick it was unhealthy to be outside.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-7	[Exhibit 3: First of three photos of California wildfires referenced in comments 6 and 10.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-8	[Exhibit 4: Second of three photos of California wildfires referenced in comments 6 and 10]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-9	[Exhibit 5: Third of three photos of California wildfires referenced in comments 6 and 10]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-10	The [2021] California wildfires were caused by lightning strikes due to Climate Change, Governor Newsom said that I have the video. Climate Change is caused by carbon dioxide greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels (natural gas) to make electricity at the Calpine built Tracy power plant that supports the Banks and Jones pumping plants to send Sacramento San Joaquin river water to Central Valley farms and Southern California.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
51-11	Agriculture uses 80% of California's water. We do not have much water due to climate change I believe you caused ["Cause" is Tracy Power Plant, Jones pumping].	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-12	What you have been doing is killing our salmon and steelhead, it is unsustainable, unnecessary and it needs to stop right now.	Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which describes that all potentially significant environmental impacts related to fish and aquatic resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
51-13	I saw this story streaming on CBSN https://youtu.be/B07ADXy7rsk I downloaded and read the attached PDF by Ms. Julia Kurnik, WWF Director, Innovation Startups - Markets, "The_Next_California_Phase_1_Report_02-27-20". It is well thought out and I believe with the right leadership chosen by Ms. Julia Kurnik and her peers can be implemented immediately through President Biden and Vice President Harris' Infrastructure Bill. If The Next California [See attachment #2] project cannot attract bipartisan support for the Infrastructure Bill nothing can. I believe making The Next California project a Biden Harris success could flip MO, AR, TN and MS from red to blue states in the midterms and 2024 and save all American consumers of fruits, nuts and vegetables $1.26 Trillion from environmental risk. Through this ["The Next California Project'] change California's State Water Project can be cut in half for the water that is now available due to the Climate Change you have brought upon us. You will not need a second or third Calpine built Tracy fossil fuel power plant to support Scary tunnel [Delta Conveyance Project] boring, construction and pumping water back up out of a 60 foot below sea level tunnel.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-14	You do not need a Delta Conveyance office, a Jacobs Engineering project office and their nasty carbon footprints. Tony Meyers, PE, Executive Director Delta Conveyance, wrote	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	them to telecommute a year ago (see page 2 of the attached letter [See attachment #3] I received via a public records request) so the offices have been empty. I hope they didn't heat and cool those empty offices. That would be a waste of energy and an unnecessary dump of carbon to the atmosphere.	comments in its decision-making process.
51-15	[Exhibit 6: Excerpt of letter referenced in comment 14.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-16	[Exhibit 7: Google Earth photo of Jacobs Project Office building.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-17	[Exhibit 8: Google Earth photo of U.S. Bank Plaza building.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-18	Thank you for reading these comments. I will be forwarding these comments to President Biden, Vice President Harris and the Governors of MO, AR, TN and MS for their consideration and asking their support implementing the Next California Project.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-19	Dear California Water Commission (CWC) Commissioners Quintero, Baker, Ball, Byrne, Curtin, Herrera, Alvarado, Swanson, staff and the public. This is my 27th letter over the past 3 years to the CWC. Please accept my following public comment in response to agenda item #10 "State Water Project (SWP) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Update" at the 15 Jan 2020 CWC meeting. The new Delta Conveyance Design and Construction office building at 980 9th Street Sacramento adds a helicopter pad and 65 parking spaces in a 7+ year lease to SWP's carbon footprint. Why can't employees, contractors, consultants and directors use CalTrain and bicycles like the rest of us? Why can't the construction office be located in a trailer	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	at the jobsite in the Delta bringing project management closer to its customers like every other construction project in the world?	
51-20	[Exhibit 9: Second Google Earth photo of U.S. Bank Plaza building.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-21	Delta Conveyance's construction power demand of 242 mega-volt amperes (MVA) and operating demand of 60 MVA will require an additional natural gas fired power plant. The existing Tracy Combined Cycle Plant that supports Jones and Banks pumping plants emits 390,233 metric tons of CO2e annually. The Scary tunnel will double that component of the SWP carbon footprint. Please reference my previous Scary tunnel video comment https://youtu.be/rvm7r4hYcWs [Link is currently unavailable]	The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR and the comment does not provide an explanation or evidence for the claim. The project does not require a gas fired power plant. Please refer to Chapter 22, Energy, regarding the project's use of energy for construction and operation which are estimated to be 175.663 MW for the proposed Bethany Reservoir alignment (Alternative 5). As described in Chapter 22, the potential impacts analyzed would result in no impact for Impact ENG-2 and a less-than-significant impact for Impact ENG-1. Please also see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding the effects of the project on greenhouse gases (GHG) in the study area. As discussed in Impact AQ-9, the project would result in a less-than-significant with mitigation impact on GHG emissions. Please refer to table GHG Emissions from O&M, Increased SWP Pumping, and Displaced Purchases of CVP Electricity under 2020 Conditions for the estimated quantity of metric tons CO_2e emission per year for the project alternatives. Please also see Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding the technical methods for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from electricity use.
51-22	[Exhibit 10: Screenshot of Microsoft Excel spreadsheet from the California Air Resources Board that contains 2018 GHG emissions data for the Tracy Combined Cycle Plant.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-23	CWC approved and Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) and Water Infrastructure Improvement for the Nation (WIIN)	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and it is not a comment on the contents

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	funded off stream reservoirs Los Vaqueros, Sites and Del Puerto Canyon (seeking WIIN funding) require pumping water up 500 feet dumping megatons of carbon into the atmosphere.	of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
51-24	The water remains stagnant in the reservoir, is in a toxic algal bloom incubator and would be much safer in underground storage away from sunlight algae requires to grow and there is no water loss due to evaporation.	The Delta Conveyance Project would not affect surface water quality in the reservoirs upstream of the Delta for reasons described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Water Quality. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-14, for the impact analysis of the project's potential effects on cyanobacterial blooms in the Delta and in the SWP/CVP export service area waterbodies, which were determined to be less than significant.
51-25	As Department of Water Resources (DWR) public facing entity the CWC has a responsibility to reign in the exploding carbon footprint of these proposed projects to protect our planet and future generations of Californians.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, which is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta), consistent with the California Water Resilience Portfolio (California Natural Resources Agency et al. 2020) in a cost-effective manner. The objectives focus on the SWP's ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize disruption of SWP operations from earthquakes in and around the Delta, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility. As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-9, and response to comment 51-21, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Please see Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding the technical methods for the estimation of GHG emissions from electricity use.
51-26	[Attachment 1: Screenshot from dcdca.org of a document excerpt labeled Section 19.1, Power Demand.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
51-27	[Attachment 2: World Wildlife Fund report titled "The Next California" published February 2020.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
51-28	[Attachment 3: Letter from the DCO to the DCA regarding the fiscal year 20/21 budget and funding through the end of calendar year 2020, dated July 15, 2020.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
54-1	The Los Altos Library is supposed to have hard copy of your Delta Conveyance EIR but there was not a copy of this EIR in Los Altos Library reference today. Could you confirm that this EIR has been sent to Los Altos as indicated in your news release of July 27 or advise when hard copy will be available there for review?	In regard to the comment requesting additional information, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the availability of the Draft EIR at public libraries.
57-1	Why on earth would you tear up the delta which is already got its own issues when we are so fortunate to have the Pacific Ocean with rising water levels, with rising water levels, available and adjacent to the entire the state where we could build desalination plants to supply all our water needs for the entire state. This plan would eliminate the need to pump water to southern California, while protecting the natural water flows though the delta benefiting the fish and salt intrusion. Thank you for your consideration.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
58-1	Our son's well in northern California went dry in March and you are wanting to drain our water to send it to southern California! They do not conserve water and we do. The delta is	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	a natural ecosystem and this will damage the water supply which is already dangerously low and our population is growing fast. Please stop this ecologically & financially wasteful project Southern California needs to learn to conserve. Our garden is dry because we are letting our lawn and other plants die and they have countless swimming pools of water.	Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding water supply. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
59-1	If building Twin Tunnels will get more rain or create more water flow, if salt water encroachment is held back by talk then by all means build the tunnels. Dams generating power for 75 years is the cheapest power available and some Congressman wants to dismantle them what is he thinking or not thinking and people voted for him to represent us? Oregon is deciding now to remove three cheap power producing dams in the Gorge because of endangered salmon? Is salmon becoming more important than citizens? Is there something in the water that causes pie in the sky decisions? Building tunnels is not going to give more water only take from what little we have.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please note that the Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix.
59-2	Desalination is expensive right now but in the future as population increases and the demand for water increases that cost will come down.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
59-3	Twin Tunnels is, not if a disaster in the making.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please note that the Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
62-1	The comment period is absolutely not long enough. Given the extensive size of the EIR document and the massive amount of impact your proposed project will have on so many levels, proper and insightful comments cannot possibly be supplied in such a short window of time. Please extend the time to comment on your proposed "Delta Conveyance".	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
63-1	The 90-day period allotted to send comments to the EIR is woefully inadequate. The report is very long and detailed. More time is needed to give it proper attention.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
64-1	Normal people cannot absorb and thoroughly review that many pages in 90 days. (A year would be even more appropriate).	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
64-2	• I say NO to DWR, their tunnel, and their phony community meetings. We can't be bribed.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
65-1	I'm finding it just too difficult to read the EIR report for the Conveyance Project during the time given. There is much to process! I respectfully request that the time for EIR to be extended by another 90 days to fully comprehend.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
65-2	Thank you in advance for granting this request.	Please refer to response to comment 65-1 regarding DWR's extension of the comment period.
66-1	Who paid for the EIS?	This comment was submitted to DWR during the Draft EIR public comment period and prior to the release of the Draft EIS. DWR is considering this to be a comment on the Draft EIR. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project financing.
66-2	How will the "Delta Conveyance" be operated? Several of the models show capacity for 6,000 CFS draw out of the river. What CFS will the river be flowing when 6,000CFS is diverted? What is the maximum flow that will be left in the river when water is diverted to the "conveyance"?	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). As described in Chapter 3, the amount of water being diverted and the amount of flow maintained in the river depends on multiple factors, including time of year and existing regulatory requirements. Please refer to the operational criteria tables in Chapter 3, which describe the circumstances under which the project could divert water from the Sacramento River. Chapter 5, Surface Water, section titled Changes to Sacramento River Basin Flows, provides an analysis of modeled flows in the Sacramento River downstream of the north Delta intakes under different hydrologic conditions, demonstrating that the project would not substantially reduce Sacramento River flows. In addition, please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for additional details regarding project operations and the flow that would remain in the river system.
66-3	It is difficult for the average citizen to view the EIS documents. I was able to go to the library but couldn't check anything out and couldn't download files from the thumb drive because the files were so large. Why weren't additional thumb drives provided to libraries so that the thumb drives could be checked out? Only one thumb drive was provided to the Courtland Library, and they didn't allow it to be removed	This comment was submitted to DWR during the Draft EIR public comment period and prior to the release of the Draft EIS. DWR is considering this to be a comment on the Draft EIR. Please see Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding public availability of electronic documents and accessibility and the outreach activities conducted

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		throughout the EIR process. Upon request, members of the public could receive a thumb drive of the Draft EIR via mail. As described in Chapter 35, because internet connections in the Delta are often unreliable, DWR provided EIR materials to over 20 libraries in the five Delta counties on thumb drives.
67-1	More time is needed to study the Delta conveyance boondoggle tunnel. Delta people aren't robots that can read 10,000 pages in 90 days!	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
68-1	It would be greatly appreciated if you could extend the deadline for comments on your recent email regarding the DELTA tunnels. We are not lawyers many of us are retired and it takes us a while to get through the document and understand it. So far it doesn't look good but we definitely need more time to get through the document and gather our thoughts regarding same. Please extend the deadline at least an additional 90 days that would be a minimum. Thanking you in advance,	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
69-1	Please extend the time for comments on the proposal. Need at least 6 months to review the proposal.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
71-1	I request that the comment period be extended past 90 days. This is much too much information to review in that period of time.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
71-2	Thank you for your attention to this matter.	This is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
72-1	Please extend the comment period on the Tunnels project.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
73-1	We just got back and we are half way through the review period for the Draft EIR. I can only think of one person in the Delta that will read the EIR for a living. The rest of us have very busy lives that do not have the time to grasp a document of that complexity and magnitude. The public review period should be at least nine months, not 90 days.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
73-2	In the interest of fairness to the people most affected by the Tunnel Project, please grant an extension.	Please see the response to comment 73-1 regarding the extension of the comment period.
74-1	My name is Captain Frank Morgan, I have lived in Discovery Bay on the California Delta for over 20 years.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and provides general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
74-2	Please consider this my formal request to EXTEND the Draft EIR comment period for the Delta Tunnel Draft EIR. A document with thousands of pages to read and evaluate, is simply to large of a document to fully understand and provide thoughtful comments in the short time currently allotted, which ends on October 27th.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
74-3	Also, I request that ALL PUBLIC comment outreach and ALL community meetings be held IN PERSON and NOT with strictly Zoom access. If in-person public meetings are not possible due to COVID safety concerns, then postpone the public comment time until such time that it is safe for the community to be physically present at all of the public comment meetings! This topic is far to technical and important to hold on-line meetings only.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings held during the public review period for the Draft EIR. Please also see the response to comment 74-2 regarding the extension of the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
74-4	Meetings should be noticed with plenty of time for the community to participate and they should be CONVENIENT for all attendees. During the last "twin tunnel" meetings, there were meetings held in Brentwood at venues that held limited amount of attendees, and as a result, many concerned citizens were required to sit in satellite rooms with TV monitors, or not let in at all. I strongly request that meetings be held in the Discovery Bay Elementary school gymnasium to allow ALL CONCERNED CITIZENS the opportunity to be physically present at the meetings and be heard by all in attendance. I am sure more meetings should be held in other communities throughout the Delta region as well, but since thousands of concerned citizens live in Discovery Bay, it only makes sense to have meetings in Discovery Bay, if the DWR is truly interested in meaningful public comment.	Please see response to comment 74-3 regarding the public meetings held during the public review period for the Draft EIR.
75-1	I am reviewing the DEIR for the Delta Conveyance. Is there a section entitled "Project Description?"	Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for details regarding the project description.
76-1	Due to summer vacation absence, I am requesting at least a 90-day extension.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
77-1	My name is Greg Camphire from Santa Ana, California, and I'm writing to comment on the Delta Conveyance Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and provides general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
77-2	The Delta Tunnel project would result in a significantly negative impact on the Delta as well as the San Francisco Bay and Trinity and Sacramento Rivers Tribal Cultural Landscape. Since it is linked to the proposed Sites Reservoir, the combined effect would extract too much water from these important but dwindling natural resources.	Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a discussion of the study areas evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding Delta Conveyance Project's operations, which do not include changes to State Water Project or Central Valley Project operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, evaluates potential impacts on Tribal cultural resources that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, including the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. Although the analysis in Chapter 32 concludes that impacts on Tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, for consideration of other projects, including Sites Reservoir, in the cumulative impact analysis of the EIR.
77-3	Many California tribes depend on the survival of the salmon, and they shouldn't have to defend their resources from the destruction caused by this project.	DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please see the response to comment 77-2 regarding the analysis and mitigation measures included in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts on salmon to a less-than-significant level.
77-4	The DEIR fails to consider any alternatives that reduce diversions from the Delta. All DEIR alternatives result in terrible ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife--including endangered species--as well as the disturbance of cultural resources such as historic tribal villages cannot be adequately mitigated. The resulting toxic algae levels would negatively impact fish runs during a time of extreme climate crisis. All DEIR alternatives would also result in increased water exports.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the comment. The comment assertions regarding impacts of the project are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project related to Cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please see the response to comment 77-2 regarding the analysis and mitigation measures included in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. Potential impacts on cultural resources are discussed in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, which concludes that potential impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Chapter 19 also includes mitigation measures to avoid and reduce effects to the extent possible.
77-5	The state's Delta Tunnel plan remains deeply flawed and would not significantly improve statewide water supplies. Instead, it will bring irreversible damage to the Delta while wasting billions of dollars that could be better spent elsewhere.	The comment assertions are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
77-6	The negative economic impacts will affect millions of residents across the state, especially those in underserved communities where water quality and quantity would be severely curtailed.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding socioeconomic effects. Additionally, the EIR evaluates potential surface water changes in Chapter 5, Surface Water, and water quality effects in Chapter 9, Water Quality. Please also refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding the environmental justice analysis. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
77-7	The current DEIR only reflects minor revisions to the same old plans that have been previously rejected. We must develop better alternatives to provide a resilient statewide water supply and adequately face long-term drought and climate change. We must do better.	Please refer to response to comment 77-4 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, the alternatives development process, and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 77-7 regarding engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
78-1	No tunnels! Leave the delta and its fish alone. Especially now that global warming has begun and the northern rivers are likely to shrink.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please note that the Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project.
80-1	Hi, please prioritize the delta ecosystem and deprioritize agricultural interests with historic water rights. We need to get real and rearrange the way water is allocated	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding information about water rights.
80-2	Stop exporting our water in the form of crops at the cost of CA residents and CA ecosystems.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to response to comment 80-1 regarding the State Water Project, how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
81-1	I just heard about "The Delta Tunnel Draft EIR" and, I am very dismayed by such a short notice for such a critical Delta issue that affects millions of California citizens. Please extend the review time frame for this proposal at least another 90 days (preferably a year} so that citizens can have the time to absorb the projected effects of this proposal.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
81-2	As I currently see it, the proposal affects drinking water for millions of Californians by damaging the aquifer with salt water intrusion.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts on drinking water and salinity intrusion are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, for analysis of the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please refer to Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, regarding drinking water supplies.
81-3	The salt water intrusion also displaces our citizens, farming and further endangers wild life.	Please see response to comment 81-2 regarding project operations, regulatory requirements, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to salinity. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding the project's potential impacts on agriculture. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
81-4	It [saltwater intrusion] will also have a major effect on the economy of northern and central California.	Please refer to the response to comment 81-2 regarding project operations, regulatory requirements, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to salinity.
81-5	Please extend the review time for this proposal.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and DWR's extension of the comment period.
82-1	I strongly support the Preferred Alternative for the DCP indicated in the Draft EIR as the best alternative. California's water conveyance system is in desperate need of updating to meet changing conditions that the original design did not consider. The current system supports far more people than when it was originally constructed, through water conservation efforts and recycling. However, conservation and recycling will not be sufficient to meet future demands without modernization of the State Water Project. California has a choice; move potable water to the people or move people to the water. Without modernization of the State Water Project, Californians will need to relocate to northern California or they will leave the State.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support to the project.
83-1	I've been reaching out to my local leaders with a suggestion to bring water to Calif. and the connecting western states. I recently spoke with Palmdale, CA. Mayor Steve Hofbauer. Mayor Hofbauer sent your event info to me.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
83-2	You might want to consider this suggestion: I believe that water can be transferred via pipe or an aqueduct or both, from areas such as Lake Michigan, which always maintains its fresh water supply with snow melt, and the often-flooded states of Kentucky, Mississippi and surrounding areas. If done right, the flooded states would see this as an asset. The flood prone areas could remove water as the hurricanes/storms bring it in, via automatic pumping, water from the lakes can be pumped	The suggested comment was not evaluated in the alternative screening process and not considered an alternative to the proposed project. DWR, as a state agency, does not have the authority to develop a project outside of the State of California and therefore the comment-suggested alternative is beyond the scope of the Delta Conveyance Project. Furthermore, piping water from another state would not pass the first level screening criteria described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives (attain objectives of climate resiliency, seismic resiliency, water supply

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and transferred continuously towards Calif. It won't eliminate their problem but, at least, they won't throw away the water. And maybe sell it to us?	reliability, and operational resiliency). This is because moving water from another state would not result in (1) climate resiliency, as out-of-state water sources could be affected by climate change; (2) seismic resiliency, because earthquakes could still occur in California that would affect the SWP; (3) water supply reliability, because transfers from out of state would be subject to multiple political and regulatory issues as exemplified by existing water sources from outside of the state [e.g., water from the Colorado River Watershed]; and (4) operational resiliency, because the SWP would still be needed within the state. Finally, piping water sources from other states is not being considered because of infrastructure cost and construction/operation logistic feasibility. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Appendix 3A and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
83-3	The building of that infrastructure [required to transport water from Eastern States to California] will create jobs right off the bat! I really think it [taking water from Eastern States] can be done! We've already moved liquid, with oil pipe lines from Alaska and a water aqueduct here in Ca, so the technology is here. Why not transfer Life-Giving Water?	Please see response to comment 83-2 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
83-4	The benefits are [of the alternative which calls for taking water from Eastern States being proposed in this letter] unending: Send it [Water from Eastern States] here with stops at distribution/pumping stations in each state along the way. Each state it passes through will benefit greatly (new construction bring jobs and growth). Man-made lakes can be built (new recreation areas, tourism and supporting industry) and hydroelectric power can be created (Green Energy!). [As a result of water being taken from Eastern States] Our deserts will flourish (which could help the environment and reduce	Please see response to comment 83-2 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	global warming) and that water will turn our deserts into growing cities with farms and homes and every business you can imagine. Jobs and a huge tax base will spur economic growth due to the supporting industry for the construction of the water pass and all of the new homes and business built. Businesses will build, anticipating the area growth, like Amazon and companies looking to relocate and expand, new airports and other forms of transportation will be needed. The list goes on and on.	
83-5	Loans will be made so banks will do well, I'm sure even the stock market will get in on the action [Moving water from Eastern States to California]. And the water itself will create an oasis for our citizens to live in and prosper from. Americas population will grow, our open lands will be used, our country's economy will be the best in the world! There's water available, it's just waiting! And we need it! Our lives depend on it. Think big, think huge! We can terra form this part of the planet! We can do it! MAGA! The more you think about it the better it gets.	Please see response to comment 83-2 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
84-1	I am writing to you today as a private citizen- unaffiliated with any and all career roles I may hold- asking the Department of Water resources to please extend the public comment period for the draft delta tunnel EIR.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
84-2	3 months is simply not enough time for organizations, let alone members of the public, to review a 20,000+ page document- especially for laypersons who are not familiar with the terminology and technical aspects of an EIR. I attended the DWR virtual public comment hearing this week, and many members of the public who were commenting have also asked	Please refer to the response to comment 84-1 regarding the extension of the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	for an extension. This seems to be a shared sentiment across every organization that is reviewing the EIR.	
84-3	Please consider my request and all other requests you have received on this topic. Any extension would be greatly appreciated	Please refer to the response to comment 84-1 regarding the extension of the comment period.
85-1	The Delta Conveyance Project is NOT a solution to drought, Climate Change, biodiversity loss, water supply, or water quality challenges. As a biologist, Woolsey Wildfire survivor, California taxpayer, MWD customer, and co-founder of a local climate coalition, I strongly OPPOSE the Delta Conveyance Project and voluntary agreements that would enable water contractors to bypass existing law, i.e., the Bay Delta Quality Control Plan, and take still more water from the Delta. Voluntary agreements cheat the people of California who step up during every drought to conserve water. California must instead choose the "No Tunnel Alternative"	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for more details about how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the voluntary agreements.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
85-2	Bay-Delta decisions made now will have far-reaching consequences that will impact generations of Californians, perhaps even our state's future habitability. The Delta Conveyance Project will not provide any new water in an era of escalating Climate Emergency. According to recent studies, scientists predict snowmelt from the Sierra Nevada that feeds the small rivers and tributaries that flow into the Sacramento River could disappear in as few as 25 years.	Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future.
85-3	As our entire state struggles through the worst mega-drought in 12 centuries, hydroelectric power is shut off for lack of water, and whole communities foresee losing their water allocations as early as next year, Californians understand that the Delta Conveyance Project will offer NO water reliability, will cause MASSIVE environmental damage, will decimate Delta communities and wildlife, and will result in billions of WASTED tax dollars, as well as HIGHER water costs for Southern Californians like me. We want REAL solutions to our critical water problems; and we want our rivers, wetlands, natural lands, and wildlife restored and protected.	Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. As evaluated in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and financing.
85-4	The Delta Conveyance Project, in contrast, would siphon off millions of acre-feet of freshwater that would otherwise flow naturally through the Bay-Delta, diverting up to 6,000 cubic feet per second from the Sacramento River without preserving sufficient flows for endangered native fish species, including keystone Delta smelt (which have already been reduced from	The assertion that the proposed project would take the flow of the entire river, increase saltwater intrusion, raise water temperatures, and degrade the Delta estuary is not consistent with the analysis in the Draft EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the ecosystem's most abundant fish species to its rarest in a span of 50 years), longfin smelt, green sturgeon, Central Valley steelhead, winter-run Chinook salmon and spring-run Chinook salmon. The fact that multiple species that have inhabited the Delta ecosystem for millennia, all with different ecological needs and behaviors, are all on the brink of extinction (decimating the San Francisco Bay fishing industry) should be a clear warning to stop the damage that reduced flows have already caused this valuable and vulnerable ecosystem. Scientific research showed, in a comprehensive State Water Board analysis, that 75% of traditional flows are required to restore healthy fish populations; but 50% of water is currently diverted out of the Delta, and this newest proposed tunnel diversion has the potential to take the flow of the entire river – which would further increase saltwater intrusion, further raise water temperatures, and further degrade the estuary.	project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641) and operated in accordance with the operational criteria described in Chapter 3 to minimize potential effects on aquatic species. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, for analysis of the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. The impact analysis evaluates water temperature on multiple special-status species where appropriate (e.g., Impact AQUA-2 in Chapter 12) using quantitative information (e.g., DSM2-QUAL modeling for representative 17 locations on the Sacramento River). Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on Chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
85-5	It is unconscionable that tribes (who were here long before our cities and farms) have no water rights while industrial agribusiness takes the lion's share of our state's water, and that ratepayers are being given NO VOTE on financial commitments that will keep California children in debt for the rest of their lives.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Common Response 8,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding information about water rights. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, Chapter 1, Introduction, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project. Please refer to response to comment 85-3 regarding project costs and financing.
85-6	It is criminal that shared water that belongs to the California public – and is needed for fish, wildlife, and water quality – is being delivered to for-profit San Joaquin Valley corporations, which are draining California watersheds and aquifers dry (and will ultimately destroy our largest Western estuary) to constantly increase their irrigated acreage (thereby driving irreparable land subsidence that is, ironically, undermining the very infrastructure carrying that water), not for fruits and vegetables to feed California families but, to primarily grow almonds and livestock forage sold on the export market to China and the Middle East – diverting California's dwindling water overseas. This scheme is another blatant water grab designed to privatize public water for private profit, at taxpayer expense. In an accelerating Global Heating Emergency, this unjust and unsustainable arrangement is both morally & fiscally irresponsible. Industrial, corporate agribusinesses must be made to live WITHIN the reality of drought and an already severely overdrawn water budget. California's archaic water rights system and the Delta Conveyance Project both completely ignore the realities of Climate Breakdown. It's time, once and for all, to drop new iterations of corrupt water tunnel schemes that build for a climate that no longer exists, to profit the few at the expense of the many … and to instead prioritize	This is not a comment on the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see response to comment 85-5 regarding information on water rights, and project costs and financing. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	foresightful investments suited to the realities of the future, to benefit California's people and the natural heritage that sustains us all.	
85-7	With every tunnel iteration, Californians have been, and continue to be, vehemently opposed to the destruction of the Bay-Delta. Stop wasting our tax dollars so private multinational corporations can steal public water! Enhanced local and regional water sources are the ONLY supplies that are at all resilient given the uncertainties of Climate Change and seismic risk. For the estimated $16-40 Billion in total bond, interest, mitigation and inflation costs of the Delta Conveyance Project, California could buy A LOT of ACTUAL water resiliency while avoiding the negative impacts to Delta communities, tribes and ecosystems.	Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, how the Delta Conveyance Project would increase the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future, and the reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered as part of the No Project Alternative and may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also refer to response to comment 85-3 regarding project costs and financing, and response to comment 85-6 regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding water rights and contracts.
85-8	Instead of this destructive tunnel, California should instead focus on expansive investment in water projects that create climate resiliency while enhancing local and regional water sustainability, through better surface and ground water management for BOTH urban and agricultural users -- to REDUCE dependence on, and exports of, Bay-Delta water. California can and must improve EXISTING infrastructure statewide, restore Sierra watersheds, and make Southern California fully self-sufficient through investments in water efficiency, conservation, groundwater remediation, stormwater capture and riparian and wetlands habitat restoration for aquifer recharge, and high quality treated-wastewater recycling and graywater reuse for outdoor landscaping. In fact, a Pacific Institute report, "The Untapped Potential of California's Urban Water Supply: Water Efficiency,	Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future, and the reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to response to comment 85-6 regarding existing efforts and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Water Reuse and Stormwater Capture" (https://pacinst.org/publication/california-urban-water-supply-potential-2022/), published in April of 2022, shows that California cities can actually cut water use 30-48% and boost local supply by doubling reuse and increasing stormwater capture … with the highest water savings potential on the South Coast.	future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
85-9	Finally, the EXPORT of water-intensive crops -- including alfalfa and almonds -- to profit PRIVATE business, or foreign nations, at the expense of our PUBLIC water supplies must end. This inexcusable THEFT of Californians' water from the public commons can no longer be tolerated in the midst of a 12 century mega-drought that is worsening by the day!	Please refer to response to comment 85-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future. Please also see response to comment 85-5 regarding the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and response to comment 85-6 regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
86-1	Thank you for the CalSim models. Can you please provide the water temperature models used for the analysis as well?	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for detailed modeling information within the comment period.
87-1	The Colorado river is running dry. In no small part due to unsustainable population growth in the desert (Arizona, So. California). The answer from the delta water conveyance project is to not take more water from other areas. Drain Northern California. There are many steps that should come before we embark on multi-billion-dollar water projects: - It does not address water rights. The current water rights are over 100 years old and essentially are "first in time, first in right." This is inappropriate to our current situation and should be addressed before multi-billion-dollar water projects are approved.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, the project approvals process, and other required actions. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding information about water rights. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	- No water efficiency / use requirements. Southern California is a desert but, per capita, they use more than people in the northern part of the state. Why are high water-use crops allowed? Golf courses? Private swimming pools? We must have plans to use water more efficiently. Water companies bottle our water and sell it to back to use (Crystal Geyser, etc.), often in national forests. This needs to stop. -We don't efficiently use our gray water. It should be treated and reused.	be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
88-1	I am a concerned resident of California and writing to comment on the Delta Conveyance Project draft Environmental Impact Report. The Delta Conveyance Project seeks to enable unsustainable exports to continue at the expense of the environment, Delta communities, and ratepayers. California has the opportunity to be a climate leader and invest in water conservation and recycling infrastructure that will better serve the needs of Californians now and into the future.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. As evaluated in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
88-2	First, DWR too narrowly limited the purpose of the proposed project to restoring and protecting the reliability of SWP water deliveries. If the scope of the project is truly about restoring and protecting the reliability of SWP water deliveries, DWR should expand the purpose of the project to address structural deficiencies in existing SWP infrastructure, including reliance on unsustainable water exports from the Delta.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the adequacy of the purpose and objectives statements for the purposes of CEQA.
88-3	Second, the Draft EIR has not analyzed an adequate range of alternatives. To be consistent with the Delta Reform Act, DWR must analyze alternatives that would increase Delta outflow and reduce exports. DWR has not included alternatives that would achieve the same water supply reliability goals while reducing reliance on the State Water Project's Delta exports by pursuing water conservation, efficiency, and additional demand reduction measures. The "No Project" alternative is also premised on the flawed assumption that existing diversions via the State Water Project will continue into the future.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of the alternatives considered in the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding alternatives suggesting reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and co-equal goals.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.
88-4	Third, the Draft EIR does not adequately address the impacts of the Delta Tunnel to Delta communities. The DEIR acknowledges that participating Tribes have all resoundingly expressed that they prefer a "no tunnel alternative," but does not give sufficient consideration to the community's concerns.	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the CEQA requirements for describing and evaluating a No Project Alternative in an EIR and how the No Project Alternative for the Delta Conveyance Project meets those requirements. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding the consideration of Tribal perspectives in DWR's decision on whether to approve the project.
88-5	The Community Benefits program is inadequate and does not include concrete plans, and many of the suggestions seem to lack research on efficacy. Given the substantial cost of the suggested projects, it is unclear whether they would actually come to fruition.	Please see Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, regarding how the framework was informed by public input received through interested parties interviews, workshops, and public comments. As described in Appendix 3G, the Community Benefits Program is part of the proposed project and alternatives and approval of the Program would be included in CEQA approval. Specifics regarding implementation of the program would continue to be developed and finalized, with community input, after that approval.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
88-6	Finally, the Delta Tunnel will likely contribute to cumulative, compounding negative environmental impacts on the Bay Delta when considered in the context of other projects, actions, and environmental challenges in the region. These include: -additional diversions proposed by the Sites Reservoir Project, Pacheco Dam, and other dams and canal projects	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the cumulative impact assessment. Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, documents the criteria used to identify projects under the cumulative impact analysis and then provides a list of those projects, including the Sites Reservoir Project. Pacheco Reservoir was not included as part of the cumulative impact because it falls outside the Delta Conveyance Project study area.
88-7	Finally, the Delta Tunnel will likely contribute to cumulative, compounding negative environmental impacts on the Bay Delta when considered in the context of other projects, actions, and environmental challenges in the region. These include: -proposed voluntary agreements	Please see the response to comment 88-6 regarding the cumulative impact assessment. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the voluntary agreements.
88-8	Finally, the Delta Tunnel will likely contribute to cumulative, compounding negative environmental impacts on the Bay Delta when considered in the context of other projects, actions, and environmental challenges in the region. These include: -global climate change, aridification, and sea level rise	Please see the response to comment 88-6 regarding the cumulative impact assessment. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for more details about how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, drier future.
88-9	Finally, the Delta Tunnel will likely contribute to cumulative, compounding negative environmental impacts on the Bay Delta when considered in the context of other projects, actions, and environmental challenges in the region. These include: -water quality, including effects of increases in salinity, toxic hot spots, pesticides, mercury, and other pollutant discharge	Please see the response to comment 88-6 regarding the cumulative impact assessment. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project, and how the project would not contribute to significant cumulative conditions, related to various water quality constituents including electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity), mercury, and cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms.
89-1	I am opposed to any ridiculous plan to put a water diversion tunnel in the Delta. It is a total waste of money and resources.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
90-1	I am writing to express my concern and disapproval over the proposed Delta Tunnel. Based on the evidence presented in the DEIR, I believe that this project will bring significant social, cultural, and ecological harm to the Bay Delta's ecosystems and its indigenous communities.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. As described in Chapter 12 and Chapter 13, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible.
90-2	The Delta Tunnel would further destroy an already fragile ecosystem plagued with toxic algae blooms (and myriad other threats).	Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project, and how the project would not contribute to significant cumulative conditions, related to water quality constituents including cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms.
90-3	And it [The Delta Tunnel] would further desecrate sacred grounds for the communities indigenous to the region. This is a violation of human rights during a time when reparations and rematriation of land have been extended to California's indigenous communities.	Please refer to response to comment 90-1 regarding the EIR's analysis of cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources were consistent with current State policies regarding indigenous people in California.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
90-4	Please reconsider and cancel plans for the Delta Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
91-1	Thank you for your response below. For the record, my two main concerns remain	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
91-2	Please extend the comment period to give concerned citizens like myself time to properly evaluate and understand the complexities of the DRAFT EIR. This is even more of a concern now that the DWR issued a "change sheet" yesterday to the DRAFT EIR. Clearly the DWR admits that there are errors and/or confusing materials in the DRAFT EIR and adding corrections/changes or clarifications this late in the review process, only adds to the confusion and time it will take to fully understand the complexities of the issues.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. As stated on the Delta Conveyance Project EIR website and in the Change Sheet, the formatting and editorial issues identified in the Change Sheet and corrected files did not modify the Draft EIR impact analyses or conclusions. Therefore, nothing included in the Change Sheet represented a barrier to full, adequate, and meaningful review of the Draft EIR.
91-3	Adding helper materials to the DRAFT EIR is a further example that the original written document was/is confusing and hard to understand to most average members of the public. Which brings me to my second concern, all the added helper material and pages of explanation are no substitute for "convenient", in-person public meetings where attendees can ask questions and engage in a dialogue with DWR officials to fully understand all aspects of the proposed project.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
91-4	Whether required by law or not, PLEASE hold public meetings in convenient locations (school gymnasium in Discovery Bay and other locations) so the public most effected by the proposed project has the full and unencumbered opportunity to discuss the complex issues without having to be tech savvy or travel long distances to attend a Sacramento Board meeting.	Please refer to response to comment 91-3 regarding public meetings and other outreach and educational activities that DWR conducted during development of the EIR and the public comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
92-1	As a Sacramento Delta [Andrus Island] resident, I am against the Delta Tunnel project. It would devastate the Delta's ecosystem. That impact alone would ripple across and affect life of all forms. This tunnel project should be cancelled based on the actual scientific facts exposing the impact this project would have. This mindless project is about profit not need.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project to the Delta ecosystem is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, Chapter 9, Water Quality, includes an evaluation of potential impacts on water quality and concludes that project impacts would be less than significant. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.
93-1	I'm not in support of the Conveyance Project which is now one of the biggest political footballs that doesn't have the interest of the Delta's Health in mind.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
95-1	Thank you for your efforts to complete the Delta Tunnel Project! We certainly need it completed to maintain our access to precious water.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support for the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
96-1	The DEIR does not adequately report the existing condition of the South Delta Bay region. Conditions exist that require the addition of stored and imported water from local reservoirs and the Sacramento River to maintain a quality of water that is suitable for use by municipalities and aquaculture. This condition is brought about by the over allocation of the waters of the San Joaquin River, over commitment of South Delta water to the Central Valley, and the lack of water volume in the South Delta.	The comment assertion regarding the existing conditions of the South Delta Bay region is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please also refer to Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, regarding existing conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation, as required by CEQA. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the study area for resources analyzed in Chapters 5–32 and areas upstream of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding Delta Conveyance Project's operations which does not include changes to State Water Project or Central Valley Project operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes.
96-2	Table 5. Calculated Southern Delta Replacement Water with No Legal Delta Inflow from San Joaquin River Project Releases, May-July 2021 [Footnote 1: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/drought/drought_tools_methods/docs/wua_app_d_092721.pdf]	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.
96-3	The water flows in the San Joaquin River are so low that, at times, 90% of the water in the last 40 km of the river is comprised of Sacramento River water. This situation creates conditions that are detrimental to migratory fish ability to locate their native waters. Also, the many diversions of water in the South Delta contribute to the loss of many returning mature fish and the inability of newly hatched fish to find suitable pathways to the Pacific Ocean. For many decades mitigations have been implemented to control this situation, however, much of the Delta and its biodiversity has been lost. Quote from, California Department of Water	The assertion that the proposed project will cause increased harm to the Delta and its biodiversity is not consistent with the analysis in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts on fish and aquatic species to less than significant. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Resources/California EcoRestore Highlights 2015 to 2020 [Footnote 2: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/state-water-project-delivery-capability-report-dcr-2019/resource/a46521b1-dd7b-437f-a001-92b47402b265?inner_span=Tru] Over the last 150 years, the Delta has lost 98 percent of the native habitats that support these species. Scientists attribute the steep decline of the Delta ecosystem and fish to drought and human activity, including the development of levees supporting agricultural operations and water conveyance. Absent efforts to protect native species, we can expect many more species to go extinct over the next century. The present mitigation efforts have led to the near extinction of native migratory fish species and much of the native marsh and wetlands that support the biodiversity that have created and maintained this region for centuries. The implementation of future mitigation efforts to improve the delivery of delta waters to the south of the state will only cause increased harm to the delta and its precious biodiversity.	Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on Chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
96-4	The state and federal authorities must step in and develop new rules and regulations to implement sustainable water deliveries that do not degrade the natural environment and habitat that the majority of existing species depend. In case it is not clear, I do not support the construction of a new conveyance tunnel in the Delta.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's potential impacts on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding state and federal antidegradation policies.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
97-1	I am formally PROTESTING the project to divert 1.6 BILLION GALLONS per hour or about 25% of Sacramento River annual average flows to S. California rendering the delta area near Rio Vista, a SALTWATER (River?).	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives regarding proposed operations. The comment regarding the volume of water to be diverted by the project is grossly inaccurate. The project is limited by physical capacity and operational constraints. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
97-2	Southern Delta water diversions already REVERSE the flow of the San Joaquin River which upsets tidal influences in biology and fish behavior.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
97-3	I am frankly astounded that the state presumes the project as the only ALTERNATIVE as if to suggest it's REQUIRED that this water be sent south……WHO decided that?	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project (SWP) and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, which is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta (Delta), consistent with the California Water Resilience Portfolio (California Natural Resources Agency et al. 2020), in a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		cost-effective manner. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR.
97-4	How about we leave the delta alone already badly damaged from current water sent to the Delta Canal.....	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
99-1	The Delta Tunnel project is a short-sighted solution to the long-term problem of managing water resources in California. Periodic droughts are historic to California, but our climate crisis has increased their frequency and intensity with catastrophic results. The demand for more water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and personal use will only increase as California heats up. No one wants to change the way we use water, but we must. California is hemorrhaging water to water brokers and the Delta Tunnel project is a band aid. NO ACSTION is the best solution at this time.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.
99-2	The proposed alternatives to the Delta Tunnel will result in worse ecological conditions for fish and wildlife, not better. Who cares about fish and wildlife? California residents do. Native Californians need them for physical and cultural survival. Non-native Californians need them to protect our freshwater resources. The Delta Tunnel project says it will restore habitat in the delta but this is empty rhetoric.	Please refer to response to comment 99-1 regarding the project purpose and objectives which do not include habitat restoration. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively. As described in Chapters 13 and 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. DWR understands and recognizes that certain species are key species for Tribes and DWR has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape, as described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources.
100-1	Glad to be able to provide a comment today. You did a great job with your part. I suspect my words are not new to you. I will also submit more detailed written comments.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
100-2	Regarding the Western Delta Salinity Barrier, one of the reasons it was eliminated long ago and cited again in Appendix 3A was the need for brackish water in the delta. I firmly believe that controls and technology now exist that controllable gates, when combined with controlled flows from the reservoirs, could combine to provide whatever salinity level you wanted to achieve in the Delta and also allow for appropriate flows for fish etc. That solution is the long term solution and provides complete control of the delta and the salinity in it. It really deserves a 2022 look. It's not appropriate to shoot this down because the environmental folks won't like the thought of it. They need to be educated on why this is the right investment.	Although western salinity barriers have been studied, as an alternative to the proposed project they were screened from further consideration because it does not meet most of the basic project objectives such as the south Delta water supply reliability, climate resiliency, seismic resiliency, and operational flexibility screening criteria. Barriers would not meet the operational flexibility criterion because they would not provide for an alternate point of diversion or conveyance in the Delta that could be used when conditions at the south Delta SWP facilities would not allow for water supply exports. In addition, to be considered feasible in the future, substantial research for effective fish passage, ecosystem effects of changing tidal patterns and magnitudes upstream and downstream of a barrier, impacts on commercial and recreational navigation, water quality

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		impacts in the Delta, water supply effects, and potential downstream of barrier effects associated with sea level rise would need to be understood at a much higher degree of certainty than currently is available. The western Delta barrier concept could also fail to meet the coequal goal under the 2009 Delta Reform Act of "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta ecosystem and the fish, wildlife and recreation it supports" because this concept as presented could fundamentally alter the Delta ecosystem's brackish water, tidally influenced environment to primarily a freshwater system. The consequences for such a change are not currently fully understood but could include changes in species types, abundance, and biodiversity as well as effects on migratory fish patterns, recreational fishing, and other water-oriented recreation. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for more information regarding the alternatives development process.
101-1	STOP THE DELTA TUNNELS, PROTECT ARE RIVERS AND DELTA, PRESERVE NATURE AND PROTECT THE WILDLIFE.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
102-1	I WISH TO JOIN SEPT 13TH CALL..PLEASE SHARE THE LINK. THANKS.	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information and weblinks within the comment period.
103-1	Section1.1 Line 12-13 - The only concern is to ensure water for water exporters, nothing for the Delta/Bay Line 15-16 Once again protecting water exporters and doing nothing but exploiting the Delta/Bay.	The comment assertion that the project purpose and need are solely to exploit the Delta is not consistent with the content of and analyses in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including the California Department of Water Resources'

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		(DWR's) continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and has evaluated the potential environmental impacts on the Delta. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
103-2	Section 1.2 Line 4 - Since pumping started in the early sixties, we have lost 2/3's of the fish population in the Delta. To say this EIR addresses that is laughable.	This is not a comment on the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. An analysis of potential impacts from the project to fish and aquatic species is provided in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources.
103-3	Section 1.2.3.1 Line 15 - The federal biological opinions are based on junk science proposed by Trump's appointee who previously worked as head of one of the largest exporters (Westland's Water District) This is classical "Fox guarding the hen house" and a slap in the face of rational decision making.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used, inclusion of the 2019 BiOps, and the use of best available science.
103-4	[Section 1.2.3.1] Line 24 - "new conveyance" does not automatically mean the tunnel!	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
103-5	[Section 1.2.3.1] Line 35 - Need I say the Governor is in bed with large San Joaquin valley water exporters/growers like Stewart Resnick (Wonderful Farms) who immediately wrote a $250.000. check to Newsom when the recall vote was called. Quid pro quo.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
103-6	Section 1.2.3.2 Line 14 - Does not consider why/how much irrigation is needed because of what is planted where. Nut trees take water all the time and cannot be fallowed. Planting them in a drought prone desert like the western San Joaquin is irresponsible.	Please see response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
103-7	Climate change affects sea level rise. It is clear more water needs to be sent downstream to counteract saltwater intrusion. The only agreement is the state of the levees. The same levees that have withstood the various earthquakes of the last one hundred years, need to be re-enforced which would be much cheaper than the tunnel. Section 1.2.3.3 - Levees need to be strengthened. It's cheaper than the tunnel once again. As for Delta levee risk, we do not have hurricanes in CA and the Delta is protected from tidal waves by the Bays and geography. It is one of the rare inland Delta's in the world which is even more reason to protect and not exploit it. The argument in this EIR is [expletive].	Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated, alternatives considered but eliminated, and discussion of repairing existing levees.
103-8	[Section 1.2.3.3] Line 34 - This is DWR's real and only concern. Clean water for corporate agriculture. DWR is a shill for corporate agribusiness.	Please see response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see response to comment 103-6 regarding the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
103-9	Section 1.2.3.4 - Federal EPA regulations are routinely violated in order to keep water flowing south. As mentioned before the Trump administration used junk science as justification to keep pumping in violation of EPA guidelines. DWR is in the pocket of agribusiness and this language is clearly biased towards water exporters. Section 1.2.3 - At the end of this section it is clear DWR would like to continue using the junk science of the Trump administration to further its giveaway to San Joaquin water districts.	Please see response to comment 103-3 regarding the CEQA baseline used, inclusion of the 2019 BiOps, and the use of best available science.
103-10	Section 1.2.4.1 – Totally fails to mention the peripheral canal was voted down by a statewide ballot. The tunnel is nothing, but the peripheral canal buried. This is a total affront to representational democracy and exist because Jerry Brown wanted to complete his father's dream of turning Northern California into a series of drainage ditches to serve L.A. and Gavin Newsom wants the big checks that corporate Agriculture writes for him. I refer you to my earlier remarks about Stewart Resnick writing checks for Gavin. I might add that I am registered as an independent voter but generally vote democratic.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal and the California WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The assertion that the Draft EIR does not discuss the alternative development process, including a discussion about consideration of the Peripheral Canal as a viable alternative, is not consistent with the content and analysis of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
103-11	Section 1.3 Line 11 - "DWR as the owner and operator of the SWP". DWR has consistently pushed the tunnel and refused to consider alternatives. They have been "cheerleaders" for the tunnel. The DWR appointments by the last two Governors were done to ensure the tunnel is built with no regards for alternate solutions.	Please see response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 103-4 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
103-12	Section 1.5.1.1 - Once again DWR will only make decisions that fit their preconceived opinion that the tunnel is the only answer to Ca.'s water needs. Once again, it's the fox guarding the hen house. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. EPA standards have repeatedly been ignored or modified by "agreements" by the Newsom/Feinstein cabal for San Joaquin water districts. "Range of alternatives" is another farce in this document as the proponents of the tunnel have simply dismissed any alternative to the tunnel.	The comment assertion that DWR did not consider other project alternatives is not consistent with the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, including the No Project Alternative. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the proposed project will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA. Please refer to response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act.
103-13	This is as far as I have gotten so far but it's clear to anyone not already a tunnel proponent that this document was devised to deceive the public to make it look like a legitimate fair assessment of the need for a tunnel. It flies in the face of honest government. It ignores the will of the people at the ballot box concerning the peripheral canal which is the tunnel.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. Please refer to response to comment 103-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 103-10 regarding the differences between this project and the Peripheral Canal. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, the Chapter 1 section titled Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
104-1	The Delta Tunnel project is a short-sighted solution to the long-term problem of managing water resources in California. Periodic droughts are historic to California, but our climate crisis has increased its frequency and intensity with catastrophic results. The demand for more water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and personal use will only increase as California heats up. No one wants to change the way we use water, but we must. California is hemorrhaging water to water brokers and the Delta Tunnel project is a band aid.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project and the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits.
105-1	As a resident of Oakley, CA, and a user of the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta waterways, I don't think the Delta Conveyance Project is a good thing for the communities of the Delta. It seems to me that the project will have many negative effects on nearby residents, wildlife habitats, local water quality and the general nature of the Delta in its current state.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, wildlife, and water quality. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in no impact or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
105-2	The spoil from the tunneling process is going to create a huge blight on a large portion of adjacent delta lands. There is an old saying, "don't mess with mother nature" and I think that is a good rule to follow when considering the Delta Conveyance Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. In the context of the comment, DWR is considering "spoil" to be Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM). Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, which provides an overview of how the RTM would be generated, tested, and stored within the construction sites. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR.
106-1	I am aware that there was a meeting held on 9/28. Is there any video of it posted online that I could watch?	DWR responded to all information requests during the public review period.
109-1	I, [commenter], longtime Solano County resident, strongly oppose Delta tunnels. I understand the good intentions behind the idea but ultimately it will cause great harm to our region in Northern California. Please do not go	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	forward with this project. Should the people of Norther California have to worry about where their own water is?	environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
111-1	I oppose the project. It is a poor solution for the environment, plant and animal life, and farming will suffer. It is a very short-term solution given climate change as evidenced by the drought and snow and lake level conditions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to agriculture. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
111-2	A more viable long-term option/solution for all California coastal and nearby cities would be a number of desalination plants.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding desalination and the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
113-1	I am writing to state I oppose the delta tunnel project as it limits the available resources for our own community. It's not beneficial for the Northern California environment. I oppose this project and wish to continue to speak out against it. Please contact me for further questions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
114-1	Please do not defer water from our delta to Southern CA. It's bad for agriculture, the environment, and our economy.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture. While Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 were found to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce the extent of these impacts, and Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. For potential effects related to socioeconomics, please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
115-1	This would cause havoc to fragile ecosystems and disrupt the lives of those who live here. For what? So that you can take water for big agriculture that ships almonds out of the USA and for big development in what is virtual desert. Shame on your greed and stupidity.	Please refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably and to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding development and management of California's surface water resources. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to terrestrial biological resources, fish and aquatic resources, and local communities. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
115-2	Our residents are already sick from algal blooms.	The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including algal blooms and public health in Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 26, Public Health. Please refer to these chapters and supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of potential impacts on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		water quality and public health as a result of project construction and operation, which were determined to be less than significant.
115-3	Our fish population is in sad decline.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. An analysis of potential impacts from the project to fish and aquatic species is provided in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
115-4	Your project will create noise, confusion, and obstruction for our residents.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities and noise (specifically Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration).
115-5	You will destroy our local histories and indigenous lands.	Please refer to Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, and supporting appendices for these respective chapters, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, that could occur as a result of project construction, operation, and maintenance.
117-1	Even before the failed, unpopular peripheral canal was proposed at a cost, then of $7B, there were other projects to ship the Delta water south that had been turned down by the California taxpayers. Taking water away at the Delta Cross Channel at Walnut Grove in order to feed the pumps at Clifton Court Forebay near Tracy has already brought saltwater incursion to the asparagus farms on Sherman Island and put them out of business. Much of the water in the California	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Aqueduct leaks out or evaporates before it gets to its destination in the south state.	
117-2	This is crazy. There are ways to conserve, make, and deliver fresh water, especially when the entire length of the state borders on the Pacific Ocean. Come on, politicians and environmental planners...take a dose of reality and spend the taxpayers' money on projects that create new water - not rob Peter to Pay Paul. Please consider reverse salinization plants powered by wind and solar. Yes, they are more expensive, but they could be a better idea in the long run.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding desalination and the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
117-3	And let's also take advantage of reuse of "grey" water for residential landscape irrigation.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 117-2 regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
118-1	In the Draft EIR released in July 2022, there are 3 different alternatives proposed: Eastern Alignment, Central Alignment, Bethany Alignment. Are all 3 alternatives still being considered? Which alternative has the most support? When will a final determination be made?	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding a description of the proposed project and project alternatives being considered by DWR and evaluated throughout the EIR. Chapter 33, Other CEQA-Required Analysis, section titled Environmentally Superior Alternative, describes the proposed project (Alternative 5) DWR has

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		identified as environmentally superior based on the project objectives and the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary in the section titled Final EIR Review and Project Approvals for information regarding the process for project approval.
119-1	I strongly oppose the construction of ANY Delta water conveyance tunnels. The 'Fantasy Island' days-- where very low-cost water supplies area delivered magically to arid and desert areas with taxpayer-funded water infrastructure to augment the property values of folks who bought land in the desert or in areas where very little natural water supply exists--must end. We need to stop funding human settlements in areas where water is limited. Those areas must learn to support their communities within the limits of the water supplies their communities receive-- or move.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
120-1	I live in Hood, which is a rural small town on the Sacramento River, just west of Elk Grove. It is a wonderful place to live, with families who have lived here since the 1940s. It is everything I like...quiet, surrounded by fields and nature, great soil for gardening and full of friendly, helpful neighbors. I am greatly concerned about the Delta Conveyance Project beginning 10-20 years of heavy construction surrounding Hood, with the heavy equipment and deafening pile driving described in the Environmental Impact Report.	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities and noise (specifically Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration). The analysis of pile driving noise in the EIR is intended to present a worst-case condition. The modeling of pile drivers in Chapter 24 assumed source noise levels in the upper range of values measured in previous studies (see the Chapter 24 table titled Source Sound Levels for Pile Driving; Washington State Department of Transportation 2018). The previously collected measurements were based on impact-driven piles. For the proposed project, vibratory methods would primarily be used.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Based on geotechnical investigations to date, the use of impact driving is anticipated to be limited (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c). The analysis in the Draft EIR assumes impact driving will be needed in some cases. As stated in Mitigation Measure NOI-1, future field investigations would include the testing of pile driving shrouds to further reduce noise levels. Accounting for difference in pile type and additional noise reduction, future field investigations are expected to demonstrate lower noise levels than those presented in the EIR. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
120-2	But I would like to discuss other impacts from the construction…the disturbance to one of the Sacramento Delta's signature species….. the Sand Hill Crane. Almost nothing is more thrilling than having a flock of Sand Hill Cranes fly directly overhead…birds the size of 8-year-old children, with 6–7-foot wingspans, floating in perfect formation on a Delta breeze as they search for a foraging spot. These magnificent Cranes travel thousands of miles yearly from their nesting grounds in Canada and Alaska to winter in the Sacramento Delta. No wonder they are celebrated with a festival in Lodi every year, as, just like the Monarch Butterfly's yearly migration, it is truly one of nature's miracles. Their distinctive trilling call has me looking skyward for a glimpse every time, as a sighting never ceases to amaze. From the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR, Figure 13G-1a is titled" "Greater and Lesser Sandhill Crane Sound Level Impacts:	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on the ecosystem are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding sandhill cranes in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Impact BIO-33, and Appendix 13G, Construction Sound Level Impacts on Sandhill Cranes. As described in Mitigation Measure BIO-33, activities will be restricted to outside of the greater sandhill crane winter use season to the extent that it is feasible to do so. Mitigation Measure BIO-33 discloses the construction activities that are likely able to be conducted outside of the winter use season, such as the construction of access roads and underground transmission lines and pile driving, which are activities that are only required to occur for short durations. Mitigation Measure BIO-33 also requires that helicopter surveys and field investigations be conducted outside of the sandhill crane wintering season in suitable habitat. The analysis in Chapter 13 concludes that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Medium-Term Pile Driving and Heavy Construction." This diagram shows medium-term pile driving and heavy construction throughout the Sand Hill Cranes' foraging habitat. The Draft EIR states "it is assumed that noise from the construction of water conveyance facilities could 9 temporarily displace sandhill crane use of habitat in the vicinity of project activities." This pile driving and heavy construction throughout the Sand Hill Cranes' foraging habitat is what greatly concerns me. From my experience, Sand Hill Cranes seem to be very sensitive to noise and disturbance. I have seen a group of Cranes in a nearby Hood field foraging, and when a helicopter passed overhead, the group lifted off in an absolute panic, flying haphazardly in all directions, and did not return to the field. I have seen groups of Cranes in flight separate in panic when a small plane flies by. Where the Cranes' nesting sites are in Canada show that they prefer isolated locations and do not nest near logging operations. That the Delta Conveyance Project heavy construction will be the cause of much disturbance to the Sand Hill Cranes, birds listed as California Department of Wildlife Fully Protected Animals, goes without saying.	Please also refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources. The CMP identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for sandhill cranes and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operations.
121-1	We are in a severe drought pattern and the Delta is already degraded from the low water years. No thought is given to the rich habitat that the Delta used to be. The salinity levels are high enough for seals to be living under the docks in Stockton and fish that need fresh water are becoming scarce. Water hyacinths choke our waterways and Southern California wants to take more so that they can fill their swimming pools and have green lawns! I look around my neighborhood and see brown yards. Instead of stealing our water they should take the	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. With regard to salinity and as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	money and use it to created reservoirs in Southern California to catch the water that runs into the ocean every year.	Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting new water storage, demand management, and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
122-1	I am against the Delta Conveyance project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
122-2	This project takes fresh water out of the Sacramento River at a rate of 6000 cf per second thus impacting river water temperature, volume, fish habitat and wildlife depending on the river. This amount of water from the delta will increase delta salination and degradation. The delta is the cradle for salmon and Delta Smelt and many other endangered species so this should not happen. The intakes kill fish especially smaller ones no matter what type of screens are used.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws (e.g., endangered species protections). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Delta, including water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality; fish including salmon, delta smelt, and other endangered species in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources; and wildlife in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Please refer to these chapters and supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of salinity, temperature, volume, and fish habitat and wildlife as a result of project construction and operation. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, and which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives.
122-3	To impact prime agricultural land 2,400 acres is outrageous. These lands are too precious to have torn up to 300 feet deep, covered in cement and then a huge tunnel placed into them.. This will change ground water flow and impact rainwater reaching ground water . Sucking that much water out of a watershed will impact the whole water shed from the top down and cause more aridification.	The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including agricultural resources and groundwater in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 8, Groundwater, respectively. As described in Chapter 15, conversion of agricultural land would result in significant and unavoidable impacts even with mitigation. Please also see Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding comments related to impacts on agriculture. Additionally, as described in Chapter 8, potential impacts related to groundwater were determined to be less than significant. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding Delta Conveyance Project operations, which do not include changes to State Water Project or Central Valley Project operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes.
122-4	The project is so environmentally and culturally decrepit and should be stopped. Many local tribes, who have sacred river areas and land around the Delta and Sacramento River will be adversely affected.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapters 19 and 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
122-5	The amount of cement used to line the huge 45 mile tunnel area will totally impact water flow, water quality and hyporheic zones.	The tunnel lining material would not affect the quality of water deliveries to the SWP service area as described in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality, and water flow in Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The project would not have impacts on the quality of water deliveries to the SWP service area as described in Chapter 9. Please refer to these chapters and supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts on water flow, water quality, and hyporheic zones as a result of project construction and operation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments related to project operations and flow.
122-6	We need to focus on localized water solutions, stopping development were not enough water supports it and stop industrial agriculture that plants rice, corn and almonds or pistachios in the desert. Work with nature instead of against it by growing what is water wise and is more natural for this area. Every town should have their own water tanks and uses gray water for toilets and gardening. Building swimming pools in every yard needs to stop also and bring back the public pools instead.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
123-1	The Delta Conveyance Project seems to threaten the Bay area and the freshwater and marsh habitats around the delta. This will provoke an ecological disaster.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on the ecosystem are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. The EIR also analyzes various water quality constituents in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As shown in Chapters 9, 12, and 13, potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, aquatic species, habitats, and water quality would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, which identifies potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operation.
123-2	Further, it prioritizes water to certain large corporate consumers at the expense of residential and small consumers. This is inequitable. In a state with water shortages and concerns about water usage, this project is not only controversial, it creates improper preferential choices that impact consumers adversely. This is a bad option and should NOT be approved.	The comment assertion that DWR delivers water preferentially and at the expense of noncorporate consumers is unfounded and not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition for the project.
124-1	The Delta Conveyance System will destroy the CA Delta, killing fish, leading to more salinity and destroying cropland/	The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project destroying the Delta is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Additionally, the project would be operated in accordance with the operational criteria described in Chapter 3 to minimize potential effects on aquatic species. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture. While Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 were found to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce the extent of these impacts, and Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation.
125-1	It's time you got on with it.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
126-1	I would like to complement and acknowledge the Delta Conveyance Team on the tremendous amount of work done and shared with the public on this project through the Draft EIR.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support for the project.
126-2	My comment on the proposed project presented in the Draft EIR centers on the apparent inconsistency in the alternatives point of delivery (differing project objective) and configuration and impacts that result. Of the nine alternatives described, only one (Alternative 5, which happens to be selected as the proposed project), involves construction up to the Bethany Reservoir; this does not appear on the surface to be a reasonable range of alternatives to satisfy this objective. Alternative 5 proposes construction adjacent to several conservation easements and vernal pools, and within a public recreation area and several protected species habitats. The necessity for only this alternative's significant environmental	The comment assertion that the EIR does not analyze a reasonable range of alternatives is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 16, Recreation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	effects to deliver to the Bethany Reservoir, when none of the other alternatives do, is not justified.	
126-3	I was unable to find documentation explaining why there is an exclusion for consideration of the "Bethany Pump Station" from Alternative 5 being located immediately to the east of Byron Highway between the California Aqueduct approach to the Banks Pumping Plant and the Delta-Mendota approach to the Jones pumping plant. It would likely be a smaller subterranean pump station than the current Alternative 5, as it would not be required to push the water through the pipeline aqueduct up to the Bethany Reservoir and would instead discharge directly to the Banks Pumping plant approach channel, as all the other evaluated alternatives do. All of the impacts associated with Alternative 5's pipeline aqueduct would be avoided creating a superior alternative in terms of environmental impact, and it would be consistent with the range of other alternatives evaluated by making this change.	The Bethany Reservoir alternative (Alternative 5) was developed with the intent of reducing environmental impacts associated with the project, and one important way that it reduces impacts is that it does not include a southern forebay. If the Bethany Alternative connected to the Banks Pumping Plant approach channel, it would need to have a southern forebay to regulate water between the new pumping plant and Banks Pumping Plant (similar to the central and eastern alignment alternatives). Including a new forebay would be less effective in reducing impacts of the project, so this option was not pursued. Please refer to the Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant Facilities and Site Configuration technical memorandum in the Engineering Project Report (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022) regarding the arrangement of the facilities and supporting infrastructure that constitutes the concept-level site configuration for the Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant (BRPP) facilities. As stated in the technical memorandum, the size and configuration of the overall BRPP site would depend on the selected project design capacity. The size and number of the below ground structures (pumping plant dry pit bays, surge basin, and wet well), the above-grade electrical building, and the arrangement of other structures and facilities would change based on the number of pumps required to achieve the selected project design capacity. The engineering concept drawings show the required building dimensions and configurations of the BRPP facilities as they apply to each project design capacity. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the adequacy of the project description and engineering details for the purposes of the CEQA analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
128-1	I live in a house on the water of Discovery Bay. We currently have mostly fresh water in our bay with both children and adults swimming and floating off their docks. After all, that is the prime reason many people chose Discovery Bay as their home.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
128-2	This project will move more salt water into Discovery Bay and change the whole ecosystem. Including the plants and trees close to water and the salmon migration. One only has to travel a short distance downstream to Antioch to see a desalination water treatment plant to see the effects of more salt in the Delta. We would prefer to keep sharks in the salt water and not in Discovery Bay.	The comment assertion that the project would cause saltwater intrusion and change the entire Delta ecosystem is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. The analysis specifically includes evaluation of monthly average EC at multiple locations, including Old River near Middle River which is near Discovery Bay. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
129-1	Chapter 17-Socioeconomics - unlisted significant costs A project of this size will require a great deal of traffic control	The comment assertion that the project would increase the need for and costs of existing emergency response services and that the EIR does not include mitigation for potential traffic impacts is not consistent with the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and planning to reduce traffic congestion and vehicle accidents. I did not find any reference to mitigation of this expense in the DEIR. Local and state law enforcement agencies should not be expected to bear this burden. This expense would be significant, as many local law enforcement agencies utilize a great deal of overtime to provide normal service. This project would likely require the hiring of additional personnel and providing the necessary support equipment. This matter must be addressed in a greater deal if the project is to proceed.	analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, regarding potential impacts on local public service providers, including first responders and emergency services. DWR would provide construction site security during construction and operations. In addition, construction contractors would provide primary emergency response services. Therefore, temporary emergency response facilities, equipment, and trained personnel have been included in the plans for the main project construction sites, including intakes, tunnel launch shaft sites, and the Southern Complex or Bethany Complex. As such, the analysis determines there would not be any significant impacts on public services and utilities as a result of the project. Please refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, for the analysis of potential impacts associated with potential increases in vehicle miles traveled during project construction. As described in Chapter 20, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would implement site-specific demand management plans to reduce traffic impacts.
129-2	Chapter 17-Socioeconomics - unlisted significant costs Another issue I have is the mitigation stipulated for acquisition of privately held, active farmland that is providing tax money to the local community. Some of this land will remain with the project as it will be needed to provide necessary facilities and services in support of the project. However, other sections of the DEIR make reference to the possibility of returning unneeded land to farming, using it to provide habitat or other unspecified purposes. Recovery for loss of local taxes is provided for, but a timeline is not provided detailing how long mitigation will last. At some time in the future local jurisdictions will suffer a loss as it would not be practical for the	The comment assertion that the project would result in the loss of property tax revenue is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR and California law. California law requires "full mitigation of property tax or assessments levied by local governments or special districts for land used in the construction, location, mitigation, or operation of new Delta conveyance facilities" (Cal. Wat. Code § 85089). Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and property tax revenue effects of land acquisitions.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	water agencies to maintain this benefit into perpetuity. This matter will most likely be in the legal system for years.	
130-1	The Delta Conveyance Project is basically a rehash of the numerous rejected projects over the last 50+ years that proposed to divert water from the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Delta. These included the Peripheral Canal from the '80's and the later California WaterFix amongst many others. The goal of those projects and the current Delta Conveyance Project proposal is all the same – divert water from the Delta into the SWP/CVP canals. Voters, constituents, scientists, environmentalists, businesses, and politicians have repeatedly told the state no on those projects due to cost and negative environmental impacts.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal and the California WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Common Response 3 also contains a discussion about alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
130-2	Table 6-0 Clearly shows that any of the alternatives will be delivering an additional 300+ (in dry years) to 600+ (in normal years) thousand acre feet of water into the SWP and CVP. This will have an overall negative effect on the Delta and SF Bay ecosystems, with additional water diverted from an already impacted delta and bay ecosystem with existing water diversions.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on the ecosystem are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase deliveries during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. As shown in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Please also refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, which identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operations.
130-3	Agriculture uses 40-50% of the SWP and CVP water but only contributes to 2% of the state's economy Instead of the Delta Conveyance Project, the state should consider the no project alternative and use those funds to incentivize farmers and agribusiness to convert existing water intensive agriculture crops to less water intensive crops. This would free up water resources to feed the expanding high tech industry which contributes the most to the state's economy in terms of revenue and high paying jobs. The balance of the saved water resources could go to restoring the river, bay and delta ecosystems and also wetland restorations, which is the best practice for protection against sea level rise.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
131-1	Build the storage before the transfer! It has been over 40 years since the last major water storage project, the New Melones Dam was completed in 1976. The reservoir was not fully filled until 1983 due to the strong efforts of environmental groups. Environmental groups have worked hand in hand with California government officials over to ensure no additional water storage was added. California has gone for more than 40 years without a major water storage project. We cannot accept the promises of government and cooperation agencies. Former Governor Jerry Brown and current Governor Gavin Newsom are using politics to circumvent their obligations to the people of California.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting new water storage.
131-2	Today, strong partnerships between Southern California water interest, San Juaquin farm interest, major environmental interest have come together to build the pipe line before there is adequate storage. Without additional storage the pipeline can move enough water to reek havoc on the Sacramento San Juaquin ecology and economy. While supporters claim they will put in safe guards to ensure water flows will be maintained, we know that political promises are meant to pacify the coalitions, mute the opposition, persuade the gullible with no consequences for failure to fulfill promises. The only way to ensure the Delta is not damaged or destroyed, it to ensure there is adequate water supplies. The only way to supply enough water is to build more water reservoirs.	The comment assertion that the project would destroy the ecology of the Sacramento-San Joaquin system is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered and alternatives suggesting new water storage. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, for information about how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements and to protect fish. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. The EIR also analyzes various water quality constituents in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As shown in Chapters 9, 12, and 13, potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, aquatic species, habitats, and water quality would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding potential socioeconomics effects in the Delta. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding water supply.
131-3	The Delta Conveyance is the greatest threat to the Delta's environment. Greater than drought, flood, over fishing or shrinking levees. Politicians, water districts, and farm consistencies, along with their political partners Environmental Groups have combined to rape the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta and the Sacramento River watershed of the most valuable resource, water.	The comment assertion that the project is the greatest threat to the Delta ecosystem is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. The EIR also analyzes various water quality constituents in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As shown in Chapters 9, 12, and 13, potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, aquatic species, habitats, and water quality would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
132-1	Wow. All the options presented are designed to dry the delta and destroy its keystone species salmon. Salmon die and whole Northern CA ecosystems are destroyed, including the coastal forests that actually trap the rain to make the water that you want to ship away. STOP TRYING TO DESTROY THE PLANET FOR PROFIT! Ecosystems are not plumbing systems, and all the plans offered amount to a rape of the environment.	The comment assertion that project alternatives are designed to dry the Delta and destroy keystone salmon species is unfounded and not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Additionally, the project would be operated in accordance with the operational criteria described in Chapter 3 to minimize potential effects to aquatic species. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potential impacts on salmon would be less than significant with mitigation.
133-1	Our son's well in northern California went dry in March and you are wanting to drain our water to send it to southern California! They do not conserve water and we do. Southern California needs to learn to conserve. Our garden is dry because we are letting our lawn and other plants die and they have countless swimming pools of water.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
133-2	The delta is a natural ecosystem, and this will damage the water supply which is already dangerously low, and our population is growing fast. Please stop this ecologically & financially wasteful project.	The comment assertion that the project would damage water supply is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 133-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding water supply. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please see Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
134-1	I oppose the construction of the delta pipeline due to its impact on frontline communities, tribal foodways, and the ecology of the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, Tribal cultural resources, and Delta ecology. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
135-1	Until such time Southern California eliminates private swimming pools, lawns, and golf courses, I oppose sending any additional water into the California Aqueduct.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Response 1 regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
135-2	Central Valley farmers need support to prevent further depletion of ground water.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources, including groundwater in Chapter 8, Groundwater. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.
135-3	The Westside cultivation should cease and be converted to solar farms to power the grid.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
136-1	As a Delta boater, I am more than concerned by the quality and quantity of the water flowing through our Delta. We boaters must increasingly avoid new shallow areas of dirty water choked with weeds. Not just hyacinth, but increasingly new	The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources raised by the comment, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation, and various water quality constituents, including harmful algal blooms, in Chapter 9,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	water weeds choking the waterways along with algae bloom because of decreased depth of water flow and increased sunlight reaching the bottom of the rivers. No one is controlling these grasses and weeds that are far worse than ever before because we don't have enough fresh water flowing into the Delta!	Water Quality. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
136-2	The salinity of the Delta has increased markedly as the tides bring in more ocean flow. This is not healthy for the fish and general ecological system of our precious Delta waterways. Seals/ sea lions increasingly visit the waters around Stockton now. AND YOU WANT TO BYPASS WATER TO THIS AREA AND SHIP IT SOUTH???? What can you possibly be thinking? If there are ANY ecological studies done at all for the project, they can't possibly find any other result than the fact that this project is a death warrant for the Delta system and an unbelievable waste of taxpayer money to even consider such a ridiculous idea.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertion regarding impacts of the project to the Delta is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. The comment assertion that the project is being funded by taxpayers is not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, in the section titled Contract Amendments, the costs of constructing,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		operating, and maintaining the State Water Project (SWP) water supply function, including the proposed Delta Conveyance Project if approved, would be paid entirely by the local public agencies that contract with DWR for a supply of water from the SWP. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
136-3	If votes mean anything to the Democratic Party, those who are making the decision to pursue this idea voted on in different political times will be the ones to pay the price for losing control of the California government. This issue is large enough to split our state. Far more constituents are against this project than you may realize. We want more water for the Delta, not less! The only way to get what the Delta needs, apparently, is to vote those who continue to pursue this project out of office.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
137-1	Why I do not support the Delta Conveyance Project : 1. Northern California rivers need water to support the fish and ecosystem.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, which describes potential changes to surface water resources that could result from implementation of the project, and see Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for the analysis of potential significant environmental impacts of project construction and operations on the resources mentioned in the comment and proposed mitigation measures, particularly Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
137-2	Why I do not support the Delta Conveyance Project : 2. If you are running out of water in SoCal, maybe stop using so much.	Please refer to response to comment 137-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
137-3	Why I do not support the Delta Conveyance Project : 3. This will not improve the drought, and will create more vulnerability in the future. We are over taxing the aqueducts and rivers.	The comment assertion that the project would increase risks associated with future drought conditions and existing water supply infrastructure is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 137-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and regarding the project purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
137-4	Why I do not support the Delta Conveyance Project : 4. This is Native water, so listening to what Native peoples are wanting, I cannot support this	Please see response to comment 137-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
137-5	Why I do not support the Delta Conveyance Project : 5. Please think about life holistically. Your life will be impacted too	Please see response to comment 137-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and the EIR's analysis of potential significant environmental impacts.
138-1	1) Contact the Environment Protection Agency, Region 9 regarding earmarked or unclaimed funds associated with the necessary Infrastructure, Clean Water, and Clean Drinking Water Acts.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project financing.
138-2	2) Please collaborate with the Coast Guard, Army and the Air Force's Civil Engineers. Focusing on Force Protection, Project Efficiency, and Maritime law. As a result, there may be a need to request additional Global War on Terrorism Funds.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, coordination with other agencies is necessary for certain permits and approvals.
139-1	Please do NOT build the tunnel, or any other conveyance infrastructure to channel water from the Sacramento River or elsewhere in the northern Sacramento Valley around the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. We are already pumping too much water out of the Delta to ship south, mainly for unsustainable agriculture.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
139-2	We need to dramatically reduce the amount of water allocated to agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley and dramatically increase the natural flow in rivers and the Delta and reverse the terrifying decline in many of our native aquatic species, including (but not only) salmon. Smelt in particular acts like the canary in the coal mine, and their disappearance is a stark warning that we are pushing the entire Bay-Delta estuary ecosystem past a dangerous point of no return. We are destroying the resources that have always made California great. Stop selling our water	Please refer to response to comment 139-1 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment as a result of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 12, potential impacts on aquatic species, including smelt and salmon, would be less than significant with mitigation.
140-1	This project is bad for frontline communities, indigenous tribes, and local habitats. The effects on all three will be irreversible. We need to take drastic action to reduce our water usage as a state and we can do it without wasting millions on a project that's damaging to people and will eradicate species already at the brink of extinction.	The comment assertion regarding the significance of impacts of the project on species is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, Tribal cultural resources, and habitats. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and financing. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
140-2	Please go with the No Action alternative at the expense of our people and our planet.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.
141-1	All alternatives result in reduced survival of juvenile Winter and Spring-run salmon through the Delta; some northern California tribes' culture and traditions deeply depend on the survival of the salmon.	As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, impacts on salmon would be less than significant with mitigation. Please also refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources. The CMP identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operations. As described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR has consulted with Tribes and considered the salmon and other native fish species

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape.
142-1	Save the salmon please	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. An analysis of potential impacts from the project to fish and aquatic species, including salmon, is provided in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
143-1	I am greatly concerned about the environmental and ecological impact that the Delta Tunnel could cause to the Bay Area water system. Before spending multiple billions of dollars I would hope the state would consider enacting other measures first that will help conserve water without disrupting a large watershed.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, specifically Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
143-2	Thank you and have a nice day.	This comment provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
144-1	Comprehensive outline and project description. This a major project that has implications not just for the near future but well beyond future generations and huge financial investment. As I reviewed the project details two questions jump out, the size and scope is scaled for today's needs. I don't see consideration for greater future demands on population growth and greater agricultural expansion. Making it bigger with today's dollar and land availability removes the need in the future to go back and expand for greater needs and facings bigger costs.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA environmental baseline and projected future conditions. As described in Common Response 1, the project's Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released on January 15, 2020. As a result, and as outlined by CEQA guidelines, the year 2020 is used in the analyses in Chapters 5–32 as the environmental baseline to represent existing conditions. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, regarding an analysis of the project's potential to directly or indirectly induce substantial economic or population growth. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
144-2	The water is there in the high Sierras, the project does not address capturing this natural resource.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
145-1	As a 63 yr lifelong resident of Northern California. I remain concerned over our water resources shipped to Southern California. Rural doesn't mean people don't live here. It means we have agricultural needs as well as water for people. 6,000 cfs is more water than I can imagine, nor can I imagine what more I can do to save water only to send it to So Cal.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
145-2	What plans have you considered regarding earthquakes?	The project has been designed and engineered with seismic risk in mind. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the performance of the project's objectives with regard to seismic resilience. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including earthquakes in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity.
146-1	Moving water away from the delta in order to satisfy an ever growing population is short signed at best. Criminal at worst. The 20th century approach is not good any longer. Let's move forward with better answers that fit current technology and environmental priority's.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
147-1	As a resident of rural Northern California, water is critical to our local ag industry and way of life. The last years of drought have been absolutely devastating to our communities. I would only support this project if the state moves forward on water storage projects like Sites Reservoir. The state can't continue doing nothing to help water shortage issues. Climate change is only going to make the situation worse. Thank you for your time.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, contains information regarding the California Water Resilience Portfolio and other activities the State is undertaking related to water supply and water management. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
148-1	I support the project and I do not have a preferred alternative. I would like to propose a design feature which would help to offset the system's electricity usage. Please add a design feature that stipulates that all of the permanent disturbed areas, buildings and parking areas that can support solar panels and storage batteries should be developed and maintained to the maximum extent feasible.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support for the project. The project is currently being designed to reduce energy consumption and rely on renewable energy sources, where feasible. As described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices, EC-17, DWR will pursue solar panel development at various locations along conveyance facility sites such as the tunnel launch shaft sites, reception and maintenance shaft sites, and on flat-roofed buildings at the Southern Complex and Bethany Complex pumping plant

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		sites. Options will be evaluated to ensure they are logistically, economically, and environmentally feasible prior to final design and implementation. Solar power generated at these sites would be used for operating conveyance and appurtenant facilities.
149-1	Only going to move water during wet year? Who is going to believe that? This is just another water grab that will harm the Delta eliminating the salmon due to overheating of the severely diminished remaining water. Do not approve this expensive tunnel.	The comment assertions regarding water temperature changes and the significance of impacts on salmon are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, potential impacts on salmon would be less than significant with mitigation. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, the project alternatives would have minimal effects on water temperature relative to existing conditions and the effects on fish and aquatic species from changes in water temperature would be expected to be minimal. Please also see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria for information about how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements and to protect fish. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
150-1	Where can I find the electrical power consumption during construction and post construction?	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period. Please see Chapter 22, Energy, regarding electrical power consumption during construction and post construction.
150-2	Also, are there any maps of the new power lines and substations needed for the project during construction and operation of the tunnel. We assume some facilities will be utility-owned and others by DWR. We would like to see both types of electrical facilities on a map.	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) responded to all requests for additional information within the comment period. Please see Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, regarding power lines and substations.
153-1	I'd like to draw some similarities, some historical context between this project and the peripheral canal that was rejected resoundly by voters in 1977 when it was first	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	proposed. The canal vote was a couple years later. But the three tunnels there proposed in this project are very similar to the peripheral canal in terms of their overall direction and their purpose. Unfortunately, the three tunnels projects are so similar that we'll just take the Bethany alternative, you're going to take 6,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Sacramento river, dump it into a tunnel, and divert it to the southern end of the Delta, which is basically the peripheral canal	water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 1 regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The comment's assertion regarding three tunnels is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, all project alternatives would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
153-2	Unfortunately, our rivers are already being diverted to death, kind of death by 10,000 diversions. They are heavily overdrawn. If you look at the environmental research letters post 1914, they look at the over drafting in all of California's rivers. And many of these rivers are over drafted eight to 10 times more water they can possibly carry. The idea of doing more of this is patently absurd.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
153-3	A purpose of this, one large purpose of [over drafting water from rivers] is to send this water to the Central Valley for irrigation for agriculture. And one of the biggest crops down there now is almonds and pistachios. And a Pacific Policy Institute study in June of last year, showed that they are one of the highest ranking water dependent crops at 4.49 acre feet per acre of crop, 4.49 acre feet of water per acre of crop. Yet, in the face of that, they increased the stands of pistachios and nuts by 51 percent from 2010 to 2020. That's just unsupportable. It's crazy.	Please refer to response to comment 153-2 regarding the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, the purpose and objectives of the project, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
153-4	If you look at the consequences here, you draw a whole bunch of water out of the Bay and you're going to increase salinity, you're going to have toxic algal blooms, which we've already seen to devastating example in the past couple of weeks, increased concentrations of toxins and algal blooms, agricultural runoff, pollutants from waste water treatment	The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. Please refer to this chapter and supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of salinity, algal blooms, agriculture runoff, pollutants, and other potentially significant environmental impacts as a result of project construction and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	plants that can't be rinsed away because there is no fresh water to do it.	operation. With further regard to salinity, as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Chapter 9 also evaluates the impact of the alternatives on cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (CHABs) in Impact WQ-14, which would be less than significant.
153-5	This project, it should be converted to something that looks at water reclamation. We should be investing billions of dollars into water reclamation, not taking the existing water out of the rivers.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
154-1	Thank you. My name is [speaker name]. I'm a San Francisco resident and volunteer activist with the Sierra Club and a Delta recreationist.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
154-2	The recreation section of the DEIR fails to address a key issue, water quality. No recreationist is going to enjoy a Delta with poor water quality. All of the alternatives in the DEIR substantially increase water exports from the Delta on average by approximately 500,000-acre feet per year, including significant increases in water diversions in dry and critically dry years of 200-to-300,000-acre feet per year as shown in table ES-4. Water quality in the Delta and throughout the Bay/Delta estuary, is already in terrible shape. Exporting even more water will worsen it further. Water-skiers, wakeboarders, and swimmers won't want to enter water that is polluted or covered in harmful algae. Fishermen won't want to fish in this water especially if as expected, the current greatly reduced populations of fish continue to decline further. Wildlife enthusiasts won't see the once abundant populations of birds and other creatures. The recreation section must be thoroughly revised to reflect the significant reduction in flows through the Delta as a result of the increased diversions.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on recreation, water quality, fish, and wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase deliveries during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation, and various water quality constituents, including harmful algal blooms, in Chapter 9, Water Quality, which were determined to be less than significant. The EIR also addresses fish populations and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Species, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. As shown in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts on fish and wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation.
154-3	On page 16-33, the DEIR quotes the Delta Reform Act to quote 2009, which calls for the co-equal goals of increased water reliability and an enhanced Delta ecosystem. No	DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	statement in the recreation section addresses enhancing the Delta ecosystem.	Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act.
154-4	All the best available science says the same thing. The Delta needs more flows, not less. The entirety of the DEIR needs to be thoroughly revised to address how the operations of the project will increase flows throughout the Bay/Delta estuary, not reduce them.	The EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase deliveries during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
159-1	I just want to echo the need for more time to review that document, the Environmental Impact Report. Thank you.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
162-1	Good morning. My name is [speaker name] out of Trinity County.	This information states the name of the commentor. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
162-2	I'd just like to request additional time for review of the DEIR as well.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
163-1	MS. PIGGOTT: Thank you for your comments. Okay. I see we have another hand raised. I'm going to ask you to unmute.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
163-2	Yes. I'm going to join the group. I think we need more time to read and fully digest what has been written. As said before, this is very complicated. Many people are affected by this project. And I think we need to give the maximum time extension of this time period past -- way past October 27th is requested. And I submit that. Very well. Thank you.	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
164-1	Hi. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIR.	The comment does not address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
164-2	I have some very significant concerns about this project. One being despite how this is being promoted, the project will not provide any additional storage or provide water supply during drought periods. So I don't see how it's going to really help us in that aspect. A review of the project document seems to show its primary purpose is to provide additional fresh water to south of the Delta farmers and Southern California, and to do this by sacrificing the Delta. The project would divert a significant amount of fresh water out of the Delta. By doing this, you're basically starving the Delta of fresh water, which already has significant salinity issues. You cannot remove this much fresh water without having impacts.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the SWP and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how drought was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project would provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Regarding salinity, and as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
164-3	And basically, the project itself is an underground version of the peripheral canal. I see very little that's different about it besides it being buried.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal and the California WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
164-4	I would like to further emphasize the importance of extending the review period for the document. To this date, we have received over 39,000 files that describe the modeling for the project and that does not include all of the modeling file yet.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	We received most of these files at the end of last week. There is no way we can intelligently evaluate these files in the remaining time for this review. So I would like to ask this review be extended at a minimum of an additional 90 days so we can properly review the project	
165-1	Hello. My name is [speaker name], a private citizen. And listening to the -- anyway.	This information states the name of the commentor. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
165-2	I am shocked that the DRE -- the -- the DWR would be increasing water flows. Historically water flows out of the Sacramento has been historically unsustainable. The fact that we're going to be increasing that, I find untenable.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions.
165-3	We need to use this money from these - from this project to create efficiencies and hold agriculture's water use, create efficiencies, and also for urban and cities and rural efficiency as well. Our water is expensive. We should hold it as a value, not as something we just give away.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
165-4	I agree with the Native Americans that we must treat them lightly. We have not historically in California treated them	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	lightly. It's about time that we do so and put their names and their needs on the top of the list.	of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. DWR recognizes and affirms Executive Order N-15-19, which apologized on behalf of the citizens of the State of California to all California Native Americans for the many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect California inflicted on Tribes. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources were consistent with current State policies regarding indigenous people in California. Additionally, please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, which describes DWR's good faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also see Common Response 16regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
165-5	I also agree with everyone that 90 days for this size of document is -- is an inappropriate amount of response for the length of this -- the length of this project to date. I thought we were going down to one tunnel and now we're back to three tunnels	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. The comment's assertion regarding three tunnels is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, all project alternatives would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel.
165-6	And although we do need to have some water infrastructure strengthening, I do not believe that putting a tunnel and	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	consuming more water to the south from the Sacramento River, is the correct answer. We need to work on efficiency, efficiency, efficiency, and not just keep using this water as it is -- as if it is free.	state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to response to comment 165-3 regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR, and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
166-1	So, my name is [speaker name]. I'm an elderly woman. Third generation Californian. My great grandfather's barn still stands outside of Patterson. My grandfather, one of them, was a dryland farmer on the Altamont who gave up there because of the drought that came in in the 1920s. Another -- another grandfather was a water engineer who worked for the Bureau of Reclamation, and I had uncles who worked on Zone 7. I get this, I say this because this is my contact. That is who I'm here speaking for because I do not like public speaking.	This information states the name and the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
166-2	But I have to go to the library to even look at one chapter in this EIR because it takes a fast speed to even be able to open it. I can't call in from there. I can't download the chapter from there. I mean, this is a massive document. I tried to read a few chapters.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, for a description of DWR's efforts to increase accessibility of the EIR.
166-3	[Chapter] 10, which is on seismicity, and I couldn't -- I couldn't understand why every single alternative was judged as less than significant. There should be some other rating that indicates you don't know, because the Sacramento drainage has been there for a hundred thousand years. The Sacramento drainage has survived many, many earthquakes. But you don't know. You -- every one of those is judged less than significant. And this is so shortsighted. So -- so blind. It's just like you're just checking off the boxes to say, oh, we -- we -- we looked at this. I don't know how many years	Please see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, section titled Analysis Level of Detail, regarding the type of analysis found in the EIR. The EIR impact analysis, including impacts identified as less than significant, is supported by substantial evidence using methodologies and appropriately scaled study areas as described in the Methods for Analysis sections of the respective resource chapter (i.e., Chapters 7–32). Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	was spent writing this [the EIR]. It's well written, but it is blind. It does not look at the actual conditions that will be caused by this.	
166-4	I've got a degree in geology from the '70s at a state school	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
166-5	And I know that -- that it's the structures that will go into putting in the tunnel that is seismically vulnerable.	Please see Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, for an analysis of potential impacts related to geology and seismicity, which were determined to be less than significant. This chapter concludes that construction and operation of all facilities would meet all required standards for earthquake safety. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake.
166-6	The document is too huge even for organizations to really review as I have heard today. And you're not giving enough time.	Please refer to response to comment 166-2 regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and DWR's extension of the comment period.
166-7	No project is the only one that makes any sense to me.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.
167-1	Hi. My name is [speaker name]. I'm an outreach coordinator	This information states the name and the background of the commenter. It

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and community member of Clarksburg. I've been involved with the tunnel project now, this is our third goat rodeo round with DWR with this terrible plan.	is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
167-2	The plan is slated to completely destroy the way of life here in the -- in the Delta and in Clarksburg and Walnut Grove and especially Hood.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR, including those related to local communities. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.
167-3	The project does not take into account all of the catastrophic impacts that will happen to the people who are usually multi-generational farming families. It doesn't take into account what it's going to do to the multi-billion dollar agricultural industry out here with truck traffic and impediments on being able to harvest and being able to plant as they have for generations.	The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32, including the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture. For Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-3, for an analysis regarding project-related traffic and farming operations, which were determined to be less than significant with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
167-4	It doesn't take into account the complete and total devastation of some of the most beautiful prime ag land and conservation land that is used to support cranes and other wildlife including the Swainson's Hawk.	Please see response to comment 167-3 regarding the EIR's analysis of potential impacts on agriculture; as described in that response, DWR would implement mitigation measures to reduce disclosed impacts on agricultural resources. The EIR evaluates potential impacts on wildlife in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on cranes, Swainson's hawks, and other species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 13, all potentially significant impacts associated with cranes, Swainson's hawks, and other wildlife could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, which identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for sandhill cranes, Swainson's hawk, and other special-status species, and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operations.
167-5	It doesn't take into account how disruptive and actually terminal the noise and the pollution will be to the people who live here in the Delta and the people who visit the Delta.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the environmental resources raised by the comment, including noise in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, and air quality in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.
167-6	The project is something that will cost our children not the 16 billion or the 20 billion or whatever the initial estimate is, but it will cost them probably two or three times more and will be a debt they will be ever saddled with.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding.
167-7	To trap water at the northern end of the Delta, basically a water grab, to trap water at the north end of the Delta and send it south bypassing the estuary, which will kill it in all frames and all ways, it will kill it. It will kill the people. It will kill the land. It will kill the wildlife.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
167-8	And this tunnel project has got to be stopped. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't create any new water. It doesn't even create cheap water. And the fact that these agencies like Zone 7 or Metropolitan are so on board to put their ratepayers at risk by financing and by supporting this project, is actually, in my opinion, criminal.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see response to comment 167-7 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. The project is not intended to create new water supplies. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding.
167-9	This is the same exact project that it's always been. It doesn't matter whether it's one tunnel or two. It's equally destructive to our communities. And we need to stop this madness and stop spending money on something that doesn't work.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. Please see response to comment 167-2 regarding engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. The EIR also analyzes Alternative 5, on the Bethany Reservoir alignment, which eliminates the need for a forebay and significantly reduces the total acres affected by the project.
167-10	We need the no tunnel alternative, and we need to point our -- our direction towards recycled water projects, towards projects that will actually create sending it to another.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
167-11	Thank you for your time. And absolutely no tunnel. Save the Delta.	Please refer to response to comment 167-8 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and response to comment 167-10 regarding the No Project Alternative.
168-1	[Speaker]: Thanks for your time on being able to comment about this. There were a couple things I noticed with the draft EIR.	This information provides a general introduction. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
168-2	I'm a resident of Trinity County, and when looking at the fish and aquatic resources analysis, there was nothing that talked about the Trinity River below the dam where the water diversions heading down the Sacramento, a huge source is from the Trinity River. And, undoubtedly, this project is going to create more of a strain on the Trinity resources. So, I'd like to see a better analysis of what's going to be happening on the Trinity River.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding why the Trinity River operations would not be affected by the Delta Conveyance Project. The Surface Water Changes section of Chapter 5, Surface Water, evaluates the project alternatives' potential to result in changes to Trinity River flows and changes to SWP or CVP reservoir storage levels. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, in the section titled Evaluation of Operations and Maintenance, an initial screening of model outputs indicated that detailed biological analysis was not necessary for areas upstream of the Delta, including the Trinity River system.
168-3	Another something else that I have not been able to see, although echoing others, it's a massive document to try and review in a short amount of time, more time would be great.	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
168-4	But I don't see anything in regard to the no project alternative that would speak to the water policies for the rest of California	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	such as conservation requirements and building codes for things like composting toilets. I would like to see more in the Environmental Impact Report that would address alternatives to this tunnel water source for Southern California, including other policies that have nothing to do with the waters and rivers and our basin conservation.	Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
168-5	Those are the two [refer to comments 3-5] things that stood out to me about the Environmental Impact Report Draft. And I think the no project alternative is the only sensible option here.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.
168-6	I cede the rest of my time. Thank you.	This comment provides general closing information. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
169-1	Thank you. My name is [speaker name]. I want to speak to the operations of the proposed Delta conveyance.	This information states the name of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
169-2	To the best of my understanding, all of these proposed alternatives under the current operations, would result in actually taking more water out of the Delta. That the Delta and that the exports from the Delta would be increased. That just seems totally unacceptable to me.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding DWR's existing water rights.
169-3	The science on this is so clear and has been clear for a long time, that in the Delta and in the tributaries of the Delta, if we are able to -- if we are going to protect the public trust resources and protect the fish and other wildlife that depends on the Delta and its tributaries, we need greater flows, not less flows, not greater exports.	Please refer to response to comment 169-2 regarding project operations. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Public Trust issues are addressed in Chapter 33, Other CEQA Required Analyses, and Common Response 17, Public Trust.
169-4	I think in light of that, all of the proposed alternatives, with the exception of the no project, are just going to make this already bad situation worse. And I urge you to go back to the drawing board at least with regard to operations and the amount of water to be diverted from this system.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to response to comment 169-2 regarding project operations. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
170-1	Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words. I am not resident of that area. I'm just on different end, Salton Sea area here, Indio, California.	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
170-2	But I -- I see that people oppose this project; I'm learning right now just from this meeting.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
170-3	Well, I want to say -- actually I need, before I forgot to say, I need information who is in charge of the design, if I can have it.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, DWR (the CEQA lead agency) owns and operates the SWP and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. Please also refer to Chapter 1 regarding the role of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA). As described in Chapter 1, DWR directed the DCA to develop preliminary design concepts for the project facilities and alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
170-4	I am avid engineer architect, inventor of several breath-through technologies in industry including solar hydro geothermal. And I do have a system that can use salty water or water from this Bay, whether or not that it's used. I know its salinity's less there but and can produce by using solar energy, can produce potable water depending how many models or systems can be used. It's amazing, amazing project. It's something that can be used in any coastal area where is present sun and ocean, like Cabo San Lucas and here in Salton Sea. It's my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea is where we can use salty water of the ocean, using sun and geothermal	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	option, both options, and having byproduct potable water. They might -- they might consider that. I busy with some other projects I cannot be full time there, but please I can teach them what can be done. And also salt concentrated brine can be used for extraction of radium. It's amazing concept. And if you can send me some information, people who's in charge of the project, I'd like to send you information about that, that could be incorporated very well, even if the project continue or not, I see opposition, but we need water. And I can do that. Potable water. So, without really degrading the Delta.	
170-5	But I would appreciate if somebody -- I -- I took the audience for comments and I see their line in next shot for it, but how can I get information of the people who are in charge of the project? Again, if you can send me some information, I could -- I could put my information on chat maybe and --but thank you for this opportunity.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
170-6	Thank you for now.	This comment provides general closing information. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
171-1	Thank you very much. This is a great opportunity to comment. My name is Don Lynge. I have a background in marine science. I had to let that dream die at one point and do construction but I still understand the processes. And I've studied quite extensively about the whole Delta water thing, Delta Reform Act.	This information states the name and background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
171-2	What I hear mostly this state talk about is that -- it's a common -- the two part -- I can't remember the words -- but common goals of supply plus protection. I don't hear enough about the fact that the state's required to reduce the dependency on Delta water. And taking water out of the Sacramento River above the Delta, is slight of hand.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act, coequal goals, and reducing reliance on the Delta.
171-3	I mean, I'm not making accusations, but it's not -- you're still taking water away from the Delta. And the [EPA's] anti-degradation policy applies here. You take -- you let less water flow to the Delta you're going to have a greater problem.	Please refer to response to comment 171-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an analysis of potential water quality impacts associated with construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding federal and state antidegradation policies.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
171-4	In any of restorations that they propose, EPA water has a very clear definition of aquatic restoration. And that doesn't meet that either.	Please refer to response to comment 171-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources. The CMP identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operations. As described in Appendix 3F, as well as in Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, and in Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan has been developed in light of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers guidance.
171-5	Just from a scientific perspective, it's a bad idea. And there are alternatives. And we're in a new time. You know, we started this thing thinking, okay, we just need to make it easier to get water out. Well, these -- this global warming thing is worse and worse and worse.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to response to comment 171-2 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
171-6	And the amount of water taken out is not sustainable. It's, at present, marginal. When there were shortages, Southern California got by just fine without water.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see response to comment 171-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
171-7	Southern California, like metropolitan's water agencies want to provide their -- their customers with cheap water. Cheap water is not a concern anymore. I mean, we're -- water is like gold now, and we really need to protect that.	Please see response to comment 171-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 171-6 regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
171-8	They do have, I know, desalination is expensive, but so is pumping water that far and so is some 20 miles of tunnel.	Please refer to response to comment 171-5 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding.
171-9	I really think that we need to focus on alternatives.	Please see response to comment 171-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives and response to comment 171-5 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
171-10	There's a great new plan to upgrade the screens, the fish screens in the – Clifton Court Forebay	Please see response to comment 171-5 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
171-11	-- sorry, I'm a little slow with words this morning.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
171-12	And I think that there's so many good alternatives that this is really just not -- it's not good for the Delta.	Please see response to comment 171-5 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
171-13	It's not good for the traffic that would be there. These quaint little urban hamlets are going to lose their flavor. It's just, you know, the amount of material hauled out of there, there's just so many things that --	The EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including traffic in Chapter 20, Transportation. As described in Chapter 20, while most potential impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project is expected to increase average vehicle miles traveled to a level that could be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation.
173-1	This is [commentor]. I'm an independent journalist that covers fish environmental justice and water issues.	This information states the name and occupation of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
173-2	For forty years for a number of publications, different versions of this same gigantic and wasteful public works project, the peripheral canal, the Bay/Delta conservation plan, the California water fix, now a single Delta conveyance have cast a dark, toxic shadow over California water policies since it was first decisively rejected by California voters in November 1982 as the peripheral canal.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts.
173-3	Supporters of the tunnel claim the tunnel will protect the reliability of water transport infrastructure, address impacts of sea level rise, and improve the Delta's aquatic conditions. In fact, the project will do none of these things, instead hastening the extinction of Sacramento winter and spring-run chinook salmon, central valley steelhead, the Delta and longfin smelt, and the green sturgeon.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on aquatic resources are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements and would be operated in accordance with the operational criteria described in Chapter 3 to minimize potential effects on aquatic species. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potentially significant impacts on salmon, steelhead, smelt, and sturgeon could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
173-4	According to a recent blog post by Doug Obegi of NRDC [National Resources Defense Council), the Department of Water Resources proposed operations of the Delta tunnel, are significantly less protective of the environment and fish than operations that the National Marine Fisheries Service and other agencies required for the proposed twin tunnel project only a few years ago under the California water fix. As a result, all of the alternatives in the EIR as it is now, substantially increase water exports from the Delta on average by approximately 500,000 acre feet per year, including significant increases in water diversions in dry and critically dry years. All of the available science reveals that the Delta tunnel will, in fact, hasten the extinction of Delta and longfin smelt, Sacramento winter-run chinook Salmon, central valley steelhead, green sturgeon, and other fish.	The comment assertion that the project would result in significant impacts on delta and longfin smelt, Sacramento winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, green sturgeon, and other fish is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the operation of the project and a discussion of the application of the operational criteria described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, to certain hydrologic scenarios, including dry years. As demonstrated in that Common Response, the operation of the north Delta intakes would occur during the defined excess conditions and excess conditions can and do occur during dry and critically dry years. Please refer response to comment 173-3 regarding project operations and the impact analysis for aquatic resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.
173-5	Delta tunnel will, in fact, hasten the extinction of Delta and longfin smelt, Sacramento winter-run chinook Salmon, central valley steelhead, green sturgeon, and other fish. The Delta tunnel is based on the irrational premise that diverting more Sacramento River out of the Delta will somehow restore the Delta. But I don't know of any water diversion project in the world or U.S. history where taking more water out of a river estuary has restored that river or estuary. The Delta project if construction – if constructed would be no different from previous water projects that divert water throughout the world.	The comment assertion regarding the significance of impacts on delta and longfin smelt, Sacramento winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, green sturgeon, and other fish is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 173-3 regarding project operations and the impact analysis for aquatic resources. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
174-1	With so much water being extracted from the Delta area from the river, how will you be able to control contaminants that will concentrate in those areas? Is there any planning for -- for that?	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts, including those related to contaminants, would result in less-than-significant impacts.
175-1	I have followed the process for these water wars and been following this for a long time.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
175-2	And this year because of the drought, I've already taken out my lawns and have done the low-flow toilets, I've done all kinds of things. You know, it's triage where I live, that what's going to live and what's going to die. And in the meantime, we're still allowing people to put in more water-intense trees that they get almonds and pistachios and then they export them.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
175-3	We need a healthy Delta to help with sea level rise. It's critical. We can't just keep going higher up the river and seeing how we can get more water to store somewhere when the amount is already too -- that we're taking out of the rivers is too much for them to be healthy to begin with.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
175-4	You've seen the pictures of the dry riverbanks in the Rio Grande, Colorado, and there's too much life in the Delta. It's such a special place that we need to restore it and save it for prosperity for seven generations. And this is another killer project that is being proposed.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
175-5	I support the comment of [previous commentor]. I looked last night at the EIR, there's 30 chapters. I honestly will have to pick the ones I want to focus on because I don't have enough time for all of them.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
175-6	It's just really sad that we're just going to end up with more money, the big money trying to get the water grab. Santa Clara Water District thinks that they can just buy their way into more storage and more water all over the place. And their comment is, well, we have fish in our area, too.	Please see response to comment 175-4 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to response to comment 175-3 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.
175-7	The native indigenous folks have helped us maintain the land and the air and the water for generations. And it's really an affront to them for us to continue to desecrate this land that really was given to us for conservation.	Please see response to comment 175-4 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, which describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also see Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
175-8	But we need more recycled watering. We need more thoughtful process.	Please refer to response to comment 175-3 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
175-9	The algal blooms and all the problems are going to end up going from the water to the air. We already have air pollution problems that are affecting the health of people all over the Bay Area.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, potential impacts associated with cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms were determined to be less than significant. Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures related to air quality. Please also see Chapter 26, Public Health, regarding an analysis of potential effects to public health.
175-10	So, I ask you to reject this. This should be a no project, and we should do sensible things. Thank you.	Please see response to comment 175-4 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.
177-1	This is [speaker name] and I telephoned in because I want to make it clear that I'm totally opposed to this project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
177-2	I don't understand why the Department of Water Resources continues to say that they're improving the Delta	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a detailed explanation of the history and complex issues that have led to the development of the proposed Delta

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Conveyance System. There is no Delta Conveyance System. Yes, you have pumps at the other end of the Delta, but back in 1960 when the water code 12934 authorized the Delta master levees. The Department of Water Resources spent that money elsewhere. Because the project was under financed and contractually over committed to begin with.	Conveyance Project. Prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts dating as far back as the early 1960s are described under the section titled Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts. Text under the section titled Current Planning Effort explains that the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) was directed by DWR to develop the preliminary design concepts for the project facilities and alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.
177-3	Now, with that said, the project that you're proposing is going to put the entire water supply for all those people that are dependent on the state water project for water. And the reason why I say that is because the Department is not taking into account an ARkStorm event. We [speaker does not identify who "we" is] had several meetings and webinars discussing this problem and issues and press releases relating to this ARkStorm event, which is going to happen. I suggest that the Department go online and look up ARkStorm events. I believe Dr. Swain was involved and also the U.S.G.S. The problem that we have here is that the Department of Water Resources is trying to make up for it, the over-contracted project, it contracted for more water than it could provide. It's going to take 10 to 12 or 15 years to build that tunnel. And in the interim period, we're going to experience an ARkStorm that's going to wipe out that tunnel. I suggest that the Department of Water Resources start being honest and explain to the people what's really going on.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for modeling projections of potential changes to water supply under each project alternative. Please see Chapter 30, Climate Change, section titled Recent Trends in Climate for how DWR considered ARkStorms in its analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
177-4	The major conflict for the past 60 years has been because the Department of Water Resources failed to provide the authorized facilities that were approved by the voters and the legislature back in 1960. On that note, I think the Department of Water Resources should reduce their Title A Entitlement and start being more realistic about the amount of water they can provide.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding water rights and contracts.
177-5	We [speaker does not identify who "we" is] will be having a series of webinars in the near future explaining why the public should be more concerned about this project than the Department is letting us know.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
184-1	Hello. I'm a concerned stakeholder. Anyone living in California should be aware of and concerned about the history and future of California's water use.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
184-2	Millions of people of disadvantages -- disadvantaged communities depend on the State water project for a source of safe and affordable water. The Delta Conveyance Project needs to stop playing the disadvantaged community card, about six million Californians, when the State is not willing to provide education, healthcare, affordable housing, stop gentrification and restrict polluters. And are these communities of people being forced off their land and out of their houses by the demands of corporate profiteers, who are losing their homes, because big ag is draining the groundwater out from under them for corporate profit, and the State refuses to step in and help them or the profiteers themselves, the Stewart Resnicks, and the wall street investors. How about making users accountable, not individuals dependent on wells, big agriculture and big oil and mining which are accelerating depletion and poisoning of our groundwater.	Please refer response to comment 184-1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for an analysis on potential adverse effects on environmental justice communities. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
184-3	If rain and snow fall in the winter and spring but the greatest demand and need is in the summer and fall. It's simple, we need to adapt. Open reservoirs. The California aqueduct and much of the Colorado River system loses up to 50 percent of its water due to evaporation and seepage. We need to focus on resolving those issues first.	Please see response to comment 184-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding Delta Conveyance Project's operations, which do not include changes to State Water Project or Central Valley Project operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes.
184-4	Sea level rise is another concern since slow-moving saltwater intruding into the Delta will contaminate the State's water supply and has been aggravated by bad water policies throughout the State.	Please see response to comment 184-3 regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project, which includes helping to address anticipated rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events. Chapter 9, Water Quality, includes an evaluation of potential impacts on water quality (including electrical conductivity, a measure of salinity, in Impact WQ-5) and concludes that project impacts would be less than significant.
184-5	California is also overdue for a 100-year flood. It's been 160 years since the great flood of 1862 that put the entire Central Valley, including the City of Sacramento, under 6 to 20 feet of water. Are we prepared for flooding, for contamination of agricultural land and of the State's water system?	Please see response to comment 184-4 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Chapter 7, Flood Protection, for the EIR's analysis of potential impacts on flood protection. As described in Chapter 7, the potential impacts analyzed would result in impacts that are less than significant, or less than significant with mitigation.
184-6	Existing facilities have been incredibly environmentally damaging and use huge amounts of electricity, all the more profit for power generators and the demand component for more fossil fuels. Much of the existing systems or facilities are open-air, more	Please see response to comment 184-1 regarding the State Water Project and background information on how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	evaporation, more saline buildup adding salt to the system, more ways for terrorists to poison. Climate change is only an aggravating challenge. There's no question of the need and many compelling reasons to modernize infrastructure.	including Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 22, Energy.
184-7	Construction will have further impact on our wildlife natural habitats ecological systems up and down the State.	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and plant species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
184-8	A pumping plant needed to lift the water from conveyance system tunnel up to the existing Bethany reservoir will require huge amounts of power, require more dams, more environmental damage, and more profit. Does it reduce energy needed to use water or use it more?	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. Chapter 22, Energy, provides quantifications of energy that would be needed to construct each of the Delta Conveyance Project alternatives, as well as the expected energy required for operation (including maintenance). The EIR concluded that although the project would increase the use of electrical energy, this increase was not considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy and would not conflict with any state/local plan goal, objective, or policy for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The comment assertion that the proposed project will require more dams is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please also see response to comment 184-1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives.
184-9	So please step back and look realistically at preservation of land, air, marine and ecosystem habitats, as well as our water.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources, including Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
184-10	To what degree can you continue to tolerate rapacious short-term corporate greed? The original systems that move water through the State were built as pork for folks in congress to benefit wealthy investors and as part of the game of brinkmanship between the Army Corp. of Engineers, the US Bureau of Reclamation, the California State Water and -- consortium of bought and paid for politicians at all levels of government. Local water agencies have always been driven by insider political considerations, historically by agriculture interests. Water in California continues to be a profit center for big business and big agriculture which funds politicians' elections. We will almost certainly be issuing waivers to those who profit from this project.	Please see response to comment 184-9 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see response to comment 184-1 regarding the State Water Project and background information on how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to the various state, regional, and local plans, projects, policies, and programs related to water supply and water management.
184-11	The State needs to insist its inhabitants and agriculture readapt to a semiarid climate and revert to the natural river system. Yes, California needs to improve the State water system by reducing use and water for crops unsuitable for our climate, by stopping the use of State water to grow alfalfa and other high-water use crops for export and functionally exporting our water to foreign countries for corporate profit.	Please see response to comment 184-1 regarding the State Water Project and background information on how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
184-12	Newsom is correct, we need to preserve fisheries, but also our wetlands, our groundwater and force the agriculture sector to become accountable for all water use paying market-rate prices to force them to conserve and replace. Cheap water subsidies and tax breaks for big agriculture and its investors must stop. Housing and farms should not be built on floodplains, dams should be removed as soon as they're gone, and all efforts should be made to restore the ecology of the State before California becomes a wasteland.	Please see response to comment 184-1 regarding the State Water Project and background information on how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please also see response to comment 184-11 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management. The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 8, Groundwater, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for the EIR's analyses of impacts on the environmental resources raised by the comment.
185-1	Hi. My name is [comment name].	This information states the name of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
185-2	And all project alternatives in the Draft EIR proposed three water supply conveyance alignment or pipes combined with proposed construction of new North Delta diversion and conveyance facilities capable of carrying 3,000 to 7,500 cubic feet per second. Intake A would be south of and on the other side of the Sacramento River from Clarksburg. Intake B would be just North of Hood and Intake C would be between Hood and Courtland.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
185-3	There already exists the California aqueduct which is more than 701 miles long and carries water to the south. It delivers water to 27 million people and irrigation for 750,000 acres of farmland. The Delta-Mendota Canal is 117 miles long and delivers water from the Sacramento River to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. The Delta-Mendota Canal California Intertie project was completed in 2012 at a cost of $34 million to deliver water to Southern California.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
185-4	Sea levels are already rising, and California has been having increasingly low water years.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
185-5	This is not advisable to build more outtake pipes from the Sacramento River as this will cause saltwater to intrude into the delta. This will destroy valuable farmland, destroy freshwater fisheries, and introduce saltwater into the water supplies of millions of people.	The comment assertions regarding the destruction of freshwater fisheries and a change in drinking water quality due to saltwater are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for the analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment. Regarding salinity, and as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. As shown in Chapter 12, potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapter 15, for Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		impacts to the extent feasible; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation.
185-6	The Delta provides rich and productive habitat for more than 500 species of fish and wildlife, all of which will be impacted by this project. Water affected by the project includes vital habitats for many fish, including Pacific Salmon, Ground Fish and Coastal Pelagic Fish. The Southern Resident Killer Whale is considered to be impacted because of potential effects on their Chinook Salmon prey.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and plant species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 185-6 regarding the EIR's impact analysis for fish and aquatic resources. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Impact AQUA-19, the effects of operations and maintenance of the project on southern resident killer whales were determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potentially significant impacts analyzed related to wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
185-7	Delta agriculture accounted for $4.6 billion statewide. All alternatives will result in the conversion of important farmland. Up to 5,736 acres would be lost. These alternatives would cause the conversion of Williamson Act farmland or farmland in a farmland security zone.	Please refer to response to comment 185-5 regarding the impact analysis and mitigation measures for agricultural resources. In addition, please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for the analysis of socioeconomic effects related to agricultural production.
185-8	Groundwater storage, conservation, recycling, reuse, and desalination should all be used to provide more water.	Please refer to response to comment 185-4 regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
185-9	The people should be allowed to vote on this proposed project.	As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, Chapter 1, in the sections titled Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
186-1	I looked all through the DEIR, the public health section, didn't see any mention of fertilizer not anywhere in the DEIR. And only one really insignificant mention of herbicides. That's kind of a glaring omission, because if the fertilizers caused the Algal blooms, and the pesticides you gave some attention to that, but kind of minimal.	Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire discusses the presence of fertilizer in the Delta region and potential impacts associated with transport of hazardous material or release of hazardous chemicals into the environment. The analysis found that there would be no impact or a less-than-significant impact. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses potential project impacts associated with nutrients (Impact WQ-7) and harmful algal blooms (Impact WQ-14), which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 26, Public Health, analyzes impacts associated with vectors, constituents of concern and water quality, bioaccumulation, and electromagnetic fields that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project; the chapter also provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts. This analysis concluded that potential impacts would be less than significant and less than significant with mitigation.
186-2	The pesticides and the fertilizers and herbicides, have a very well documented effect on currently big increases in autoimmune diseases.	Please refer to response to comment 186-1 regarding the EIR's analysis of potential hazards and public health impacts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
186-3	So increasing any more water to the Central Valley promotes more usage of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. It ends up causing a lot of disease. You cannot really -- well, to be more specific, I've got time to mention one that people can relate with: Diabetes. Toxins like -- arsenic pesticides and herbicides are typically found in Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes. These compounds trigger and/or destroy the insulin producing beta cells in the pancreas. Specifically -- I can't get much more specific than that.	The comment assertion that the project promotes usage of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers is unfounded. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to response to comment 186-1 regarding the EIR's analysis of potential hazards and public health impacts.
186-4	So increasing any more water to the Central Valley promotes more usage of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. It ends up causing a lot of disease. It's a big trigger for -- I was going to say herbicides, specifically. It's a big trigger for neurological diseases, which are autoimmune: Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, ALS, multiple sclerosis; they're on the increase.	Please refer to responses to comments 186-1 and 186-3 regarding the EIR's analysis of potential hazards and public health impacts.
186-5	So increasing any more water to the Central Valley promotes more usage of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. It ends up causing a lot of disease. Power elite likes to underplay these facts. Power elite being big medical business, international agricultural business, that kind of thing.	Please refer to responses to comments 186-1 and 186-3 regarding the EIR's analysis of potential hazards and public health impacts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
186-6	One more comment: You cannot really say - you cannot say that the Central Valley and Imperial Valley grew our food for us, because they don't. Most of it's going to Pacific Rim countries: China, Japan and Korea. That's where it's going. The one that gets all the publicity is the 80 percent of exported -- the almond industry output. So, you know, there's lots of other crops. You know, you've got your alfalfa for their cow industry worldwide. But any way the -- you know, we're exporting. The Californians are paying for it. But the water barrens and the politicians involved and the companies involved, they get the money and the Pacific Rim countries get the food. They get the imbedded water, they get the mineral resource, but us Californians pay for it.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
186-7	So my main question is: How long is this farce going to continue? Done.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
193-1	I'm an independent journalist that's covered the Fish Environmental Justice and Water issue for 40 years.	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
193-2	First of all, I wanted to say that I completely support the Sierra Club California's request for an extension of a 90-day comment period that Ms. C. just talked about.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
193-3	Second, [in addition to a comment extension request] I wanted to register my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnel and the Draft Environmental Impact Report.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
193-4	Different versions of this same gigantic and massive and wasteful Public Works project, the Peripheral Canal, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, the California WaterFix, and now the single Delta Conveyance has cast its dark, toxic shadow over California water policy since it was first rejected by California voters in November 1982 as the Peripheral Canal.	Please see response to comment 193-3 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix and the Peripheral Canal. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
193-5	Tunnel proponents claim the tunnel will protect the reliability of water transport infrastructure, address the impacts of sea level rise and improve Delta's aquatic conditions. But the project will do none of these things. Instead it will hasten extinction of Sacramento River winter and spring-run Chinook Salmon, Central Valley Steelhead, Delta and Longfin Smelt and Green Sturgeon.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the project purpose and objectives. As described in that Common Response, the project purpose and objectives include protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, helping to address the impacts of sea level rise, and providing operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta. Please refer to Common Response 1 for a discussion of the ability of lead agencies to make reasonable assumptions about how a project would work in the future without guaranteeing these assumptions under CEQA. Please refer to the project purpose and objectives as stated in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Chapters 4–32, which substantiate DWR's assumptions about how the project would meet the stated purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on aquatic resources are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements and would be operated in accordance with the operational criteria described in Chapter 3 to minimize potential effects on aquatic species. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potentially significant impacts on salmon, steelhead, smelt, and sturgeon would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
193-6	According to a recent blog by Doug Obegi of NRDC, DWR's proposed operations of the Delta Tunnel are significantly less protective of the environment than operations that the	Please refer to response to comment 193-4 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project being independent and separate from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix and response to comment 193-5 regarding project operations and the impact analysis for aquatic resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	National Marine Fisheries Service and other agencies required for the proposed Twin Tunnel project only a few years ago.	
193-7	All of the alternatives in the DEIR substantially increase water exports from the Delta on average by approximately 500,000 acre-feet per year. The entire Delta Conveyance Project is based on the irrational and unscientific premise that diverting more Sacramento River water before it reaches the Delta will somehow restore the Delta ecosystem, while providing water supply reliability. I don't know of any water diversion project in the world or US history where taking more water out of the river or estuary has restored that river or estuary. The Delta Tunnel project, if constructed, would be no Different.	The EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. The EIR is substantiated using best available science. See Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science in the EIR. The project purpose and objectives do not include restoring the Delta ecosystem. The project purpose and objectives include protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, helping to address the impacts of sea level rise, and providing operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta. Please refer to response to comment 193-5 regarding project operations. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
194-1	[Speaker name]: Good afternoon. This is [speaker name]. Thank you for calling on me. I appreciate it. And I just have a few verbal comments to make.	This information states the name of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
194-2	The DEIR does adequately report the existing condition of the South Delta Bay Region. Conditions exist that require the addition of stored and imported water of local reservoirs and the Sacramento River to maintain a quality of water that is suitable for use by municipals and agriculture. This condition was brought about by the over-allocation of waters of the San Joaquin River, overcommitment of the South Delta water sent to the Central Valley and the lack of water volume in the South Delta. There's not much we can do about the lack of that water volume unless one makes a huge commitment to dredge it. I know there have been dredging operations in the shipping canals in the North and the Central Delta that have greatly increased their flows and their freshwater flows back to the Pacific Ocean. But the water flows in the San Joaquin River are so low in the summer that 90 percent of the water in the last 40 kilometers of the river is comprised of Sacramento River water. This situation creates conditions that are detrimental to migratory fish's ability to locate their native waters.	The comment assertion regarding existing conditions of the South Delta Bay region is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, regarding existing conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation, as required by CEQA. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the study area for resources analyzed in Chapters 5–32 and areas upstream of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding Delta Conveyance Project's operations which does not include changes to State Water Project or Central Valley Project operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR provides an analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for a description of potential changes to surface water resources and water supply that could result from implementation of the project and alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for the analysis of potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic resources, which were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
194-3	Also, the many diversions of water in the south Delta contribute to the loss of millions of returning mature fish and the inability of newly hatched fish to find suitable pathways to the Pacific Ocean. For many decades, mitigations have been implemented to control the situation. However, much of the Delta and its biodiversity has been lost. I think I have time to get a quote here from the California Department of Water Resources. Over the last 150 years the Delta has lost 98 percent of the native habitat that supports these species. Scientists attribute the steep decline of the Delta ecosystems to fish, to drought and to human activity, including the development of levees supporting agricultural and water conveyance. Absent efforts to protect native species, we can expect many more species to go extinct over the next century.	Please refer to response to comment 194-2 regarding existing conditions, potential changes to surface water resources and water supply, and impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project.
194-4	I call for the State and Federal governments to step in and establish regulations that will reallocate water to this [South Delta] region and preserve the situation in the Delta. Actually, they won't restore to its original pristine conditions, but at least it can slow the degradation.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to response to comment 194-3 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding state and federal antidegradation policies.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
195-1	Thank you. This report concerns me because the parties involved with implementing the EIR, are more concerned with fulfilling water delivery contracts and other water delivery agreements than protecting the water quality for Delta residents. This is assuming there will be extra water to be sent to the southern part of the State.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on water quality. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.
195-2	Indigenous people have the oldest water rights and these rights should be respected, not wealthy agriculture and big corporations.	Please see response to comment 195-1 regarding the State Water Project, background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding water rights and water contracts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
195-3	Pumping water out of the Delta will destroy the Delta, turning it into a swamp. The water quality will degrade, the fish will be warm with less water and will die.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts on the Delta are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for a description of potential changes to surface water resources and water supply that could result from the proposed project and alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please refer to response to comment 195-1 regarding project operations and the water quality analysis in the EIR. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level and operations-based flow-related effects on Delta water temperature are expected to be minor.
195-4	Delta levees are needed whether there is to be a single tunnel or not. This is because Delta levees are necessary protection against increased floods risks resulting from climate change impacts for the Delta's 4 million residents, 2 including Environmental Justice Communities. Very recent climate change studies indicate that permafrost, thawing, peat soil, fires and faster than expected loss of Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets, all are contributing to the increased likelihood of abrupt climate change effects including sea level rise. Climate change impacts within the Delta include: More extreme flood events, reduced runoff into the Delta watershed, warmer water temperatures and reduced fresh water flows that will alter environmental conditions in the	Please refer to response to comment 195-1 regarding the purpose of the project. Although the Delta Conveyance Project is not a flood control project, it would not affect current or future flood control activities within the Delta. The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment, including flooding in Chapter 7, Flood Protection, and environmental justice in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice. As described in Chapter 7 and Chapter 29, impacts on flood protection were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, and would therefore not have a disproportionately adverse effect on environmental justice. Please refer to Appendix 7A, Flood Protection 2040/2072 Analysis, regarding future conditions with climate change and potential flooding impacts. In addition, please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Delta and the amount of water that's available. That's why it's important to keep the levees. They protect against flooding, and we need the water for the San Francisco Bay and the Delta communities.	and Adaptation, regarding climate change requirements and analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for additional information regarding the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts.
195-5	Additionally, other operating conditions dictate that south Delta pumping plants of the State and federal water projects must receive water through existing Delta channels at times when the tunnel intakes in the North cannot operate.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Please also refer to response to comment 195-1 regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
196-1	MS. SWENSON: My name is Anna Swenson. I've been involved in this project, which you guys say is a different project, but it's the same project as it was for BDCP and WaterFix and now the Delta Conveyance Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts.
196-2	And one of my comments is we'll have a very short window for public comment. We're supposed to have our comments in by October 27th. It's a huge document. We finally received some flash drives that we were able to distribute to the community only yesterday. We have a change sheet that was given out that has changes on it that they have to be, like, redistributed. So it seems really impossible for us to be able to effectively and adequately provide the public comments that you guys claim you want so dearly, when we aren't given enough time to properly review the document. A lot of us are not lawyers or professionals and we have to dig	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period. As stated on the Delta Conveyance Project EIR website and in the Change Sheet, the formatting and editorial issues identified in the Change Sheet and corrected files did not modify the Draft EIR impact analyses or conclusions. Therefore, nothing included in the Change Sheet represented a barrier to full, adequate, and meaningful review of the Draft EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and scour through your very, very heavy document and then have changes that are made on 9/22, which is approximately a month before the comments are officially due. So we are, once again, asking for an extension of time for the public to adequately be able to review the document, to review the devastating destruction that this project will bring to our communities and to be able to provide comments that would, you know, represent the actual communities that you are affecting.	
196-3	And my other public comment is: When in the history of any project has it ever been successful to take water out of an estuary and actually provide any type of healthy benefits to the estuary, to the community, to the fish population? We have salmon fish populations that are crashing and runs that are completely disappearing. So the idea that somehow magically, in some sort of unicorn fantasy, that taking more water out of the estuary at the cost of billions of dollars to my children, everyone else's children and their grandchildren, will actually be an effective alternative to what we have now.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32, including those related to fish and aquatic resources and local communities. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which describes that potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic resources, including salmon, would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. In addition, many community issues have been addressed through an evaluation of a wide range of resource impacts, including those in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 26, Public Health; Chapter 14, Land Use; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding project cost. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
196-4	We really need other alternatives to be explored; and, you know, actually considered for viability for, you know, this wicked problem that we have. But the solution is not to take more water out of the estuary or to destroy the historical legacy community of the Delta. We urge all of the agencies that are involved to please put this money instead into finding viable alternatives to serve all of California, not just the folks to the South.	Please refer to response to comment 196-3 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, the alternatives screening process, and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
197-1	As a concerned resident of Rio Vista and the Sacramento Delta, I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel). I am a fifth generation Rio Vistan whose parents and ancestors farmed and ranched on Tolland Landing in the Montezuma Hills on the Sacramento River/Deep Water Channel, on Sherman Island, and on Ryer Island. They understood what it meant to live with and be dependent upon the river, holding initial water rights to be able to farm, raise families, and contribute not just to their local community but to protecting the environment key to producing food that feeds California and the world.	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
197-2	In the 1980's and again starting in 2006, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has been actively pursuing unsustainable isolated water conveyance that would remove freshwater flows from the Delta for the benefit of other parts of the state. The Delta Tunnel is the latest iteration, however,	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	many of the impacts that plagued previous versions (the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and California WaterFix) are still present in the Delta Tunnel.	Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts.
197-3	The DEIR is inadequate and fails to inform the public of the true extent of the environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. The EIR is substantiated using best available science. See Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science in the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.
197-4	As a resident of Rio Vista, CA, I understand that the state faces a difficult task in combating the current water crisis. However, the Delta Tunnel would create a sacrifice zone in the Delta region from the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the project.	The comment assertion regarding the level of impacts on socioeconomic and environmental resources because of the project is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR, including those related to the environment, economy, and local communities. Many community issues have been addressed through an evaluation of a wide range of resource impacts, including those in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases;

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 26, Public Health; Chapter 14, Land Use; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
197-5	Further, the cost of the Delta Tunnel is alarming and unaffordable (the latest cost estimate (not including finance costs) was approximately $16 billion; this estimate is sure to go up. https://calmatters.org/environment/2022/06/california-water-delta-tunnel/).	Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project cost.
197-6	The DEIR's treatment of many impacts is misleading as it lowballs many impacts of the proposed project, precluding good faith review by the interested public. For instance, despite the project's massive disturbances from construction of a 45-mile long, 39-foot outer diameter tunnel around the Delta, the DEIR claims that all biological impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels. This is at best questionable. The impacts from construction would span a decade-plus and span thousands of acres of farmland, grasslands, wetlands and riparian habitat, disturbing and displacing wildlife.	Please refer to response to comment 197-3 regarding the EIR's compliance with CEQA requirements. Please refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources. Common Response 11 also includes discussion of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources (Appendix 3F of the Draft EIR), which identifies potential compensatory mitigation options to address impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters (i.e., aquatic resources) that may result from project construction and operation.
197-7	The DEIR also fails to analyze the water quality, agricultural and other impacts associated with removing up to 6,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Sacramento River. Removing what is about one-third to one-half of the average flow of the river is sure to create increases in salinity as well as increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms (HABs). Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts will magically be less than significant and offering no mitigation measures for salinity or HABs	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for a description of potential changes to surface water resources and water supply that could result from implementation of the project and alternatives. As described in Chapter 5, based on hydrologic modeling, long-term average monthly flow for all project alternatives is similar to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		existing conditions with minor differences. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Chapter 9, Water Quality, includes Impact WQ-5 and Impact WQ-14, which discuss electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms, respectively. As described in Chapter 9, these potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation, therefore, no mitigation is necessary. Please also refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, for additional information regarding the EIR's water quality impact analysis. As described in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impact AG-3 would be less than significant with Mitigation Measure AG-3. Please also refer to Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, for more information regarding the EIR's approach to analyzing impacts on agricultural resources, including the adequacy of agricultural mitigation measures and agricultural mitigation considerations.
197-8	Additionally, the DEIR does not adequately analyze and mitigate the impacts on Delta communities. A so-called "Community Benefits Program" would not even attempt to address the very real impacts to residents during and after construction. This is unacceptable given the extensive and lasting impacts the project would have in the region. For example, criteria and toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, across the region as a result of project construction, endangering the health of Delta residents.	Please refer to response to comment 197-4 regarding how community issues have been addressed in the EIR. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gases, which includes quantitative modeling and proposed mitigation measures. Furthermore, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
197-9	The DEIR's alternatives analysis is also lacking. The DEIR's alternatives essentially provide various versions of the same tunnel project. There are no alternatives that describe other methods to meet the DWR's water supply reliability goals.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in light of the project purpose and objectives.
197-10	The DEIR ignores other, more environmentally friendly ways to make California's water infrastructure more resilient without increasing reliance on Delta exports, which conflicts with the 2009 Delta Reform Act.	Please refer to response to comment 197-9 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to response to comment 197-4 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and coequal goals.
197-11	Overall, this project would create an environmental and socioeconomic disaster. Many of the environmental impacts, as well as the exorbitant cost, could be avoided by pursuing alternative, more sustainable, water projects. I urge DWR to abandon the Delta Tunnel and pursue more stormwater capture, groundwater recharge, recycling and reuse, and water conservation that would not create as many significant environmental and other impacts on the California Delta	The comment assertion about the level of impacts on environmental and socioeconomic resources is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 197-9 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to response to comment 197-4 regarding the analysis of potential impacts in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR, including those related to the environment and socioeconomics. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project cost.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
197-12	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	All persons, organizations, or agencies that commented on the Draft EIR will be included on the project notification list.
198-1	I want to register as strong a comment as possible in opposition to this ill conceived project!! I do not even know where to start. There is absolutely nothing positive about this proposed project EXCEPT if you live in central or southern California and care nothing whatsoever about what you will do to your neighbors in the North in order to assure yourselves of water to grow almonds to ship to China or to water your golf courses.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
198-2	This will absolutely ruin so much of what is now so wonderful about the California Delta…everything from killing fish to the pollution it will cause in its creation. PLEASE do not go forward with this horrible project.	Please see response to comment 198-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for the analysis of potentially significant impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment. As

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts on water quality would be less than significant. As described in Chapter 23, most potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would reduce the extent of Impact AQ-5; however, Impact AQ-5 could still result in significant and unavoidable impacts.
200-1	I am an elderly, 3rd generation Californian. My great-grandfather's 1880's barn still stands outside of Patterson, one grandfather was a dryland farmer on the Altamont pre-1920's and another was an engineer who worked on bringing Hetch Hetchy water to San Francisco – he died the year I was born. I grew up in 1950's Livermore with uncles who worked for Zone 7, knowing about the California Water Project and that water is something NOT to be wasted. I ended up getting a BS in geology and meteorology at SJSU in 1982, doing a lot of field work around the Owens Valley, and have spent my life exploring and appreciating all of California. I have watched climate change happen and did everything I could do to keep it from being ignored.	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
200-2	The reality of climate change demands that we come up with solutions other than the disruption of the Delta and the Sacramento River to provide water for Southern California export agriculture and population growth.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
200-3	I was relieved to be able to download the chapter on Flood Protection (Chapter 7) so I could read it carefully. I found its assessments much more honest than those of Chapter 10 (Geology and Seismicity) and its presented data scientifically clear. It does lack more recent data that represents what is happening now, basing flood risks on historical data from 1957, or 2007 to 2016. I think it focus on annual versus event data and long used definitions of 100-year and 200-year floods is a major flaw as we are already seeing quite clearly how our climate is changing. I know data takes a while to amass, but for a project that will take 20+ years to complete to usefulness and will not even begin construction until global warming and its resulting changes in weather patterns are advanced, there needs to be greater focus on forward-looking, leading-edge scientific data like that presented in Xingying Huang and Daniel L. Swain's 12 August 2022 Science article "Climate change is increasing the risk of a California megaflood" (https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abq0995). I quote: "Altogether, it appears that the plausible worst case scenario storms in a warming climate are likely to produce massive precipitation accumulations, but even more exceptional runoff in relative terms due to profound changes in mountain hydrology brought about by decreasing snow fraction. This has particularly large implications for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River flood plains (as well as their	Please refer to Chapter 7, Flood Protection, for the EIR's analysis of impacts on flood protection. As described in Chapter 7, the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts, or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please refer to Appendix 7A, Flood Protection 2040/2072 Analysis, for an evaluation regarding future conditions with climate change and potential flooding impacts. In addition, please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding climate change requirements and analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for additional information regarding the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science and the climate change projections used in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	upstream tributaries)—a part of the state where millions of Californians now live atop ancient flood deposits. Flood risk during an event like either of these scenarios will bring widespread and severe flood risk to nearly the entire state, but the extreme increases in projected surface runoff in the Sacramento and San Joaquin basins are of particular concern given the confluence of high pre-existing risk in these regions and a large population that has never experienced flooding of this magnitude historically.	
200-4	This Flood Protection chapter of the draft EIR makes a very grave error in not more clearly stating what its scientific authors must already understand: flooding risks are increasing with climate change and a year's worth of precipitation may fall in one or two events. New conditions change how flooding risk must be approached and the old data may simply not have the relevance they are given in this chapter.	Please see response to comment 200-3 regarding potential impacts related to flood protection, the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts, and the use of best available science and climate change projections in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
200-5	State monies should be focused on repairing, protecting and investing in levees and flood protection before they are undermined by tunneling.	Please refer to response to comment 200-2 regarding the purpose of the project, the alternatives screening process, and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Although the Delta Conveyance Project is not a flood control project, it would not affect current or future flood control activities within the Delta. Please also refer to Chapter 7, Flood Protection, section titled Regional Planning Efforts Related to Delta Flood Management, for a discussion of levee programs that DWR manages that are critical to Delta flood risk management, including levee maintenance and improvements.
200-6	I was relieved to find Chapter 30: Climate Change, to be very well-prepared and including information from the Delta Stewardship Council. The summary projections table 30.2 is good. The phrase "More flood potential" appears constantly, and I just wish this awareness was reflected more clearly in Chapter 7. I believe it is a fault that Chapter 30 only mentions	Please see response to comment 200-3 regarding potential impacts related to flood protection, the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts, and the use of best available science and climate change projections in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the work of Dr. Swain briefly (ArkStorms in 30.2.2.1) and seems to focus on drought and not the floods.	
200-7a	I have lived with an awareness of drought all of my life but lived through floods in both Northern and Southern California during the 1980's.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
200-7b	We may not yet have had an event like the 1861-62 statewide California flood (see https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/atmospheric-rivers-california-megaflood-lessons-from-forgotten-catastrophe/) but already in 2022, during a statewide, declared extreme drought, there have been a several flood events in the deserts of southeastern California.	Please refer to response to comment 200-3 regarding potential impacts related to flood protection, the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts, and the use of best available science and climate change projections in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 200-4 regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
200-8	If there were storage facilities in Southern California for the water that has fallen there during the 2022 monsoon, would we still be in a drought? Would there be a nearby water source for MWR if the Los Angeles River was still recharging an aquifer instead of having been 'channeled' in 1938 to prevent flooding?	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
200-9	There have been a lot of decisions in the past that we are paying for now, and DWR must apply the most recent scientific evidence and highest level of scientific ethics to avoid making more. Basing policy on input from profit- and growth-dependent corporations and \allowing them to control the future WILL cost us more in the long run than we can afford to pay.	Please see response to comment 200-3 regarding CEQA requirements and the use of the best available science in the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 200-2 regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project cost.
200-10	Because of the ramifications of sea level rise to Delta geography, it seems imperative that you review, and coordinate, ALL of the estimates of sea level rise in the San Francisco Bay and the Delta used in the DEIR to make sure that	Please see response to comment 200-3 regarding the use of best available science and climate change projections in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	they are consistent and reflect the very latest thinking. Trying to find a adequate, single citation for this, I decided on the following: https://www.adaptingtorisingtides.org/project/regional-sea-level-rise-mapping-and-shoreline-analysis/ I am sure that your scientists have many others.	
200-11	Please give great consideration to the input from the Delta Independent Science Board. I have listened to their meetings, looked at their information and believe that these scientists are the ones with the greatest understanding of the Delta. To ignore their input is wrong and brings the DWR intent with the Conveyance DEIR into question.	Please see response to comment 200-3 regarding the use of best available science in the EIR.
200-12	I am continuing to read.	This information provides general closing information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
202-1	Overall Impression of EIR After reviewing the EIR, I was deeply dismayed at the minimization of negative impacts to the Delta environment, and its human and wildlife inhabitants by the DWR. The mitigations are totally insufficient as well, to the level of being meaningless.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project and its alternatives. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to the environment, fish and wildlife, and local communities. The comment assertions regarding inadequate mitigation are not supported by the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the general approach to analysis, adequacy of mitigation measures, implementation of feasible migration, and discussion of residual impacts based on substantial evidence and use of best available science.
202-2	This project continues the historic use of power and money to unfairly and unethically grab land, natural resources and	The comment assertions are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	cultural life styles from rural and indigenous populations to serve southern cities and exporter profit, similar to the devastation of Owens Valley and Mono Lake for construction of the Los Angeles Aqueduct in the early 1900's. The EIR document is evidence of state governance that no longer serves all the people equitably and fails to uphold its own regulations and laws to protect and restore the environment. That is also is evident in the stated fundamental purposes of the project to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries at the expense of northern populations who do not benefit from the project in any way.	Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to response to comment 202-1 regarding the EIR's analyses of potential significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
202-3	Below I will comment on land use, farmland, and water quality from rising salinity.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
202-4	Land Use The EIR does not consider removal of 61-93 permanent structures because they are in open space and agricultural areas. Stating that any structures in agricultural and open areas are insignificant is absurd because you cannot grow crops and livestock or go duck hunting in a city.	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 14, Land Use, Impact LU-1, removal of structures does not constitute a significant land use impact under CEQA. As described in the analysis, environmental impacts from the removal of structures would only be considered significant if the structures qualified as historical resources or if the removal of structures would lead to physical effects on other resources. These effects and potential assessments are discussed in their respective resource chapters. Displacement of existing residents, including displacement as a result of removal of structures, is addressed in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Similarly, impacts on recreational facilities are addressed in Chapter 16,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Recreation. Impacts on agricultural resources are addressed in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources.
202-5	Furthermore, removal of those structures would prevent the owners from conducting their commercial and recreational activities. Claiming that only historical structures are significant is nonsensical.	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see response to comment 202-4 regarding the EIR's analyses regarding the removal of structures and displacement of existing residents, including those related to socioeconomics, recreation, and agriculture.
202-6	And temporary relocation for the 14 years of construction would actually translate into permanent end of that activity.	Please see response to comment 202-4 regarding the EIR's analyses regarding the removal of structures and displacement of existing residents, including those related to socioeconomics, recreation, and agriculture.
202-7	Lack of mitigation for anything other than economic effects for being forced to move away from your community is cruel and unjust; I doubt anyone living in a large urban area who was forced to move to a rural area would agree that represents fair compensation.	Please see response to comment 202-4 regarding the EIR's analyses regarding the removal of structures and displacement of existing residents, including those related to socioeconomics, recreation, and agriculture. Furthermore, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
202-8	Farmland (Agricultural Resources) The estimate that only 2,340 to 4,100 acres of "Important Farmland" will be permanently converted to incompatible uses is grossly underrepresented for several reasons. Multiple resources have clearly documented that 500,000 to 1 million	Please refer to Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to analyzing potentially significant environmental impacts on agriculture resulting from construction and operation of the project. Please refer to response to comment 202-2 regarding the purpose of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	acres of farmland need to be re-purposed in order to address drought, subsidence, rising salinity, and ecosystem decline.	
202-9	Secondly, construction will require the building of roads, parking of heavy equipment, earth deposits from tunneling, redirection of estuary water, construction wastewater treatment and pumping, housing and transportation for construction workers. In other words, most of the Delta region will be permanently converted from its current use. Already, some sources report that 800,000 acres have been repurposed in the Central Valley. The Delta Tunnel Project will ultimately mean the end of most agriculture in the local region. The DWR clearly is aware of this, as evidenced by the large Delta land purchases of at least 60,000 to 80,000 acres by the DWR and associated partners such Metropolitan Water District.	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. The comment assertions regarding project impacts on the Delta region are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 14, Land Use, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts regarding land use. Chapter 14 provides a quantitative comparison of land use impacts for each of the alternatives in the table titled Land Use Designations (acres) inside the Water Conveyance Footprints by Alternative. As described in Chapter 14, the impacts analyzed would result in no impacts, or less-than-significant impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture and the proposed mitigation measures to mitigate such impacts. For Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation.
202-10	Water Quality The EIR makes no mention, or at least incomplete determination, of the negative impact on water quality within the Delta of rising salinity. The Delta Tunnel Project's primary purpose is to protect water exports from rising salinity by diverting water from intakes further north and east. But there is no discussion of restoring the low water flows through the estuary to the Bay that causes the rising salinity. There also is no acknowledgement that diverting more fresh water from the rivers will worsen the salinity problem and subsidence. This	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on water quality resulting from construction and operations of the project. Chapter 9 includes Impact WQ-5 regarding electrical conductivity, a measure of salinity, which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	perhaps is the most unscientific and egregious aspect of the EIR.	Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641) DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding best available science.
202-11	Only brief mention is made of increases in elements such as bromide and chlorine. No mitigation is recommended. Water temperature changes are denied, which always occurs with low water flows and has been noted as an important factor in Delta fish kills. This section of the EIR is completely inadequate and omits very important impacts.	Please see response to comment 202-10 regarding the sufficiency of the EIR's water quality impact analyses and how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements. In addition, please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for the EIR's analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on fish and aquatic resources. As shown in Chapter 12, potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
202-12	Conclusion In summary, I am opposed to the Delta Conveyance Tunnel Project. There are many alternatives for developing new water resources through conservation measures in southern California.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
202-13	The EIR as written minimizes important impacts and many of the mitigations are insufficient.	Please see response to comment 202-1 regarding the EIR's analyses of potential significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
202-14	The EIR is ethically, culturally, and economically insensitive to the needs of Northern California. The DWR is legally required	Please refer to response to comment 202-2 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	to equitably represent the entire state of California, not just the water exporters.	compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see response to comment 202-1 regarding the EIR's analyses of potential significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
203-1	I see that we have one commenter. You should receive a message to come off mute shortly.Go ahead, Nancy. MS. BLASTOS: Can you hear me? MS. SCHANEL: Yes, we can. Thank you. MS. BLASTOS: Thank you, and good evening.	This information provides general introductory information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
203-2	Thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak on the Delta Tunnel. My name is Nancy Blastos and I'm an advocate for the No Tunnel Solution.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments requesting no-tunnel alternatives.
203-3	The Delta was never meant to supply 80 percent of its water to the industrial farmers who export rice, almonds, avocados, pistachios, grapes, et cetera, for great profits for themselves. The other 20 percent goes to our departments who sell water to California residents and commercial industries.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
203-4	I propose repurposing water, catching groundwater, sewage, runoff water wherever we can find it. We can cleanse contaminated water. We can use it as does -- the State of	Please refer to response to comment 203-3 regarding the purpose of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Washington has a great program, I'm so impressed.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
203-5	We also need to fix residential leaks and commercial leaks and place it fairly. This could provide up to 40 percent more water. This is conservation and we all need to be mindful of conservation. Our water is disappearing due to global warming, and we can no longer waste it, because it has been taken by global warming and wasteful use.	Please refer to response to comment 203-3 regarding the purpose of the project and response to comment 203-4 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
203-6	Upon reviewing a section of the DEIR, I learned that the Delta and the water is the origin of Native Americans who worship it. The water is sacred, as in the lands. It is where terrestrial aquatic plants, fish, animals, and their habitats are part of the tribal ecosystem. The area provides views and vistas for tribal cultures and ceremony. Even working with tribal leaders, these huge monster digging machines could ruin our archeological digs, and also loss of artifacts; and inadvertently, it could damage their culture irreparably. So I hope that we can take this into consideration.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. As such, the impact analysis in Chapter 32 considers the various individual resources identified by Tribes, including those raised by the comment, and the values these resources contribute to the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, potential impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species would be less than significant with mitigation.
203-7	I don't think the amount of industry that will be produced to get the tunnels that can be -- can be endured by the Delta. And I hope you give us more time to study it, so we can pore over it and get other points of view.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
206-1	Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments today. I'm a retired engineer living on Bethel Island, and I had the opportunity to serve on DCA Stakeholder Engagement Committee, and talk with many of the State's Delta experts.	This information states the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
206-2	My primary comment here today is that I believe this project is too shortsighted as proposed to be asking for the billions of dollars of resources from the people of the State of California. The State's own climate experts indicate that ultimately sea level rise due to climate change will bring salinity levels to the point where the proposed tunnel draws water from the Delta. At that time, the tunnel will be rendered useless and the Delta will already have become a saltwater marsh effecting local farms, communities and wildlife. I believe that will happen in the lifetime of my grandchildren.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project cost, including taxpayer costs.
206-3	The experts [climate change experts] themselves have said to me that in the long-term, the only real solution is to put controllable gates and locks in the two major rivers in the Western Delta to completely mitigate issues related to sea level rise due to climate change.	Please see response to comment 206-2 regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
206-4	In Appendix 3(a) project alternatives are mentioned including a Western Delta salinity barrier. This alternative did not pass the first round of screening to support a full development of alternatives. The problem is that according to Appendix 3(a), the last real work on exploring this alternative was done in 1960. As we all know technology has dramatically changed since 1960. It's not appropriate to eliminate this alternative based upon the last serious work being done on it over 60 years ago.	Please see response to comment 206-3 regarding the range and scope of alternatives considered.
206-5	I have two additional comments regarding the proposed designs and how they relate to the project's stated objective to minimize the potential for public heath and safety impacts as a result of a major earthquake. I believe any new tunnel design should have the capability to provide fresh water into the South Delta during environmental and structural emergencies. Without this capability, I don't see any benefit to the Delta region itself from the proposed project. The statement in section 3A4.2 that the dual conveyance Bethany Reservoir alignment, would provide the same climate resiliency, seismic resiliency and water supply reliability as the central and eastern alignment is simply not true. The Bethany alternative does not have a southern forebay holding water that could be used in emergency situations in the Delta to help control damage due to climate change and seismic activity.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please also refer to Common Response 6 regarding emergency drought operations and protecting the State Water Project from sea level rise and seismic events. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).
206-6	I also believe a design change is needed to support the ability for any new pumps in the South Delta to be used completely interchangeably with the existing pumps at the banks pumping station. I believe it is irresponsible to design a parallel conveyance without this type of complete redundancy. A through Delta conveyance should be supported by any new pumps installed significantly improving operational flexibility, which is the stated objective of this project.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations, integration of the project with the SWP, and discussion of the reasonable range of alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see response to comment 206-3 regarding the range and scope of alternatives considered.
207-1	Hey, how is it going? Daniel Armstrong, resident of the North Delta supporter of the No Tunnel Alternative. The people and ecosystems of California do not need this tunnel project. The Delta Tunnel is a greenwashed infrastructure project that will be the nail in the coffin for threatened anadromous fish species, wildlife and Delta communities.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to fish species, wildlife, and local communities. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Many community issues have been addressed through an evaluation of a wide range of resource impacts, including those in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 26, Public Health; Chapter 14, Land Use; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
207-2	The State of California has a history of being flat out racist, classist and anti-environment. This project will primarily be negatively impacting historically disenfranchised Delta communities and ultimately will degrade the quality of life for humans and nature alike.	Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for a discussion of environmental justice concerns and the potential effects of the project on environmental justice communities. Please also refer to Chapter 29 regarding state and federal policies for consideration of minority and low-income populations. Please see response to comment 207-1 regarding Delta community effects and potential impacts on fish and wildlife. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.
207-3	People in urban spaces, such as Stockton and along the South Delta will experience an increase in the already growing numbers of harmful Alga Blooms and degraded water quality. While those of us in the North Delta will see a reduction of Sacramento River outflow, rising salinity, and the decimation of Delta heritage communities and the pristine connected ecosystems.	The EIR provides impact analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions are not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 207-1 regarding the impact analyses related to fish and wildlife and Delta communities. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts, including Impact WQ-14 regarding potential impacts associated with cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms, and Impact WQ-5 regarding potential impacts associated with electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity). Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
207-4	Communities such as the Towns of Hood, Courtland, Walnut Grove, Clarksburg, Isleton and Rio Vista will all experience the negative impacts on quality of rural existence. People do not have a need or desire for tons of diesel exhaust and endless lines petitions truck traffic, massive tons of tunnel muck nor the destruction of natural spaces along the proposed tunnel pumping station sites.	Please see response to comment 207-2 regarding the Community Benefits Program, and response to comment 207-1 regarding modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding an analysis of the project's potential impacts on air quality, including diesel exhaust. Please refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, for an analysis of the project's impacts on traffic. Please also see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), regarding RTM removal and disposal.
207-5	In regard to how nature will suffer, we already have seen how the powers that be have handled the Sacramento River during this drought year. The Sacramento River Temperature Management Plan and the earlier temporary urgency change petitions all contributed to death of early returning adult Chinook Salmon, who swam into a Sacramento River system only to die of gill rot, bacterial infections, and low dissolved oxygen due to a river that was averaging around, what, 75 to 78 degrees between, like, Knights Landing to Chico recently. These fish were boiling to death and floating down the river until about a week ago. This is a harbinger of things to come if the Delta Tunnel Plan comes to be. This is an insult to these majestic animals and to all the people connected to the rivers and these animals.	Please see response to comment 207-1 regarding impacts on fish and aquatic resources. In addition, please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, specifically the section titled Environmental Impacts, for detailed discussions related to potential temperature impacts.
207-6	By removing an additional 6,000 CFSs through a tunnel, we'll basically be wiping out the flows to the American and the Feather Rivers. Salt intrusion, rising water temps and less outflow will ultimately lead to a massively degraded and	The comment assertions regarding impacts on flow and water quality are not supported by the analyses in the EIR. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the State Water Project (SWP), which the Delta Conveyance

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	decimated California Delta and the river systems and, ultimately, the ecosystems and communities that connect to it, through the Bay and Pacific.	Project would become a part of, must operate to permit requirements, water quality standards, and other regulatory requirements described throughout the EIR as part of baseline conditions. Water deliveries are made based on hydrologic water years, water rights, contracts, and operation permits, water quality standards, and other regulatory requirements as described throughout the EIR (e.g., Chapter 5, Surface Water; Chapter 6, Water Supply). Additionally, Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, describes conditions under which diversions at the north Delta intakes would occur, such as excess conditions. Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, provides additional clarifying examples demonstrating how the project would operate. Please see response to comment 207-2 regarding community issues. Please see response to comment 207-3 regarding impacts on water quality, and response to comment 207-1 regarding fish and aquatic resources and terrestrial biological resources.
207-7	Those who support this project and those who have passively worked on this project basically stand on the wrong side of history. It really is that black and white. Leave the California Delta to be, it is not for us to exploit or profit from. Profit-minded individuals that have already caused nature and the people connected to this area and, ultimately, the State of California enough historical suffering.	The comment assertions regarding impacts on flow and water quality are not supported by the analyses in the EIR. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the State Water Project (SWP), which the Delta Conveyance Project would become a part of, must operate to permit requirements, water quality standards, and other regulatory requirements described throughout the EIR as part of baseline conditions. Water deliveries are made based on hydrologic water years, water rights, contracts, and operation permits, water quality standards, and other regulatory requirements as described throughout the EIR (e.g., Chapter 5, Surface Water; Chapter 6, Water Supply). Additionally, Chapter 5 provides the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please see response to comment 207-2 regarding community issues. Please see response to comment 207-3 regarding impacts on water quality, and response to comment 207-1 regarding fish and aquatic resources and terrestrial biological resources.
211-1	[Speaker]: I'm a mother in Pleasant Hills. I am a stay-at-home mom, and my family spends so much time on the Delta. That water is our peace, it is our home. We have a boat, and we're so lucky to get to go out at least once a week. The water is really clearly having a hard time.	This information describes the background of the commenter and general introductory information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
211-2	I'm not scientist. A lot of people have commented that - about specific angles; but, like, I can say fish need water. And right now the water flows and the water temperatures are not there. We're seeing so many dead fish floating.	The EIR provides analyses of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, for a description of potential changes to surface water resources that could result from the project and alternatives. Additionally, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation.
211-3	The algae is an issue to a point to sometimes it's not physically safe for my children to swim in the water. And that really breaks my heart. It breaks my heart as a mother, it breaks my heart as long-time resident.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on harmful algal blooms, which were determined to be less than significant.
211-4	It breaks my heart that all of the Native tribes up and down the waterways who live in places where these tunnels will be taking water from said they don't want this project. You know, I heard Chief Caleen Sisk speak many times during the Run for Salmon about the rates of flow and what our winter-run salmon need. I think we can listen to her voice. I mean, she knows the science that they've been using since before time. And California is in a space where we really need to begin to	Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, which describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	make decisions together with our original people, so we can begin to solve the climate crisis.	Please also see response to comment 211-2 regarding the analyses related to surface water flows and fish and aquatic resources.
211-5	To me new tunnels are completely against the direction we should be moving in. And I just really hope that we can let the Delta be the largest estuary on the West Coast; that we don't have to watch it slowly become a salt marsh, because the water is the most important thing that we all share. And we've made these decisions as California to support agriculture at a level where money isn't coming back into this State. It's going to specific people's pockets and the water is our commonwealth; that's our greatest riches.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. In addition, as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, a measure of salinity, which was determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
211-6	And we as California residents, we as California voters; we need to find a way to start to make room at decision-making tables to really follow the lead of tribes and understand that the Delta is sacred water. We have created so many issues. So I really hope you can take these ideas to heart, and I hope we can be on the right side of history.	DWR recognizes, and the EIR acknowledges, the Delta's importance to Tribes. The Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape describes the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. The impact analysis in Chapter 32 considers various resources identified by Tribes, including rivers and waterways within the Delta that are sacred, and the values these resources contribute to the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please also see response to comment 211-4 regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
212-1	Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I have major concerns about the Delta Tunnel project. I'll start with the fact that I've learned that due to the massive construction and digging of the soil, there's a good chance that communities may experience a disease called Valley fever, which has similar symptoms to COVID, but it's more deadly. People are going to be getting sick and thinking it's COVID, when it's a disease that's a lot deadlier. I worry that this will potentially cause another pandemic.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-7. As shown in Chapter 23, the EIR concludes that Impact AQ-7 would be less than significant.
212-2	Also I'm terrified of the fact that due to climate change, scientists predict that there will no longer be snow in the 2040s in the Sierra Nevadas, and that there will just be rain. I'm also terrified that there might even be less rain. If we have less rain and less snow, how can we guarantee that we're going to be able to spend tens of billions of dollars and have enough money to bring from the North to Southern California?	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project cost.
212-3	Also during the time of inflation, we cannot afford to ram through projects that are going to raise people's water rates. We need to invest in projects that are more local and more sustainable. Yes, capturing water is very important, but there are better ways to do that. We must encourage more people to capture water in their homes in rain barrels or in big trash cans. We must update infrastructure so that buildings can capture rain water, and use it on their land for irrigation. This will put less pressure on the water system as well as capturing rain water will help to put less stress on the sewer system because less water will be flowing into our storm drains and into our sewer system.	Please see response to comment 212-2 regarding the costs and purpose of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
212-4	I'm also terrified that this tunnel will push a lot more species to extinction. I'm very sad to hear that the Chinook Salmon have died off about over 90 percent, and that there are numerous other species that are at threat of extinction.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on fish and aquatic resources as a result of construction and operation of the project, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
212-5	And I am terrified that this [tunnel] is going to effect tribal communities and communities of color the most.	Please refer to Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for the analysis of potentially significant impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
212-6	We need to save this estuary. We need to use our intelligence as humans to try not to dominate so much of the world's resources and so much of Mother Nature. And we need to let some places rest and leave them undeveloped so the water cycle can continue like Mother Nature meant for it to be.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
212-7	And I encourage that you take into consideration the science and the major concerns that environmentalists have, and find a different alternative that is more sustainable, more reliable, instead of the Delta Tunnel, because it would be awful if tens of billions of dollars went to waste on this project.	Please see response to comment 212-2 regarding project costs and response to comment 212-3 regarding the range and scope of alternatives considered.
216-1	Hi. My name is [commenter]. I am a fifth-generation Hood resident. I was also on the Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee. The Town of Hood is adamantly No Tunnel.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments requesting non-tunnel alternatives. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
216-2	I would like to address Section 19 where you talk about historical communities and you failed to mention us [Town of Hood]. Ever since it was the Bay Delta Plan, you didn't even -- DWR didn't have us on the map. You intend fully for us not to	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction on the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	exist, for the Town of Hood to be completely wiped away. You are talking about a town that is mostly indigenous, Latino, elderly and low income. You are talking about a town that started in 1860 and you're going to say it's not historical? This is a town that was in resurgence in the late '40s. It was built by World War II veterans and their spouses. This is a town full of generations of people, from families that have lived there, from their grandparents, their great grandparents, kids, grandkids, great grandkids.	result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane. As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
216-3	You have failed continuously to heed our [People of Hood] input. You have intakes on either side of us. You have no studies about what the impact of the construction will do to the town. You intend to build this road through the back of the town and take out houses, when we've addressed concerns about flooding where the intakes are and how that is going to flow back into the town. It wasn't addressed because according to your person who didn't -- your engineer who didn't know that it flooded there and that that's not a possibility. And you have routinely ignored us because we're poor and we're brown and we're elderly, and that's not fair. There's complete disregard for the Delta as a being and is, in and of itself, an ecosystem.	Please refer to response to comment 216-2 regarding the overall EIR analysis and the proposed widening of an existing bridge and roadway. As described in Chapter 7, Flood Protection, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. In addition, many community issues have been addressed through an evaluation of a wide range of resource impacts, including those in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 26, Public Health; Chapter 14, Land Use; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b) regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
216-4	It is a community. It's full of business and the other towns are similar, and you continue to disregard that. This is a temporary solution and it might not actually even be a solution. And you're going to wipe out the entire Delta, and a chain reaction is going to flow up and down the Sacramento all the way up to Northern California and down into the San Joaquin, and wherever the rivers that come off of that go to, and there's a disregard for the environmental impact.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 216-3 regarding community issues, the impact analyses in the EIR, and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32 and areas upstream of the project.
216-5	My grandma said it best, and it breaks my heart when she said, "I will not be alive when the construction is over, but I'll have to live through knowing that everything I've ever known is destroyed." So I would like you to think about that, and to think about the Town of Hood, and to think about the other towns and all of the other indigenous populations up and down the State who have asked you not to build this project when you continue to force meetings down our throats in secret, and	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see response to comment 216-3 regarding community issues, the impact analyses in the EIR, design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects, and the Community Benefits Program.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	when you've completely disregarded the community benefits or the community meetings or the stakeholder engagement comments that have been provided to you.	
217-1	Yeah, my name is [commenter]. I'm a voter in Alameda County. I don't claim to be an expert on this subject, but from the little that I have seen from the environmentalists that I trust, you know, this just seems to be to be another chapter in California's exploitative and shortsighted relationship with water. You know, we never had the water to do the things that we have done, ultimately. And to, you know, experience the kind of growth that we have.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
217-2	And I also want to address, the framing that you, of course, people will depend on these sources of water and their reliability. But, you know, that's always going to be the case, you may be able to put a band-aid on the present, but that's at the expense of killing the future, in my opinion. It strikes my very much, like, you know, trying to build another lane on a congested highway. It seems like it's going to work and then more traffic comes. In this situation, we can always divert more water, but there has never been an end to that, you know? We just continue to divert more and more water and to destroy more and more of our natural resources. And, yeah, we may be able to sustain ourselves for a bit longer, but in the future, I mean, it's going to come ack to bite us. And I think that's really sad that we'll sell ourselves out that way. So that's all for me. I am, obviously, opposed to the tunnel.	Please see response to comment 217-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for a description of potential changes to surface water resources and water supply that could result from the project and alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
218-1	Okay. My name is [commenter]. I'm a ranger and farmer in Rio Vista on the banks of the Sacramento River. We currently are experiencing salinity problems with the river as are many, and I'm sure those issues are being addressed by others. I would like to provide some data and information about some of the earlier comments. I am a former academic and also a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.	This information states the name and the background of the commenter and provides general introductory information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
218-2	And I published a work with Al Sokolow at UC Davis back in the 1990s called California Farmland and Urban Pressures. And one of the issues that is crucial is population growth, and I would like to put some numbers to that. At the time, in the piece that I wrote [California Farmland and Urban Pressures], we predicted or projected -- not predicted -- we projected that by the end of this century, there would be roughly 100 million people in California, there would be more --there would be more urban land than there is farmland at the current growth rate. Those rates have slowed down a little bit. We are now at about 1 percent, which means that our population will double in about 70 years. That means by the end of the century, we'll be close to 80 million.	This information states the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
218-3	This project [State Water Project and Federal Water Project] was established when there were roughly half the people in the State than there are now, that is now the State Water Project and the Federal project are far beyond their capacity, it is a failing infrastructure, and it was a mistake in terms of its origins and its consequences.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives.
218-4	The original notion of taking water from Northern California and exporting to Southern California was articulated in the 1870s by a fellow named B.S. Alexander, who is the first commander of the Corps of Engineers, and at the direction of Ulysses S. Grant, he conducted a study and came to the	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	conclusion that the way to develop California was to take water from the north to the south. It is a 19th-Century concept at a time when the ideas of manifest destiny of unrestrained growth, and a total irresponsibility about the environment were occurring. It is not appropriate for the 21st Century.	
218-5	It [sending water from northern California to southern California] is a mistake to be abandoned, and we should look to our future with no more export South.	Please refer to response to comment 218-3 regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
220-1	Thank you. I'm a Delta resident, and my concerns have been expressed by a lot of other people. I also would be for a No Tunnel Alternative. I think the current project is extremely shortsighted. It assumes that the supply of water from the mountains and the Sacramento source is unlimited. I think that's unrealistic. I believe demand is going to grow, and that we'd be better off investing our money in more sustainable solutions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
220-2	But my biggest concern is the destruction of the ecosystem of the estuary that is the Delta area. I don't think we probably have any idea just how important this is to the larger ecosystem. I know it's a major migratory path for birds and the fish, and I'm concerned about the salinity that's been expressed and how that could destroy the area, not to mention what the construction might do to it.	The analysis contained in the EIR does not support the assertion in the comment regarding impacts on wildlife, plant species, aquatic species, and water quality. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which was determined to be less than significant.
220-3	To me this area [the estuary that is in the Delta area] is so precious that it really should be some kind of a national heritage site. And to me, destroying it this way would be like trying to blow up El Capitan for gravel or cut down the giant Redwoods to build homes. And I just think that it is not consistent with the direction that we, as a human population, want to go.	See the response to comment 220-1 regarding the purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project. The comment assertions regarding project impacts on the Delta are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see the response to comment 220-2 regarding the analyses on fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, and salinity.
221-1	[Commenter]: Hello. Can you hear me okay? [Moderator]: Yes, we can. Thank you. [Commenter]: Okay. Thank you. My name is [commenter], and I live in Hood. And it's a pretty wonderful place to live at the moment.	This information states the name and the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
221-2	We are pretty concerned, if this actually happens and we're [residents of Hood] surrounded by, you know, heavy construction for 10 or 20 years, that doesn't sound very good.	Community issues, including but not limited to construction noise, air quality, and traffic circulation effects have been addressed in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 26, Public Health; Chapter 14, Land Use; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
221-3	But I just wanted to read something that is important to me about living in this area and living next to the Delta and the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. So I'm just reading a little bit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and it's about fully protected animals. And it says: "The classification of 'fully protected' was the State's initial effort in the 1960s to 1 identify and provide additional protection for those animals that were rare or face possible extinction. Lists were created for fish and amphibians, reptiles birds and mammals. Please note that the most fully protected species have also been listed as threatened or endangered species under the more recent California Endangered Species Act." And I've found that there are few fully protected species in the Sacramento, San Joaquin Delta and one of the most famous, of course, are the Sandhill Cranes. And I was reading in the Draft -- Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR and it's figure 13(g)1(a) and it says: "Greater and lesser Sandhill Crane sound level impacts: Medium-term, pile driving and heavy construction." And this is shown throughout the foraging habitat for the Sandhill Cranes that this activity medium-term, pile driving and heavy construction will be happening if the project goes through. Which I'm against the project because I think it would just cause too much damage.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed (including Impact BIO-33, related to potential impacts on greater and lesser sandhill crane) would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation. Please also see Appendix 13G, Construction Sound Level Impacts on Sandhill Cranes, regarding the conservative analysis of the potential effects on greater and lesser sandhill cranes within modeled foraging and permanent and temporary roosting habitat. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.
221-4	We just don't have enough water. And besides that already -- because the waters in the area are filling up with toxic algae and fish are dying off, and it's kind of a mess.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding water quality impact analysis. Additionally, an analysis of potential impacts on fish and aquatic species is provided in Chapter 12, Fish

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and Aquatic Resources, which were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
221-5	Then it [the draft EIR] also says: "In the Draft, it is assumed that noise from the construction of water conveyance facilities could temporarily displace Sandhill Crane use of habitat in the vicinity of project activities."	The analysis in the EIR concludes that the Compensatory Mitigation Plan, together with other mitigation measures and environmental commitments to avoid and minimize effects on biological resources, would reduce impacts for all alternatives to less-than-significant levels. Please see the response to comment 221-3 regarding impacts on wildlife and sandhill cranes in particular.
221-6	And then I just wanted to say that from the older project the Two Tunnel, which I think is still true, the regional EPA Administrator, Jared Blumenfeld, he was the administrator - It [the older project] just said it would contribute to increased and persistent violations of water quality standards in the Delta.	As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
221-7	[Moderator]: You're at three minutes. If I could ask you to wrap up. [Commenter]: Oh, okay. Thank you. [Moderator]: Thank you for your comment.	This information provides general closing information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
222-1	Fine. Thank you. My name is [commenter name]. I'm a Southern California resident.	This information states the name and the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
222-2	I do have a comment on the EIR. Going through the EIR, the seismic summary goes into great detail concerning all the studies and assessments that have been reviewed and created in the probability of this or that seismic activity affecting the project.	As discussed in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, the project would not change the underlying geologic conditions or seismic hazards and would be required to be designed to meet geotechnical design standards. Impacts analyzed in Chapter 10, including Impact GEO-3, are less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	A concern to me is the acknowledgement of the potential for soil liquification of the levees that make up much of the containment for the Delta waters. I've not found any significant discussion of what can be or will be proposed to mitigate this condition that California is known for, earthquakes, of course, and the report site studies that forecast a major event somewhere in the State in the future over the next 30 or 50 years. We don't know what that major event might consist of or where it would be.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the performance of the project objectives, including protection of the SWP from seismic events.
222-3	But what if, after all this work and expense, a major quake causes great damage to the major canal or causes a rupture in several levees? The Delta is essentially below sea level, and the sea levels are rising, 10, 20 years they may be 8 inches, 10 inches higher than they are right now. But any significant levee failure would cause a tremendous rush of saltwater into the Delta. And this would degrade all the fresh water in the Delta and render it unusable for municipal or agricultural use. This is the prime selling point for this tunnel project that they're going to bring some of this great Northern California water down to the South Delta, and then ship it in the canal down to Southern California. But if the Delta fills up with saltwater, everything is gone out the window.	As developed in the EIR, the Department of Water Resources identified potential alternatives that address consequences of anticipated sea level rise and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events and that minimize health and safety risks to the public from earthquake-caused reductions in water delivery quality and quantity from the SWP. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change and seismicity were incorporated into the EIR's analysis. For the analysis on potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures for environmental resources mentioned in the comment, please see Chapter 7, Flood Protection; Chapter 9, Water Quality; and Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity. Please also see Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how observed trends and projected future conditions show the need for the project and how climate change could influence the ability of the project to fulfill its intended purpose. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change, including sea level rise.
222-4	Another thought, we spend all this money and time and effort to create this tunnel, which I believe has a dubious future, and are we going to have the time, the money, the effort to really	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project, which is to restore and protect the reliability of State Water Project water deliveries, consistent with the State's Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	go after things that we can do right now, meaning recovery of existing water sources in Southern California?	Resilience Portfolio, in a cost-effective manner. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative, which includes ongoing and possible future actions related to water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range and scope of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
222-5	And that's kind of a very big concern to me that we get distracted with this big project that I'm sure construction companies are really looking forward to it. Lots of money will be made by a lot of people. People will have jobs for 10 years or so, but in the long run, what are we going to end up with?	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding the socioeconomic conditions in the study area and analysis of the changes that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and implementation of mitigation measures associated with other resources.
222-6	And I think a better source of spending our dollars and our time and our effort would be to look locally, develop sources for storing water, recovering water and try to reduce our current needs or what would be perceived as our needs. And I'm as guilty as anybody else in Southern California. I mean, I	Please see the response to comment 222-4 regarding feasible alternatives and the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process, the range and scope of alternatives

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	have a swimming pool; I don't have a lawn, but I use a lot of water, probably more than I should.	considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
222-7	Thank you. That's the end of my comment.	This comment provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
223-1	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: 1. During this prolonged drought, Southern California and specifically the Central Valley south of Fresno and the Los Angeles region are not being required to stop watering lawns and outside plants. Though there is a tiered water rate for the Los Angeles region (which was just started in January this year), customers using the same amount of water as 2021 will not see a rate increase. Water usage needs to be reduced even more. California is in the most severe and prolonged drought in recorded history which requires more concerted efforts at water conservation.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
223-2	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: Farmers are still growing water intensive almond trees.	Please see response to comment 223-1 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives as well as alternatives suggesting demand management.
223-3	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: Before Delta water is shipped south, more water restrictions need to be put in place especially in the Los Angeles southern region.	Please see response to comment 223-1 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports, the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives, and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
223-4	During the 2007 drought I had a family of two adults and three children. I was allocated 50 gallons per DAY for the ENTIRE FAMILY, not per person.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
223-5	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: 2. Though this project proposes to only divert water south when rains create "excess" water, there will be "emergencies" outside that time frame when water will be diverted south. This project is like the peripheral canal project of the 1970's. An impact study was done at the time to determine the effects on the Bay and Delta regions. The results were very negative for the Bay and Delta.	Please see the response to comment 223-1 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Please also see Common Response 3 regarding dry conditions and Temporary Urgency Change Petitions. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
223-6	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: With rising sea levels, the effects of shipping fresh water south will have an even greater impact on the salinity of the Delta. The rains help flush the Delta of harmful chemicals and blue algae. The area is the most fertile and productive farmland in California which will be negatively affected by having less water.	The comment assertions are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). According to Chapter 9, Water Quality, and supporting appendices, potential effects on salinity (measured by electrical conductivity) and algal blooms would have less-than-significant impacts for all project alternatives; see in particular Impacts WQ-5 and WQ-14. As described in Chapter 30, Climate Change, project alternatives would increase resiliency in managing combined effects of sea level rise and changes in upstream hydrology. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits. The long-term average annual total CVP deliveries for all of the project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		alternatives are expected to remain essentially the same. Please also refer to Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding potential changes to SWP and CVP water supply that could result from the Delta Conveyance Project. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis and proposed mitigation measures related to agriculture in the Delta.
223-7	I am not in favor of this project for the following reasons: 3. Once a system is in place and used, it continues to be used irregardless of changes that would make the system obsolete {i.e. rainier seasons}. Increased water availability will mean demand will increase. The increased demand will be next to impossible to reduce.	Please see the response to comment 223-1 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports, the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives, and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
226-1	I'm writing you in regard to the proposal Delta tunnel project. I strongly believe your project should not go forward because it does not take into consideration tribal voices and causes disturbances of cultural resources. Many CA Tribes' cultures, diets, and traditions depend on the survival of the salmon. Tribes should not have to defend their resources from desecration from state projects. You cannot take away a cultural way of life.	Please refer to Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible. DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape. Chapter 32, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
227-1	I beg that you decide to not follow through with the Delta Tunnel and Sites Reservoir as it will only worsen California's water issues. By diverting that much water from the river which is already facing very serious ecosystem health problems, you're going to kill any hope left for restoring fish and wildlife populations, and further worsen the drought. We're already seeing massive algae blooms, large fish kills, wildlife disappearing, and therefore decrease in water quality. We're seeing these affects on too many rivers now and we need to start taking actions to help restore the rivers, not drain them of everything they have left. Following through with this plan will have effects on all of Northern California, as most of the water that falls in the northern part of the state all collects into the delta. As well, this water will just be sent south, expending much more energy than we already use to get water down there and at the cost of ruining this incredible ecosystem full of natural resources.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding potential changes in Sacramento River Basin flows that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an analysis of potential water quality impacts associated with construction, operations, and maintenance of the project, including those related to harmful algal blooms, which were determined to be less than significant. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the water quality impact analysis. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.
227-2	On top of this you're planning to build yet another reservoir that will just damage a resource that has already been altered so much and worsen the drought even more. There are enough dams and reservoirs in California already.	The comment assertion that the project would include a new reservoir is not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. New reservoirs proposed by other agencies are considered in the cumulative effects analysis in relevant resource chapters. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
227-3	If you really want to try and fix the drought and all of the huge water issues this state faces, maybe try a new solution that doesn't just contribute more to the problem at hand in the end. We spend so much of our energy on water management, if y'all actually put more money, time, and action into creating new sustainable solutions for harvesting and using water, and the energy we gain from it; you could fight the root cause of the drought by reducing energy use, restore these amazing rivers and sacred places, and try to actually secure a sustainable future for everyone that calls this planet home.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered in the EIR.
227-4	Please don't continue to worsen these problem more, as it's very close to a tipping point of no return, and these plans would tip it right over.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
228-1	I am reaching out regarding the Delta Tunnel. I do not think following through with the Delta Tunnel is an environmentally sound decision.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
228-2	Many CA Tribes' culture, diets and traditions depend on the survival of the salmon. Tribes should not have to defend their resources from desecration from state projects. This project is	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	not taking the Tribes input on the project but also not looking at the damage this would cause to their cultures. The tribes point of view should be considered in a project that would affect them this greatly.	and proposed mitigation measures for Tribal cultural resources. As described in Chapter 32, based on extensive consultation with Tribes, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR included salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta TCL and has considered the impacts of the project on the Delta TCL, including its character-defining features. Chapter 32, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources and regarding the consideration of Tribal perspectives in DWR's decision on whether to approve the project. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
228-3	Compared to the NO Action alternative, all other alternatives result in far worse ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife. The delta tunnel project should not go any further and stop in its tracks.	Please refer to response to comment 228-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and response to comment 228-2 regarding the impact analysis for fish and aquatic resources. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, for a description of the effects of implementing the No Project Alternative.
229-1	The delta project cannot go forward as proposed.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
229-2	It [The DCP] has not taken into account tribal voices that depend on salmon for their existence. You cannot sacrifice one group of people for the economic benefit of others. Yes, southern California has water issues, but native tribes should not have to sacrifice their lives to solve issues that the south has had for decades.	Please refer to Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for Tribal cultural resources. DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape. Chapter 32, in the section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
230-1	I vehemently oppose the proposed tunnels. The project won't make any more water. Also, in drought years there won't be enough water.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1 regarding the purpose of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits.
230-2	Already, I couldn't jet ski throughout the whole delta because the sloughs have become very low and clogged with weeds. I can't imagine how bad it will become if even more water is sucked out. There are many aspects to the Delta but recreation will be ruined.	As described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would be less than -significant, and none of the facilities when combined with future plans and actions would result in fewer recreation opportunities or conflict with plans to improve recreation conditions and management in the Delta. See also Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding an evaluation of recreational opportunities and construction effects on recreational opportunities.
230-3	Please find other alternatives to ruining the largest freshwater estuary on the west coast of the Americas.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range and scope of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding operational criteria, real-time operational decision making, and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an analysis of potential water quality impacts associated with construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, which were determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.
232-1	Dear Delta Conveyance, I am writing to you in regard to your new proposed Delta Tunnel Project. Information within the Delta Tunnel project proposal indicates that implementation of such project would cause harm to the Delta Bay and its	The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32, including the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 19,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	surrounding tributaries while severely disturbing cultural resources, including historic tribal villages and mounds from before European contact, which cannot be adequately mitigated.	Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible.
232-2	Proceeding with the Delta Tunnel project would decimate existing riparian zones and vital ecosystems within the West Coast's largest estuary. Toxic algae blooms will skyrocket, salmon runs will fluctuate, subsistence salmon tribes will starve, and once again Southern California will bleed Northern California watersheds dry. Please reconsider this project as it would degrade local ecosystems and violate local communities.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to ecosystems, water quality, and local communities. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding operational criteria, real-time operational decision making, and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife, including salmon, would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts; see Impact WQ-14 regarding the analysis of impacts for harmful algal blooms. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
232-3	Contact the tribes, for their position on this project holds innate importance.	Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding DWR's consultation and engagement with Tribes on the project, and the analysis of potential impacts on Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
233-1	This is about the proposed Delta Tunnel project. All EIR alternatives will disturb the cultural resources, including historic Tribal villages and mounds predating European contact, in such a way cannot be adequately mitigated. Compared to the No Action alternative, all other alternatives result in far worse ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife. The tribes who depend upon these native fish and wildlife should not have to defend these keystone resources from decimation by state projects. This is especially pertinent considering there is no scientific evidence to prove the claim that habitat restoration can mitigate adverse impacts caused by reduced flows and the DEIR fails to consider any alternatives that reduce diversions from the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures related to fish and wildlife. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science in the preparation of the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
234-1	I'm writing to you in regards of the proposed Delta tunnel project.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
234-2	The Delta tunnel project will create irreparable damage to not only the environment and land, but will also create damage to and for people and cultures. All EIR alternatives result in the disturbance of cultural resources, including historic Tribal	Please refer to Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	villages and mounds from before European contact, which cannot be adequately mitigated. Many CA Tribes' culture, diets and traditions depend on survival of the salmon. Tribes should not have to defend their resources from desecration from state projects. Indigenous peoples shouldn't have to continue to face harm to their culture and their lives from projects that they have no say in.	and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible. Based on extensive consultation with Tribes, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR included salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta TCL and has considered the impacts of the project on the Delta TCL, including its character-defining features. Chapter 32, in the section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to the specific impact discussions for detailed analysis and citations to support the conclusion that potentially significant impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
234-3	Furthermore, the Delta tunnel would have negative impacts on the wildlife. All DEIR alternatives result in increased water exports. Less water in the Delta means less water for salmon and other endangered species. Fish need water clearly and there is no scientific evidence to prove the claim that habitat restoration can mitigate adverse impacts caused by reduced flows.	See the response to comment 234-2 regarding impacts on fish and aquatic species. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		deliveries during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions.
235-1	I am a Delta resident and am totally opposed to this water project for many reasons. There will not be enough fresh water to enable farmers to water their crops.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including agriculture in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, and water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. Chapter 15 evaluates the ability of project operations to protect agricultural beneficial uses based on adherence to State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641) water quality standard. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, including D-1641. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding Sacramento River flows which are expected to remain similar to long-term averages with the project. Please also see Chapter 8, Groundwater, regarding potential impacts on groundwater resources in the Delta.
235-2	I am a Delta resident and am totally opposed to this water project for many reasons. It will harm the eco system.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertion regarding the project harming the ecosystem is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.
236-1	I am deeply concerned with the proposed plans of building the delta tunnel. Building a tunnel like the one proposed will have detrimental effects to plants, animals, and ecosystems, as well as to the people who live in and around the delta.	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to the ecosystem and local communities. The table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Executive Summary lists CEQA impact determinations on all resources evaluated. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures.
236-2	There are many indigenous tribes of California who depend on the survival of the salmon. Salmon whose survival depends on the health of multiple watersheds that surround and flow into the Delta. The toxic algae blooms and fish kills are already bad enough as it is.	Please refer to response to comment 236-1 regarding the analysis of fish and aquatic resources. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, potential impacts related to harmful algal blooms were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, as described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape.
236-3	This issue [The proposed construction of the DCP] hits close to home for me as someone born and raised in the east bay area. I grew up spending time on the delta with friends and still do. The place holds a lot of good memories for me. Let people,	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	plants, and animals continue to enjoy the delta as it is and as it has been. Please re-consider these plans and do not move forward with the tunnel until all stakeholders are considered.	
237-1	Dear Delta Conveyance, I am reaching out regarding the proposed Delta Tunnel Project. Many California tribes' cultures, diets, traditions, and way of life depend on the survival of the salmon. Tribes should not have to defend their resources from desecration from state projects. The Delta Project should not go forward.	Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, identifies Tribal cultural resources and evaluates potential impacts that could result from construction, operations, and maintenance of the project and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts where feasible. Based on extensive consultation with Tribes, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR included salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta TCL and has considered the impacts of the project on the Delta TCL, including its character-defining features. Chapter 32, in the section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
238-1	This project must be stopped! We can't afford to destroy our California Delta area by siphoning off fresh water only to let more salt water creep upstream. It will destroy this whole area in ways we can't imagine and will also destroy the wildlife.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, and supporting appendices, potential effects on salinity (measured by electrical conductivity) are less than significant for all project alternatives. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
238-2	If this project must be built, build it closer to the Antioch bridge and let the cities down south worry about removing the salt. We have a whole ocean next to us and it's time to invest in desalination plants along the coast instead of a tunnel. The salt that is removed can be given away FREE to states back east that need it to de-ice the roadways in the winter. All they need to do is get it out of here, a Win-Win for everyone,	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the range, scope, and development of the alternatives considered. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative, which includes ongoing and possible future actions related to water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges.
245-1	Good afternoon. I just wanted to say thank for extending that [DEIR comment period] because that is a lot of reading.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.
245-2	And then I also wanted to acknowledge that I do support and agree with everything everybody has already stated on the record. And it's really important to Maidu people that salmon is recognized as a Tribal cultural resources. That's all I have.	Based on extensive consultation with Tribes, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR included salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape and has considered the impacts of the project on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, including its character-

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		defining features. Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding DWR's consultation and engagement with Tribes on the project, the definition of Tribal cultural resources, and those resources identified as Tribal cultural resources. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, including those identified in the table titled Tribal Views on Delta TCL Character-Defining Features. For example, terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species and their habitats, including that of salmon, are identified as part of both the Delta's ecosystem and character-defining features that represent heritage and cultural significance to Tribes pertaining to sustenance, traditional knowledge, ceremony, spiritual practices, and stewardship. As such, the impact analysis in Chapter 32 considers the various resources identified by Tribes, including salmon, and the values these resources contribute to the Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please see Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding DWR's consideration of individual Tribal cultural resources, as well as the documentation in the record regarding DWR's evaluation of Tribal cultural resources.
248-1	In my opinion: The "Reusable Tunnel Material" is not reusable in the delicate balance of the ecology of the California Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, regarding information related to RTM, including its limited use, its testing for hazardous materials, an impact analysis, and mitigation measures to reduce those impacts. Testing completed thus far indicates the tunnel material will be suitable for reuse. All potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
248-2	DDT was banned a long time ago. Apparently, the stuff has settled in the mud as evidenced by the 2017 test borings reported in you draft EIR. In addition to the brown pelicans of the Bay and seashore, our exotic white pelicans work the territories of the Delta all year long. Migrating species are protected from this banned material. These are but 'bell	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potentially significant impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	weather' species. Other birds, fish, and people would be exposed to this pesticide in levels many times beyond published levels of acceptability. The delicate balance of Delta wildlife is already threatened to the limits of existence by the 'overdraft' of freshwater extraction. It is neither reasonable nor acceptable to dig up and disturb the pesticides that have settled in the mud over decades. Note example: The selenium which rested safely in Westlands soil before fanning became deadly when disturbed.	Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Impact AQUA-1 in Chapter 12 addresses the concern regarding contaminants for fish and aquatic resources at intake construction sites, noting that the effects would be limited. Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 26, Public Health, also discuss the presence of legacy pesticides such as DDT in the study area. The concern regarding disturbance of hazardous materials is addressed in Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, under Impact HAZ-2, which evaluates the potential for hazardous to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involved the release of the hazardous materials into the environment. The evaluation concludes that potential impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2.
248-3	The EIR is incomplete on the critical matter of additive chemicals for the project. The handling of the RTM cannot be evaluated chemically and statistically for safety until and unless the 'additive' material can be identified and evaluated as a toxic hazard. Absent the critical information about the safety of the so-called RTM, this study does not justify further investment in the project until reasonable proof exists that the excavated material can be safely excavated, transported, and manipulated for construction and other distribution. Respectfully, I cannot conscionably ignore the failure of this memorandum to demonstrate a reasonable level of safety to the Delta's people and wildlife.	Please see response to comment 248-2 regarding the evaluation of potential hazardous materials disturbance and remediation of hazardous sites. As discussed in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), RTM will be removed from the tunnel would be placed in basins with impermeable linings where the RTM would be tested for hazardous materials and initially dried prior to storage or reuse. The water drained from the RTM would be collected and treated prior to reuse. If the RTM is determined to include hazardous or toxic constituents, the material will be hauled to licensed offsite disposal. A discussion regarding RTM safety is provided in Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire. As described in Chapter 25, the construction contractor would be required to verify, by certification of the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		supplier, that the additives used for soil conditioning during tunneling operations were inert, biodegradable, and nontoxic to prevent contamination of the surrounding ground and the RTM. An assessment of potential effects associated with the transport and use of RTM is provided in Chapter 25, Impact HAZ-1, which found that the impact would be less than significant. Impact HAZ-2 analyzed whether the handling and storage of RTM would expose workers to potential human health hazards and found that with Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
248-4	About Jack Hanna's expert qualifications: I am experienced in the excavation and compaction of soil in my career and experienced in geotechnical engineering in my community work. Member East Contra Costa County Planning Commission (sunsetted). I have been an active citizen planner in Contra Costa County since 1981. Licensed contractor (retired) with specialty in grading and paving. Hanna Pavestone installed over one million square feet of precast concrete paving.	This comment describes the background of the individual commenter and does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
249-1	We wish to register the following comments [see comments 2-7] relative to the Delta Conveyance Draft Environmental Impact Report.	This is an introductory statement and does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
249-2	Tunnel alignments should be placed on public property, not private property, wherever possible. We note that the proposed tunnel alignment for the area just north of the Mokelumne River, as depicted in the Mapbooks, Sheet 6 for the Bethany Alternative, places the proposed tunnel on property currently owned by the State of California. We strongly urge that the planned alignment in this area continue to utilize public properties by placing it on Sacramento County APN # 148-0120-016 or 148-0120-015 or 148-0120–020 or any other publicly owned properties in the area	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the tunnel alignment between the tunnel shafts would be located over 100 feet below the existing ground surface and ground surface land uses would not be disturbed during construction or operations. Siting studies for the tunnel shafts considered a wide range of criteria for analyzing potential tunnel shaft locations, including access suitability, geologic conditions, number of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		landowners and types of existing and identified future land uses, farmland designations, and habitat uses. Where possible, DWR has identified public property to be used for certain project features and mitigation measures, such as the Compensatory Mitigation Plan sites.
249-3	The Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex should be located west of I-5, not east of I-5. During the deliberations of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee, it appeared that staff chose to move the proposed location of the Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex from west of I-5 to east of I-5 for two major reasons: a) the desire to locate the complex close to the railroad tracks so as to facilitate delivery of materials by rail; b) the belief that the Launch Complex would somehow interfere with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. These rationales for moving the proposed Twin Cities Complex site to an area east of I-5 are not wise because: Under the preferred Alternative #5, the Bethany Alternative, the Twin Cities Launch Complex would not utilize rail delivery for materials. Chapter 3, page 117 of the Draft EIR states, "Tunnel segments, TBM machinery, other soil materials, and equipment would be delivered to the Twin Cities Complex by road; there would be no rail-served materials depot at the Twin Cities Complex under Alternative 5." The extra costs of bending the tunnel path much farther to the east as currently proposed, and the additional complexity of tunneling under a major interstate freeway, are unnecessary and wasteful. With no need for rail connectivity under the preferred alternative, the Twin Cities Launch Complex could more advantageously be located west of I-5.	Please refer to the Shaft Siting Study technical memorandum (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022) regarding the launch site selection process and consideration of alternative locations for the Twin Cities Complex. While other locations were considered in the siting study, they were not considered in the EIR because the shaft siting study concluded that the Twin Cities location best met all siting criteria, such as engineering considerations, described in the study. The rail connection to the Twin Cities Complex was primarily included in Alternatives 1 through 4 to transport reusable tunnel material to the Southern Complex to construct the Southern Forebay embankments. Alternative 5 would not include a forebay and did not require subsequent use of the reusable tunnel material. Therefore, the rail connection was not included in the Twin Cities Complex for Alternative 5. Placement of the Twin Cities Complex for Alternative 5 would also reduce conflicts with Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding the identification of alternatives under CEQA and EIR alternatives screening criteria.
249-4	The Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex should be located west of I-5, not east of I-5. During the deliberations of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee, it appeared that staff chose to move the proposed location of the Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex from west of I-5 to east of I-5 for two major	Please see response to comment 249-3 regarding site selection. As described in Chapter 14, Land Use, post-construction uses of large construction sites, including the Twin Cities Complex, would be considered by DWR for other land uses including habitat and agricultural uses.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	reasons: a) the desire to locate the complex close to the railroad tracks so as to facilitate delivery of materials by rail; b) the belief that the Launch Complex would somehow interfere with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. These rationales for moving the proposed Twin Cities Complex site to an area east of I-5 are not wise because: The perception that the Twin Cities Launch Complex site west of I-5 would conflict with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge is not valid. Currently, the proponents of the Wildlife Refuge hope to acquire lands from willing sellers whenever possible funding becomes available. This has proceeded very slowly in the area west of I-5 and north of Twin Cities Road. However, public funds could be used to acquire acreage in this area west of I-5, for a Launch Complex site for the Delta Tunnel. Once construction is completed at the Launch Complex site, it could be transferred to appropriate parties for inclusion in the Wildlife Refuge. In this way, locating the Launch Complex west of I-5 could actually facilitate the growth of the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge in the area west of I-5 in the long term, in a location where willing sellers have been slow to come forward.	
249-5	The Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex should be located west of I-5, not east of I-5. During the deliberations of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee, it appeared that staff chose to move the proposed location of the Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex from west of I-5 to east of I-5 for two major reasons: a) the desire to locate the complex close to the railroad tracks so as to facilitate delivery of materials by rail; b) the belief that the Launch Complex would somehow interfere with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. These rationales for moving the proposed Twin Cities Complex site to an area east of I-5 are not wise	Please see response to comment 249-3 regarding site selection. As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, provisions would be implemented during construction to minimize or avoid disturbance of the Swainson's hawk and other species, including minimizing noise, dust, and light on adjacent land uses.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	because: The proposed site for the Twin Cities Launch Complex is sandwiched between two existing Swainson's Hawk easement properties. One easement is held on land directly south of the proposed site and another easement is on land directly north of the proposed site. It makes no sense to place this Launch Complex where the noise, dust, artificial light, and increased traffic flow will disturb the foraging Swainson's Hawks. It is counterproductive and nonsensical to have set aside these lands using publicly funded easements, but to now propose disrupting the peace that the birds need to take advantage of the space acquired for their benefit. This proposed Launch Complex location would be contrary to good environmental practices. A site location that is west of I-5 would be far less disruptive to the protection of these threatened birds.	
249-6	The Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex should be located west of I-5, not east of I-5. During the deliberations of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee, it appeared that staff chose to move the proposed location of the Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex from west of I-5 to east of I-5 for two major reasons: a) the desire to locate the complex close to the railroad tracks so as to facilitate delivery of materials by rail; b) the belief that the Launch Complex would somehow interfere with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. These rationales for moving the proposed Twin Cities Complex site to an area east of I-5 are not wise because: The proposed location for the Twin Cities Launch Complex is in an area that already suffers from significant traffic congestion and the Launch Complex site traffic will make it far worse. The intersection of Twin Cities Road and Franklin Boulevard is currently a congested four-way stop, especially at commute times. The at-grade railroad crossing only a few feet east of the intersection compounds	Please see response to comment 249-3 regarding site selection. The comment assertions regarding impacts on Twin Cities Road and Franklin Boulevard because of the Twin Cities Complex are not supported by the analyses contained in Chapter 20, Transportation, under Impact TRANS-1. The construction and operations of the Twin Cities Complex would not require full closure of Twin Cities Road east of the Interstate 5 freeway. If short-term overnight lane closures are needed, traffic management plans, discussed in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1, will be developed in coordination with Caltrans and Sacramento County. For example, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would require scheduling closures for road improvements to night-time hours and limiting closure periods to reduce traffic effects associates with detours. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would ensure that this primary roadway is not shut down entirely at any point during construction or operation of the project. Appendix 20A, Delta Conveyance 2020 Traffic Analysis, and Appendix 20C, Delta Conveyance 2040 Traffic Analysis, analyze roadway segments on Twin Cities Road and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the problems currently. Adding in all the traffic from employee vehicles and truck traffic generated by the Launch Complex will create an untenable traffic snarl at this already heavily impacted intersection. A site west of I-5 would have much less of an impact on this critical intersection because such a site would likely have its own new intersection at Twin Cities Road west of I-5 to stage the flow of traffic on to this critical artery at a separate location.	the Interstate 5/Twin Cities Road ramp terminal intersections. The results of the existing with project alternatives analysis and 2040 with project alternatives did not identify a change in the ability to meet the LOS thresholds for roadway segment or intersections in this area.
249-7	The Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex should be located west of I-5, not east of I-5 During the deliberations of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee, it appeared that staff chose to move the proposed location of the Twin Cities Launch Shaft Complex from west of I-5 to east of I-5 for two major reasons: a) the desire to locate the complex close to the railroad tracks so as to facilitate delivery of materials by rail; b) the belief that the Launch Complex would somehow interfere with the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. These rationales for moving the proposed Twin Cities Complex site to an area east of I-5 are not wise because: The proposed Twin Cities Launch Complex will have a negative effect of the health and well-being of the large inmate population housed at the Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center (RCCC). RCCC is located at 12500 Bruceville Road, Elk Grove, CA and is approximately 1 mile from the proposed Twin Cities Launch Complex site. This facility houses up to 2000 inmates and a large number of staff at any given time. With the prevailing southwest winds carrying dust, pollutants, and noise towards Correctional Center, the captive population will have no choice but to suffer the negative effects of these difficult construction years. The EIR for the Delta Conveyance fails to adequately analyze the health impacts of the Twin Cities Complex on the inmates and staff at RCCC. A site west of I-5 would be more distant and	Please see responses to comments 249-3 and 249-6 regarding site selection. DWR analyzed the resources mentioned in the comment. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for a discussion on air pollutants from the project in the study area and proposed mitigation measures. Please also see Chapter 26, Public Health, for an analysis of potential impacts of the project on public health, and Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, for an analysis of the impact of noise as a result of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	pollutants and irritants would likely be more dispersed and less impactful by the time they reach RCCC.	
249-8	All of the above reasons [see comments 2-7] strongly justify placement of the Twin Cities Launch Complex west of I-5 rather than east of I-5.	Please see response to comment 249-3 regarding site selection.
250-1	I'm an avid boater in the Delta and love the beauty of the area. The intakes will ruin that experience and also since the California Delta is now a National Heritage Area the intakes are not in line with the plan for the area.	As described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts that could result from the project would be less than significant, and none of the facilities when combined with future plans and actions would result in fewer recreation opportunities or conflict with plans to improve recreation conditions and management in the Delta. Please also see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding an evaluation of recreational opportunities and construction effects on recreational opportunities. Please also refer to Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, regarding visual impacts and mitigation measures.
251-1	In regards the DEIR on a proposed Delta Conveyance Project, my primary concern is the three-tunnel underground diversion design which I believe is critically flawed hydrologically as it will head-cut the natural Sacramento River channel, progressively eroding stream banks, and vegetation with a loss of high canopy, and irremediably undermining stability of the Sacramento River channel and adjacent Delta Island levees. An example of this natural stream degradation can be observed as result of US COE underground diversion of Regnart Creek in Santa Clara County. (As another example of inadvertent degradation of beneficial uses would cite Guadalupe River diversion into Pond 8 at Alviso in Santa Clara County which entrains migratory fish and is a hazard to nearby Santa Clara County marina. This action was by US Fish and Wildlife).	The comment regarding the three tunnels design is not consistent with the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, all project alternatives would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. The concern raised in the comment is addressed in Chapter 7, Flood Protection, under Impact FP-2, which addresses the potential for the project to alter the course of a stream or river in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site or impede or redirect flood flows. The analysis in Chapter 7 found that the potential impacts from the project would be less than significant without the need for mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
251-2	The excavation of the three-tunnel conveyance system is further problematic in that I believe it passes through peat which constitutes a considerable amount of the sub strata of the Delta Islands. It would be important that core boring samples were in DEIR in evidence for analysis. Did I miss them? Originally most of island levees were constructed by hand labor and are fragile with age so heavy construction activities may prove lethal?	Please see the response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. Please also refer to the section titled Soil Physical and Chemical Properties in Chapter 11, Soils, regarding the physical and chemical properties of soil found in the study area. In addition, Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, which describes the types of construction activities expected on or near existing levees as well as planned levee modifications. The project also includes road construction and improvements to existing roads that would be required to serve the construction and material delivery processes and provide access to compensatory mitigation sites. Please also refer to Chapter 3 regarding field investigations, such as soil borings and cone penetration tests, to gather additional information to be used in final design and construction.
251-3	Another concern with this three-tunnel underground conveyance is that the diverted stream current will misdirect anadromous chinook salmon to portals with possible entrainment and cement and fish screen injury. Again, did I miss mitigating aspects of this design feature?	Please see response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives, which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. It is unclear to which "portals" the commenter is referring. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, addresses potential effects of the proposed north Delta intakes for both near-field (i.e., close to the intakes) and far-field (i.e., farther from the intakes) effects; see, for example, Impact AQUA-2 regarding winter-run Chinook salmon for detailed discussion. Therein the potential for entrainment is addressed, which would not be a risk for juvenile Chinook salmon because they would be larger than the screen opening size, which meets fishery agency standards. The potential for fish screen injury is also discussed in Chapter 12, with minimal risk concluded based on screen design and available studies cited in the text. It is unclear

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		what the "cement" that the commenter is referring to is intended to mean; there would not be toxic effects from the constructed intakes, for example.
251-4	This disruptive current [diverted stream current resulting from three-tunnel underground conveyance] can also affect recreation boaters and canoeists. These are Waters of the U.S. so degree of public safety is mandated, and needs be noted in DEIR.	Please see the response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. The concern raised by the comment is addressed in Chapter 20, Transportation, under Impact TRANS-5 which addresses potential effects on marine navigation. The analysis concludes that potential impacts would be less than significant because of the limited use of barges and other vessels for construction and the limited extent of in-water construction. As described in Chapter 5, Surface Water, long-term average monthly flows are expected to be similar to existing conditions for all project alternatives. Thus, there would not be changes in flow that would disrupt recreational users. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding an evaluation of recreational opportunities and construction effects on recreational opportunities. Please also refer to Chapter 16, Recreation, regarding potential impacts on recreation, which were determined to be less than significant.
251-5	One more consideration in placement of these three diversion tunnels in this reach of Sacramento River is that in heavy storm flows large deposits of sediment have been chronicled by USGS, as on Christmas Eve 1983, when 58,000 tons were dropped at Freeport. Depending on fish screen design, sediment and debris can impose major maintenance and manpower expenditure. These storm driven sediment flows are important to be carried out into San Francisco Bay and South Bay for replenishing salt	Please see the response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. Please refer Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding sedimentation basins, the estimated volume of sediment that would be collected, and routine maintenance. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses sediment loading and turbidity under Impact WQ-13, which analyzes effects on turbidity/total suspended solids resulting from facility operation and maintenance.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	marshes and on out to Pacific Ocean for sustaining coastal beaches and cliffs. Prime source that should be referenced in this DEIR is "Sediment Budget Study For San Francisco Bay, February 29, 1992, San Francisco District Corps of Engineers, Consultants Ogden Beeman and Ray B. Kone of U.C. Davis". It is necessary for the Delta Conveyance Project to ensure that these sediment loads continue to reach San Francisco Bay regardless of flow diversions. Is this beneficial use fully assessed and guaranteed in this DEIR?	Sediment disturbance is addressed in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, under Impact AQUA-1, related to the effects of construction of water conveyance facilities on fish and aquatic species. The potential loss of sediment in the river system as a result of operation of the project is also addressed in Chapter 12 under Impact AQUA-6, which analyzes effects of operations and maintenance of water facilities on delta smelt. As discussed in the chapter, Environmental Commitment EC-15 would include study and adaptive management related to entrainment of sediment by the north Delta intakes.
251-6	I realistically disagree with the premise that there is surplus flow in Sacramento River that can be diverted with an increase of 500,000-acre feet without jeopardizing sustainability of healthy Delta Estuary. As the afore mentioned [February 29, 1992] Sediment Budget Study For San Francisco Bay catalogues all the diversions throughout the Delta system that have been assured by a century of water rights and contracts there does not appear to be any surplus. In fact, in consideration of drought cycle that we seem to be in, and the impacts of temperature rise due to global warming it seems that increased and cooler flows should be reserved to try to restore viability of endangered chinook salmon runs in the Sacramento River. Believe this sediment study was done as support documentation for S.F. COE planned Yolo Bypass Deep Shipping Channel diversion from Sacramento River at Sacramento and is definitive document on Delta Estuary flows. Your Delta Conveyance DEIR needs to reference this data.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range and scope of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Common Response 3 also addresses water rights and contracts. The analysis of potential impacts on Chinook salmon as a result of project operations and maintenance are discussed under Impacts AQUA-2, AQUA-3, and AQUA-4. Please refer to response to comment 251-5 regarding the sediment analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
251-7	Increased Sacramento River flows are also needed to hold saltwater intrusion at bay as long as possible. By the time the three-tunnel project is near completion sea level rise will have intruded to portals so some form of desalination will be needed. Can this be incorporated into DEIR?	Please see response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives, which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. Please refer to response to comment 251-6 regarding the proposed operation of the project. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, in which electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) is analyzed. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
251-8	In an October 26 San Francisco Chronicle article, Wings, and a prayer for migratory birds, by Kurtis Alexander, a most eloquent report is made on the stresses that waterfowl of the Pacific Flyway are facing this year from drought conditions throughout the West. Wetlands of Northern California, such as the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge are receiving double or triple their usual number of visitors and they are coming earlier. Habitat and bird health are essential to maintain, or we have losses due to botulism as Klamath Basin experienced two years ago with staggering loss of 60,000 birds.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, addresses potential impacts on birds. Potential impacts associated with recreation and recreational experiences are addressed in Chapter 16, Recreation, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.
251-9	Algae blooms in San Francisco Bay are latest red tide flag that reinforces need for sanitary water treatment plant upgrades but also better circulation in Bay waters and sustainable Sacramento River flows. Thousands of dead fish and toxic flows to ocean preserves cannot be routine occurrences.	Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14 for an analysis of the potential for cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms resulting from facility operations and maintenance. The Delta Conveyance Project's potential for increasing the frequency and magnitude of CHABs was determined to not be substantial, and the impact would be less-than-significant. Wastewater treatment plant upgrades in the Delta are beyond the scope of the project and the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
251-10	Jobs were cited as of vital need in your recent Delta Conveyance Project public meetings. I would suggest that the vital need rests in the alternatives to the three-tunnel project which would be the retrofit of the canals with enclosed conduits that would not lose water supply to evaporation and could be covered over with solar panels to subsidize pumping costs, Desalination units will be needed at pumping plants also. This deferred maintenance should have been started decades ago as San Francisco PUC retrofitted their Hetch Hetchy pipeline and reservoirs. San Diego and Los Angeles have made use of recent years to employ conservation and recycling elements in their water supply regimen.	Please see response to comment 251-1 regarding the proposed project alternatives, which would divert water from new north Delta intakes via a single tunnel. DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of State Water Project water deliveries in a cost-effective manner through the development of new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta as described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. However, the effect of the project on regional employment and income was analyzed in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, ECON-1. No specific CEQA determination was provided for this impact, because effects on employment and labor income are not in and of themselves impacts under CEQA, as described in the Chapter 17 section titled Summary Comparison of Alternatives. The project would result in increased jobs in construction and operations and maintenance of water conveyance facilities as shown in the Chapter 17 table titled Comparison of Effects on Socioeconomics by Alternative. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a description of the alternatives development process and why a non-conveyance alternative and water management alternatives, such as the ones mentioned by the commenter, would not meet the majority of the project objectives.
251-11	Do not see viability in adding reservoirs to Delta system that can only be accomplished with diversions from the Sacramento River. Delta rivers are already oversubscribed. Also, it has been suggested in the past that some agricultural regions like Westlands return to dry farming in dry years. In agriculture there is always the option of fields laying fallow during drought cycles, but fish and birds do not have these options. It would be admirable if water supply preference were given to crops like rice which also serve as food source to migratory	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	waterfowl. Natural systems are multi-use and when drought conditions limit natural resources then man made diversions which shortchange historical beneficial uses should be curtailed.	
251-12	The Delta Estuary, as the prime estuary of the West Coast, is a fragile and unique ecosystem that supports Pacific Ocean ecological preserves that are nationally protected. The Pacific Flyway is preserved by an international treaty. Please adhere to all applicable CEQA Law and Guidelines and the Clean Water Act in consideration of this DEIR for the Delta Conveyance Project.	The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately discloses the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding the environmental setting for the project and applicable laws and regulations considered as part of the impact analysis.
251-13	Thank you for your consideration of my concerns. PS. I might add that my long-term concern with water issues was confirmed as a director on board of the Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District when US Department of Agriculture encouraged conservation districts to embark on CRMP, Comprehensive Resource Management Plans, to assess watershed conservation measures in our jurisdiction. Believe Napa County was most successful in this effort. Our RCD imported hydrologist Dave Rosgen from Colorado and held weeklong workshops four years in a row for agency engineers to promote accommodation of natural systems in watershed planning. We were not very successful but did appreciate SF COE and RWQCB efforts in this field.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
253-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because, the goal should be to make Southern California self-reliant for water, not reliant on Northern California.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
254-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because those who decide to essentially live in a desert should not be allowed to steal water from those who made wiser choices.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
255-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because desalination plants in Southern California are a better solution in the long-term as the ocean is large and untapped.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
256-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because it would be unwise to hinder the agricultural production of the river Delta region.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, analyzes potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures related to agricultural production.
257-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because it is time for the state of CA to value and respect its rural communities more instead of always tossing them aside for urban centers.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.
258-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because it will destroy various communities in the river Delta.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not supported by the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.
259-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because it is a waste of state money!	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
260-1	This will impact my daily life with traffic congestion.	Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, for an analysis of potential transportation impacts and mitigation measures. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects on local and regional roadways including Interstate 5; State Routes 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road; and Hood-Franklin Road, as discussed in Chapter 20, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
260-2	This will impact my daily life with noise pollution	The EIR analyzes potential significant impacts and mitigation measures related to noise. As described in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, the potential impacts analyzed, including construction noise, would result in less-than-significant impacts if all eligible property owners participate in Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Otherwise, Impact NOI-1 would be significant and unavoidable. Other noise and vibration impacts analyzed would have less-than-significant or no impacts. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
260-3	It will destroy the beauty and environment of the Delta	Potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, for a discussion of the visual impacts of the project and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
261-1	This will destroy our little town of Hood - the farming\wildlife; the beauty of the river. No tunnels please. So many negatives. This is not good for the delta towns.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not supported by the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, wildlife, agriculture, and aesthetics. Please see Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, for a discussion of the visual impacts of the project and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of potentially significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to farming. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
262-1	We don't need a Tunnel. It's a waste of money! Think about our farmers! They need water to raise their crops! NOOO Tunnel!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of potentially significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to agriculture.
264-1	On 11.1.2022 from [commenter name] Lodi, Delta Grower, 65-year, Zin wine grapes.	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-2	RE: Thx for notice and briefs on facts. More for Q&A, towards facts sheets? Thank you for the notice, due within six weeks. (Is it mid-December, Christmas season?). What is the actual due date?	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
264-3	To save time, please make clear how to click the fact sheets, if not also the pros and cons of different proposals. Sorry to say, I find this time-consuming, and prefer to print out sheets to videos (with no given times).	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, for a description of DWR's efforts to increase accessibility of the EIR. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2 regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comments.
264-4	Does the information make it clear that the Mokelumne River to Lodi Lake and Terminus Marina — has suffered water exports towards Port of Oakland, then with EBMUD, since 1929? That meant watermelons without irrigation to wine grape vines, with least amount… And now more substitutions of fruit and nut trees.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
264-5	The only solution to save fresh food crops, in NorCal Delta, is the Pacific Coast. Salt energy in Desalination is researched at Stanford. Desalination was invented at UCB, with J. Leibovitz, Ph.D., 1977 (Doe Library). Since then, cost effective Desal has been used in over 100 nations.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, including desalination facilities.
264-6	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (1) Yet EBMUD continues to ignore the fact of Desalination being invented at UCB, 1977. Why? [Continued]	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-7	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (2) Please stop the water exports, with drought recycles in Lodi, Delta areas. Ok?	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
264-8	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (3) Concrete costs more than Desalination. Who clarifies the fact?	Please see response to comment 264-5 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please see Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions (e.g., desalination) to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
264-9	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (4) Who are profiteers, to please stop, in water bonds for concrete aqueducts, especially Lodi-Stockton, Delta, NorCal?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-10	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (5) Please inspect and stop wineries from adding water, after dropping grapes for lower tonnage rates.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-11	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (5) I went to meetings from Sacramento to Stockton to Los Angeles, but who represents Delta growers of food crops?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-12	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (6) Does California still produce 50% of food crops to USA (not to mention international exports)?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-13	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (7) What is done for reforestation, timely thinning, for more humidity and rain?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
264-14	Here are eight questions, towards the fact sheets: (8) Do narco crops (including marijuana) use more water than some food crops (to say the least on youth dilemmas)?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
265-1	This project, to convey a huge quantity of water from the Delta to Southern California, indicates a lack of knowledge, and possibly even a lack of concern, about the need to control salinity in the Delta. The more water drawn from the Delta, the	The comment assertions regarding lack of knowledge and lack of concern are not consistent with the analysis provided in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	more saline the Delta's water will be. This is insane at any time, but now especially in a time of drought, and would be a disaster for farmland and all life in the region. If you wanted to make the whole place unlivable, this would be a serious step in that direction. One has to wonder who would profit from this. Certainly not the many kinds of living inhabitants and commercial interests affected by salinity in the Delta.	consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of impacts on agriculture in the Delta. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
265-2	So obviously, I urge everyone connected with this catastrophic idea to abandon it. There must be a better way to make a living than by supporting this anti-life agenda! Remember the old saying that went something like this: Only when you have felled the last tree, only when you have poisoned the last river, only when you have caught the last fish, only then will you understand: You can't eat money.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
265-3	You who are reading this: Please do whatever you can to stop this despoiling of our land. Have no part in this crime.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
266-1	I believe that enough water is already being sent south.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
267-1	Attached is a brief comment letter on the DEIR for the Delta Conveyance Project. I am a water supply engineer planner and have been in this field since 1964. I am quite familiar with the SWP and Delta Conveyance needs and its history. If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to call or email me. 1. Sea Level Rise (SLR) Delta Water Quality Degradation Baseline Condition Analysis. In February the Ocean Protection Council released its SLR Action Plan, which calls for effected areas to provide 3.5 feet protection by 2050 and 6.0 feet by 2100, especially for the Delta region. Currently a large amount of fresh water is released from reservoirs to repulse tidal flows from contaminating the freshwater resources within the Delta and the water supply exports from the CVP [Central Valley Project] and SWP [State Water Project]. During historical drought periods tidal saltwater reached as far as Sacramento due to low shallow river flows. Reservoirs built for the CVP and SWP have helped prevent this type of saline water intrusion during	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	higher tides through releases of stored water paid for by water users.	
267-2	1. Sea Level Rise (SLR) Delta Water Quality Degradation Baseline Condition Analysis. But with SLR [Sea Level Rise], dramatic increased outflows will be necessary to protect the Delta and the CVP [Central Valley Plan] and SWP[State Water Project] exports if something isn't done to prevent this serious problem from worsening.	Please refer to response to comment 267-1 regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).
267-3	1. Sea Level Rise (SLR) Delta Water Quality Degradation Baseline Condition Analysis. In addition, with the project's upstream diversion from the Delta, SLR [Sea Level Rise] and other water quality impacts will be more severe within the Delta under the new project's upstream diversion operation. This analysis was incomplete as it did not look at the combined effect of various levels of SLR and reduced through Delta flows. These analyses were not made in the DEIR. A permanent installation to protect both the Delta and the CVP and SWP exports from the increasing threat of SLR is essential.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. More specifically, the analysis in Chapter 9, Water Quality, found that the project would have less-than-significant impacts on water quality in the study area. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the baseline used for the CEQA analysis. Please also refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for a list of additional information provided that presents a longer-term analysis that incorporates changes that would be expected as a result of climate change and sea level rise by the year 2040, when the project would be operational. Please also refer to Chapter 4 for a list of additional analyses of potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		future conditions that consider conditions at the year 2070 and a sensitivity analysis of an alternate regulatory scenario that considers changes in requirements to outflow. While these additional analyses are not required by CEQA, they are intended to provide additional information about how the project might operate in the future.
267-4	1. Sea Level Rise (SLR) Delta Water Quality Degradation Baseline Condition Analysis. The USACE [United States Army Corps of Engineers] in the past has constructed a facility for that purpose [rising sea levels which threaten the delta] in Seattle separating the Puget Sound ocean water from the freshwater at Lake Union and Lake Washington. That facility, the Ballard (Hiram M. Chittenden) Locks has operated successfully over the last century. It includes an excellent fish ladder "hallway" on the south side of the structure and two ship locks, one for large and one for small ships. Something along this line could be constructed across the Sacramento River along the Carquinez Strait just downstream of the confluence of the San Joaquin River near Chips Island. It would protect the Delta freshwater natural resource environment as well as the Delta, CVP [Central Valley Project] and SWP [State Water Project] water supplies. And it would protect salmon runs et.al. This concept was once proposed and evaluated but deferred. In those days no consideration for SLR [sea level rise] was incorporated in the project planning and review.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range of potentially feasible alternatives considered, including a salinity barrier alternative. Please refer to response to comment 267-1 regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis.
267-5	1. Sea Level Rise (SLR) Delta Water Quality Degradation Baseline Condition Analysis. This conceptual project [A system of locks similar to the Ballard Locks] should be analyzed and included in the Delta	Please refer to response to comment 267-4 regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Conveyance Project as a means of SLR [sea level rise] protection, but be planned as separate project with its own EIR/EIS etc. Preferably this project should be designed, constructed, operated and maintained by the USACE [United States Army Corps of Engineers] given their successful Ballard Locks project. The DEIR could analyze the amount of water that would be saved by this type of facility as well as its economic and environmental benefits.	
267-6	2. Salmon enhancement through ocean fertilization using iron chloride powder to stimulate the phytoplankton growth should be considered in the project DEIR as a way to further enrich and enhance Salmon populations in the Ocean and their increased number for spawning in the Sacramento River system. DWR [Department of Water Resources] should work this out with DFG [Department of Fish and Wildlife], USFWS [United States Fish and Wildlife Service], and other agencies as not only a means to enhance salmon populations but as a very effective means to reduce CO2 in the atmosphere and reverse climate change. Refer to a recent book "Climate Restoration" for more details.	The Draft EIR found that there are no significant impacts on salmon with proposed mitigation measures in place. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding an analysis of potential effects on salmon and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
268-1	Please stop the water tunnel project and save the northern California natural resources, fish and wildlife that mother nature has blessed us with. Please leave our Delta water system alone, preserve our natural resources, and let us enjoy the natural ecosystem as it was intended.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
268-2	The money for the project should be used in building more water storage projects such as dams. The additional power that could be supplied from this type of water resource would be of benefit to all peoples within Ca. and a backup source for other parts of the county should there be need. This would also	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	provide areas for recreational use and revenue for the county's that use the waterways.	foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
269-1	This letter is in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Conveyance Project. As a resident of San Jose and an Environmental Studies student learning about water management and policy in western United States, I am concerned about the impact that this project will have on local communities, particularly disadvantaged communities, and local ecosystems.	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, environmental justice, and the ecosystem. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, specifically addresses environmental justice and includes an in-depth discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures. This includes state and federal policies for consideration of minority and low-income populations. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
269-2	Although economic and social effects caused by the project are not officially considered a significant environmental impact according to CEQA guidelines § 15131, a project is required to analyze cumulative impacts of the project and they can be "used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project."	Cumulative impacts of the project are disclosed in the EIR. Please see Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, for more information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
269-3	If more water is taken from the delta, water quality will go down. The increasing salinity of Delta waters will impact riparian life, fisheries, agriculture, and the overall drinking supply of the millions of people it supplies water to.	The resources mentioned in the comment are analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes electrical conductivity, a measure of salinity. The project's impacts on all water constituents analyzed, including electrical conductivity, were determined to be less than significant. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for an analysis of potential changes to water supply, including drinking water, under the project alternatives.
269-4	Since 1993, Delta smelt have been listed as endangered because of threats such as changes in their food supply, decreases in freshwater outflow, and disease according to the California Department Fish and Wildlife. These threats can all happen as a result of the project's implementation. This	Please see response to comment 269-3 regarding project operations and the impact analysis for fish and aquatic species.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	species is also known as an indicator species which means it's a species that can represent the health of an estuary ecosystem as a whole. If Delta smelt populations are already declining and the project involves pumping more water out of their habitat then this is not a good sign for the future health of the Delta.	
269-5	Harmful algal blooms are also of concern if this project is implemented. As mentioned in the Appendix 09E of the DEIR, microcystin is a cyanobacteria toxin which was first documented in the Delta in 2003. The highest concentrations on record for microcystin in the Delta was in 2014 during the drought. In section 9E.2.1.7 (Appx09E), it states, "Even in intensively studied water bodies it is not possible to accurately predict microcystin concentrations or correlate toxin to biomass rations"" Despite the inability to predict the concentrations of the toxin in relation to biomass, how will this project properly monitor concentrations on a monthly basis to ensure public health is protected? How will the project mitigate the possible impacts to wildlife health if the project is implemented?	Please refer to Appendix 9E, Cyanobacteria Harmful Algal Blooms, and Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact of project alternatives on cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms would be less than significant and therefore does not necessitate any mitigation.
269-6	Lastly, I would like to magnify the cultural and recreational importance of the Delta's natural habitats to local peoples including indigenous tribes. To reiterate, historically burdened, disadvantaged communities, people of color, and those from low-income communities are disproportionately affected by the environmental impacts caused by projects like the Delta Conveyance Project. Out of the 540 respondents to the Environmental Justice Community Survey Report (Appx 29A), 70% take at least one day a month to visit the Delta's waterways and natural areas. Humans, plants, and animals all make up the environment and thus, I personally would consider impacts on the region's society just as important because they live alongside the wildlife that CEQA is trying to	Please see Chapter 16, Recreation, which analyzes the project's potential impacts on recreation, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, identifies Tribal cultural resources and evaluates potential impacts that could result from construction, operations, and maintenance of the project and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts where feasible. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, including those identified in the table titled Tribal Views on Delta TCL Character-Defining Features. For example, terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats are identified as part of both the Delta's ecosystem and character-defining features that represent heritage and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	protect. Thus, we should protect what they find important as well.	cultural significance to Tribes pertaining to sustenance, traditional knowledge, ceremony, spiritual practices, and stewardship. Please also refer to response to comment 269-3 regarding the impact analysis for aquatic species and wildlife. Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, specifically addresses environmental justice and includes an in-depth discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures. This includes state and federal policies for consideration of minority and low-income populations. As described in Chapter 29, several impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable and would have a disproportionately adverse effect on environmental justice. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
269-7	Thank you for taking the time to listen to my comments and concerns on the project.	This comment provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR.
271-1	This is the Peripheral Canal, all over again. More expensive this time. All to get water to pour in the desert. Worse, there isn't that much excess water north of the Delta.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the Peripheral Canal. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
271-2	If they want water in southern Calif, it would be better to pipe it from the Mississippi, around the south end (lower end) of the Rockies. Still a large project, but would provide much more water, much longer into the future.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered as required by CEQA.
272-1	Opposed to the Delta tunnel. Save the wildlife and nature.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
273-1	The Delta Conveyance project draft EIR is 20,000 pages and requires high level access to the internet to even view - I struggled to even read chapters even at my library's T3 internet speeds. The original 90 day public comment period was so short it was unfair and seemed intended to frustrate the public and discourage input. And it belied the value of the effort put into the document.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) extension of the comment period.
273-2	Thank you for extending the review period to December 16.	This comment provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the proposed project or the contents of the EIR.
274-1	I am an elderly, 3rd generation Californian. My great-grandfather's 1880's barn still stands outside of Patterson, one grandfather was a dryland farmer on the Altamont pre-1920's and another was an engineer who worked on bringing Hetch Hetchy water to San Francisco - he died the year I was born. I grew up in 1950's Livermore with uncles who worked for Zone 7, knowing about the California Water Project and that water is something NOT to be wasted. I ended up getting a BS in geology and meteorology at SJSU in 1982, doing a lot of field	This information describes the background of the commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	work around the Owens Valley, and have spent my life exploring and appreciating all of California.	
274-2	I have watched climate change happen and did everything I could do to keep it from being ignored. The reality of climate change demands that we come up with solutions other than the disruption of the Delta and the Sacramento River to provide water for Southern California export agriculture and population growth. It is important to reflect my ancestors and my life experience by stating that taking water from Northern California to support unsustainable development in Southern California. There are other solutions that the Conveyance chooses to ignore and all Californians will pay the price of that short-sightedness. There have been a lot of decisions in the past that we are paying for now, and DWR must apply the most recent scientific evidence and highest level of scientific ethics to avoid making more.	The comment assertions regarding ignored solutions are not consistent with the analysis provided in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science.
274-3	I read through the Geology and Seismicity chapter (Chapter 10) first, coming away angered by the Less Than Significant rating applied to the impacts of any of the alternatives. Since the Sacramento River has handled the seismic conditions of the Central Valley and Delta regions for tens of thousands of years, the No Project Alternative is the ONLY one that really can be assessed as Less Than Significant. Saying that the impact of the different tunnel configurations is Less Than Significant is specious. You don't know and no evidence is presented that seismic events will not have real affects even during the construction of the tunnel.	Please see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, section titled Analysis Level of Detail, regarding the type of analysis found in the EIR, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA requirements for the scope of the analysis contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 4, Common Response 1, and throughout the EIR, all project alternatives are evaluated using the CEQA guidelines, and the impact analysis meets CEQA requirements. The EIR impact analysis in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, including impacts identified as less

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The tunnel infrastructure is what will be vulnerable to any seismic events or changes and the honest truth is that no one knows how planned tunneling will be affected by possible shifts in the extremely deep sediments of the Central Valley. The Sacramento Valley is not a generic river valley cut by the river - it is formed by deep faulting with the hinge lying some 2500 feet below the surface. There are scientists who understand this - Drs. Eldridge Moores and Thomas Holzer are two august names that come to my mind - and they must be listened to at our peril. Do not just listen to the scientists who are paid to have opinions that enable the Delta Conveyance.	than significant, is supported by substantial evidence using methodologies as described in the Methods for Analysis section. Chapter 10 concludes that construction and operation of all facilities would meet all required standards for earthquake safety. Please also see Common Response 1 regarding the resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake and the use of best available science in the EIR.
274-4	I was relieved when I was able to download the chapter on Flood Protection (Chapter 7) and take time to really read it. I found its assessments much more honest and its presented data scientifically clear. But, it lacks data that represents what is happening now, basing flood risks on historical data from 1957, or 2007 to 2016 and focuses on annual versus event data and long used definitions of 100-year and 200-year floods I know data takes a while to amass, but for a project that will take 20+ years to complete to usefulness and will not even begin construction until global warming and its resulting changes in weather patterns are advanced, there needs to be greater focus on forward looking, leading-edge scientific data like that presented in Xingying Huang and Daniel L. Swain's 12 August 2022 Science article "Climate change is increasing the risk of a California megaflood" (https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abq0995)	As described in Chapter 7, Flood Protection, the potential impacts analyzed would be less than significant, or less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Appendix 7A, Flood Protection 2040/2072 Analysis, for an evaluation regarding future conditions with climate change and potential flooding impacts. In addition, please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding climate change requirements and analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for additional information regarding the EIR's approach to analyzing climate change impacts. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science and the climate change projections used in the EIR.
275-1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
276-1	I oppose the Delta tunnels because they’re bad for the environment, bad for water users and hurt locally-owned farms and ranches that provide our food.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, as well as comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of construction and operation for all alternatives. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
277-1	I oppose the delta tunnels.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
278-1	It will kill all the small towns in the delta that helped make up the delta. We need our water here not sent to southern California. So. calif needs to stand up and use the water that they have in better ways and stop wasting the water that they do have. This project goes through it will kill the delta 1 of 2 in the world. They talk about saving the environment well save this environment and don't put in the tunnel. There are other options that they can do in So. calif. for water. They just need to stand up and do it.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities and the environment. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding the alternatives development process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
279-1	Diverting the water that goes into the delta will have huge impact on the downstream areas. The wetlands that will be starved of water will worsen flooding during the rainy season, since they will have less capacity to quickly absorb rainwater.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
280-1	I oppose the Delta tunnels because they're bad for the environment, bad for water users and hurt locally-owned farms and ranches that provide our food.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of construction and operation for all alternatives. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
280-2	Diverting the water that goes into the delta will have huge impact on the downstream areas. The wetlands that will be starved of water will worsen flooding during the rainy season,	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	since they will have less capacity.	SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
281-1	Stop the tunnels they will destroy our local delta farms and the ecology of the delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
282-1	I oppose the delta tunnel project. It will devastate the local communities and damage the delta. We need to have a better way to manage our water resources.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
283-1	This project is an ill-conceived concept that sacrifices the Delta's drinking water, agricultural water and water desperately needed to protect the environment in our Delta. Not one new drop of water is created.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio, in a cost-effective manner. The proposed project is not intended to create new water supplies. The EIR analyzes potential impacts on water supply, agriculture, and the Delta environment. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources.
283-2	Why not put money into the improvements necessary for the southern conveyance which ends up being overall cheaper than the conveyance expansion and does not lead to the same damage of the nation's largest inland Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the project and the performance of the project objectives related to sea level rise and seismic resilience. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
283-3	I oppose the Delta tunnels because they're bad for the environment and bad for water users; further, they hurt locally owned farms and ranches that provide our food both in and beyond California and the communities that support those endeavors and call the Delta home.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, as well as comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		measures, including those related to agriculture and local communities. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
284-1	I am opposed to building the proposed water diversion tunnels. They will negatively impact our Suisun Marsh, especially in the face of rising sea levels. This also diverts water that is needed locally for our own valuable and diverse farming operations.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
284-2	Instead of a massive project to move water southward, our state need to renew its focus on building more water storage to capture rain and snowfall, and look at water recycling. Thank you.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
285-1	All area's of the world need to conserve their respective resources! Develop permaculture practices to keep more water from rainfall on their lands and prevent run off as much as possible. Mass agriculture is part of the problem as it tills up the precious soils needs poisonous herbicides and pesticides	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	that getting into our water table for human consumption or flowing into the rivers and oceans and effecting the natural biodiversity! The balance of natural biodiversity is the most important evolved aspect of our world and politicians are allowing greedy and unthoughtful individuals and businesses to destroy it and a natural way of life which benefits all humans and animals.	Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
285-2	Diverting water from Northern California will negatively impact the people and species that rely on the natural flow of water in the California Delta.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Chapter 5, Surface Water, provides the simulated changes in river conditions, which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Additionally, as described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
286-1	I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels, as Northern California already has a water shortage and it will negatively impact growers, industry, and the people!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for an analysis of socioeconomic effects on agriculture and businesses in the area.
287-1	I am completely and thoroughly disgusted by the incompetence and greed of the politicians in regards to the Delta Tunnels. If these tunnels are completed, it will hurt many more people that it will help. The Delta is a huge boating, fishing, and ranching area. Why destroy a beautiful and diverse area that is home to birds, fish, animals - as well as people?? Why destroy the farmer's way of life by taking away the water they need for agriculture?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertions are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture in the Delta and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
287-2	Suggest to SoCal to spend money on de-salination plants and take water from the ocean instead.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, including desalination facilities. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		efficiently and sustainably.
287-3	I think this is a huge mistake, and will cost so much more than what is proposed.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
288-1	Horrible plan! Please don't steal our water and send it to southern California.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
289-1	We are not getting enough water to cover the needs for farming as it is. Rice farmers couldn't plant this year. On our trip down Highway 5 we saw some fruit/nut trees are dying for lack of water. Perhaps some fields are using well water. We are not getting enough rain to recharge the water table. I see more public toilets use low volume tanks. We have a low volume washing machine. One thing that concerns me is all the roads and parking lots that cover vast areas of land, prevent the rain from getting absorbed. It seems to me that LA needs to do something more innovative for its water needs, like getting rid of swimming pools.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
290-1	Please specifically study and assure no impact to the Sturgeon that live in the Delta that are nearing extinction throughout the world.	As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potential impacts analyzed, including those related to sturgeon, would be less than significant or mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
292-1	No need to go into detail but I'd like to voice my opposition to the Delta Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
293-1	As a concerned citizen for balance in our lives WITH nature, I am completely against the Delta conveyance Project. I have attempted to read parts of the report. I am overwhelmed with the details, so I can't be specific to offer suggestions, which would probably take days, weeks and months to literally go through. Clearly for every detail, there are pros and cons. This will exist forever.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has developed a robust public education program to keep interested parties aware of the development of the Delta Conveyance Project and inform them about the need for the project. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
293-2	It seems whoever has the most power or money wins. I am coming from a place of what is the most fair and balanced to allllll [sic]. Clearly not easy to speak to as who carries the most power and has the most influence with money continues to win. Having read the Cadillac Desert book, I am so offended with the CONTINUED corruption and game playing that goes on in our governmental agencies, private corps, and politicians. I just wish a deep umbrella of integrity could rise out of all these ashes of rivalry, power, and greed.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. As described in Chapter 1, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
293-3	May somewhere in your heart of hearts know that a deeper relationship WITH Nature which always demonstrates sustainability, be your compass for action instead of control and dominance. Building ecologically and using water in our cities proportionately to what we can provide……. how do we	Please refer to response to comment 293-2 regarding a description of the State Water Project, how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and the project's purpose and objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	balance all that? Why isn't there a limit to all the golf courses we have and the water they take? Wish I had answers…. It's just all so out of proportion. When does common sense get revived?	and as described in Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
295-1	If you are really honest with yourselves, you know that this tunnel project is not a solution. If anything, this is only a temporary patch for southern California. You know that you will be making the northern California Delta and surrounding areas a waste area to say the least.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
295-2	A real solution for California would be to look for other water sources. I would suggest looking to the north possibly to Klamath lakes or better yet to the Columbia River which is the largest river in the pacific northwest region of North America. I would suggest intakes in the "The Dalles" in Wasco County, Oregon.	Proposed alternatives were evaluated in accordance with CEQA guidelines to best achieve the project goals. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
296-1	Just like the prior EIR, there are various "alternatives" - two primary routes and minor alternatives whether to end up at a new Forebay near Clifton Court Forebay or go all the way to the Bethany Reservoir. The two primary routes, Central and East, both go through prime Delta wetlands and farms and include ground water impacts and leave tunnel muck everywhere. Both routes go through soft Delta alluvial soil. The	All alternatives were designed to best meet the project goals while minimizing impacts on the Delta. Chapters 7–32 fully evaluate potential impacts on the Delta environment. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	worst, the Central, riskily drills under the railroad trestle. The East is not far enough East by I-5, out of the Delta wetlands and farmlands. Construction should not go through the Delta!	impacts on agriculture in the Delta. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, for an analysis of potential impacts on groundwater resources, which were found to be less than significant for all project alternatives. Please see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, which contains information regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material.
296-2	The other "Alternative" is "No Action." That's just silly. Why aren't they evaluating real alternatives like Congressman Garamendi and Governor Newsom proposed including a portfolio: Desalination conservation, levee repair, infrastructure repair (i.e., leaking pipes throughout L.A.), covering the aqueduct to prevent evaporation, ...Many improvements have been recommended.	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio, in a cost-effective manner. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, and Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative and Cumulative Impact Conditions, regarding the No Project Alternative. Other alternatives were evaluated in accordance with CEQA guidelines. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, including alternatives raised by the comment. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
296-3	The best alternative is to make new water for L.A. and long-term could reduce the huge electrical costs of pumping over the Tehachapis while saving more water for farmers.	All project alternatives were assessed under CEQA guidelines. Please refer to response to comment 296-1 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
296-4	California should be leading the way by offering solar, wave	Please see response to comment 296-1 regarding the alternatives

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	action power generation, and wind power as keys energy generators for desalinization plants.	development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
299-1	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 1. The range of project alternatives is narrow.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description regarding the alternatives development process and the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered. Please refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms, to locate the letter numbers of comments provided by other entities that are of interest. Responses to all comment letters are provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Response to Comments Tables.
299-2	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 2. The presentation of analytic results obscures relevant effects, including project benefits and risks.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. The Draft EIR was developed under CEQA guidelines and considers all potential significant impacts as a result of the project. As described in Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, the analysis contained in the EIR evaluates a wide range of potential environmental impacts on multiple resources using quantitative and qualitative evaluations and provides substantial evidence for supporting impact determinations.
299-3	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 3. The optimistic assumptions about mitigation and lack of representation of short-term impacts is misleading.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. Please see response to comment 299-2 regarding the analysis of project impacts. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, which describes meeting CEQA requirements for mitigating potentially significant environmental impacts.
299-4	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 4. Future conditions are evaluated inadequately and inconsistently.	other entities that are of interest. The EIR was developed under CEQA guidelines and considers all potentially significant impacts as a result of the project. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA environmental baseline and the use of best available science in the analysis presented in the EIR.
299-5	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 5. The adaptive management planning is inadequate.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. As described in Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, the Delta Conveyance Project has been developed and analyzed to minimize uncertainty using best available science, including incorporation of adaptive management. The purpose of adaptive management is to further account for uncertainties associated with major project actions, such as the north Delta diversions and compensatory mitigation habitat restoration. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the adaptive management and monitoring program, for further description of the Delta Conveyance Project's adaptive management process and for a discussion of the project's consistency with the Delta Plan, including use of science-based, transparent, and formal adaptive management strategies. Note that CEQA does not mandate that the monitoring program incorporate adaptive management. It is also important to note that applicable impacts identified in the EIR are reduced to less than significant without incorporation of adaptive management. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a discussion of the Operations Adaptive Management and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Monitoring Program (OAMMP), which addresses uncertainty related to the north Delta intakes, and Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for a discussion of the adaptive management included in the CMP, which addresses uncertainty related to habitat restoration.
299-6	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 6. Systemic (across the ecosystem), additive (across impact types and space) and cumulative (across years) analyses of impacts, benefits and trade-offs are missing.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. The EIR was developed under CEQA guidelines and considers all potentially significant impacts as a result of the project. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Progress, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the assessment of significant impacts, including cumulative impacts.
299-7	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 7. Uncertainty and risk need to be explicitly evaluated to understand the reliability of findings.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. The EIR was developed under CEQA guidelines and considers all potentially significant impacts as a result of the project. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the disclosure and evaluation of uncertainty throughout the EIR.
299-8	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are: 8. Other important issues exist.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
299-9	I would like to highlight the Major Review Comments of the Delta Independent Science Board, and independent peer review, which are:	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest. The EIR includes many tables identifying differences and similarities

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	9. The presentation of alternative performances and trade-offs needs improvement.	between alternatives for the public and decision makers to understand the alternatives and the different impacts between them. For example, in the Executive Summary there are 27 tables comparing the alternatives. The table titled Summary of Key Project Features by Alternative summarizes the key features of each alternative and the table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures identifies the impact determination of each alternative organized by resource evaluated in the EIR. In addition, the EIR has multiple tables throughout each resource chapter documenting comparisons of the alternatives and potential changes or impacts on the physical (e.g., Chapter 9, Water Quality), biological (e.g., Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources), and socioeconomic (Chapter 17, Socioeconomics) analyses.
299-10	Because I believe a panel of independent scientific experts is the most qualified to objectively review the Proposed Delta Conveyance Project/ Delta tunnel DEIR, as a scientist myself, I will adopt and submit their recommendations as my comments on the proposed project.	Please see response to comment 299-1 regarding comments provided by other entities that are of interest.
299-11	Also, to their [Delta Independent Science Board and independent peer reviewers] comments I would the add the enormous cost of the project-perhaps up to $40 Billion or more-and effects on residents of the Delta area and possible environmental justice issues as significant project impacts that demand careful analysis in the DEIR.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities and environmental justice. Please see Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding environmental justice.
299-12	I would like to request that the California Department of Water Resources keep me up-to-date as the DEIR/EIR analysis progresses.	All persons, organizations, or agencies that commented on the Draft EIR will be included on the project notification list.
300-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because, I live in the city of Hood and the tunnels will cause gridlock for me trying to go into town for essentials	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Project Alternative. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, for an analysis of potential transportation impacts and mitigation measures. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects on local and regional roadways, including Interstate 5; State Routes 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road; and Hood-Franklin Road, as discussed in Chapter 20, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
300-2	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because, this will damage the ecosystem and beauty of Delta.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, for a discussion of the visual impacts of the project and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
302-1	Please find attached a comment letter from me, attached, for the Delta Conveyance Draft EIR comment period. Please reply with confirmation of your receipt of the email and the attachment. Thank you for the opportunity to supply comments.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
302-2	Thank you for this opportunity to supply comments on the Delta Conveyance Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). I am a retired mechanical and nuclear engineer living on Bethel Island and had the opportunity to serve on the DCA Stakeholder Engagement Committee, where I was able to hear many of the design and construction details and meet and talk with many of the state's experts on issues related to the Delta. Because I will refer to the project Purpose and Objectives often, here is an excerpt from where they are clearly identified in the first paragraph of the Executive Summary ES.1 Introduction This Delta Conveyance Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is prepared by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as Lead Agency to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project, as more fully described below and in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, is to restore and protect the reliability of State Water Project (SWP) water deliveries and, potentially, Central Valley Project (CVP) water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio (California Natural Resources Agency et al. 2020:7) in a cost-effective manner. The objectives focus on the SWP's ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize water delivery disruption due to Delta seismic risk, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta. In this letter I present comments in three parts: 1. Primary comment about the overall project	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	2. Two comments on the project design presented in the DEIR. 3. A list of several comments and issues related to specific points made in the text of various EIR documents	
302-3	Primary Comment. This project as designed is too short sighted for the state to allocate billions of dollars out of the pockets of California citizens to fund this project via their increased water bills. A state expert on analyzing sea level rise due to climate change and its effect on the Delta indicated that eventually the Delta will need to have barriers across the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in order to prevent the Delta from becoming a saltwater marsh. This need is independent of whether a tunnel is built or not. It is only a matter of time before there is a need to build operable barriers, it could be 50 years or 100 years. Once the need is apparent for these larger operable salinity barriers, and they are put in place, there will be complete control on Delta salinity and the value of any tunnel that was built goes to zero, it is no longer needed. All the billions of dollars spent on the tunnels will be made useless by the billions of dollars that the barriers will require. And where is the money going to come from to fund the billions of dollars for the barriers after the current tunnel project has spent billions?	DWR has thoroughly assessed the feasibility and function of the project to meet the overall project purpose and objectives as presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. The short- and long-term impacts and benefits of the proposed project and project alternatives will be considered by DWR as part of the decision-making process. Although the future potential for a sea level rise/salinity barrier across the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers is theoretically possible and was considered in the screening process for alternatives to include for detailed evaluation in the EIR, it was not carried forward as a potentially feasible project alternative because it would not obtain most of the basic project objectives (see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, section titled First-Level Screening). In addition, Appendix 3A provides an overview of Delta salinity barrier projects that have been proposed as far back as 1929. Each of the salinity barrier projects discussed in Appendix 3A could result in adverse effects on anadromous fish because of fish passage issues and may also favor a warm-water fishery because of shifts in water circulation. Please also refer to response to comment 302-4 and responses to comments 302-11 through 302-14 for additional explanation about Delta barrier screening and why it did not meet project objectives. Project operations under climate change and sea level rise are evaluated in Chapter 30, Climate Change, and in Appendix 4A, Consideration of 2070 Conditions.
302-4	The alternative of having Western Delta Operable Barriers was briefly considered for the project and there are a couple of Pages in this DEIR, Appendix 3A, Section 3A.3.4.1 that describe what has been done to evaluate the alternative. That section identifies that the last technical work on this topic was done in 1960! A delta planning committee reviewed the work in 1963.	The Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, section titled Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier did not mean to imply that the 1957 and 1960 studies were the most recent or only studies considered. The phrase “These studies have included the 1957 … and the 1960” studies indicates that these were only two among a group of studies reviewed. The two historic documents provided valuable background information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	That was five years before we first landed on the moon. How much has technology changed the way operable gates can be designed and controlled? None of the advancement of the last 60 years of technology has been applied to understanding how this alternative could work in 2023. Humorously, as noted in the excerpt below, the DEIR says that Western Delta salinity control facilities have been evaluated since the nineteenth century, and then goes on to refer to studies done in 1957 and 1960 as "recently"! 3A.3.4.1 Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier Western Delta salinity control facilities have been evaluated since the nineteenth century. Somewhat more recently, DWR has conducted studies about the feasibility of constructing salinity barriers. These studies have included the 1957 DWR Evaluation of Salinity Control Barriers and the 1960 DWR Evaluation of Salinity Control Facilities Section 3A.3.4.1 states the following regarding the core work done in 1957: In 1957, DWR prepared Bulletin 60, which investigated methods to (1) convey large quantities of water across the Delta without major losses to Suisun Bay and property damage to Delta property owners; (2) reduce salinity in the Delta; and (3) deliver water to the San Francisco Bay Area. The study results indicated that fresh water could be maintained in the Delta by either of the following methods (California Department of Water Resources 1957). -Maintain Delta outflows to dilute poor-quality water from Suisun Bay. However, this method would require additional	After summarizing the potential benefits of the 1957 Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier proposal cited in the comment, this section of Appendix 3A concludes that "The study indicated that these plans would result in adverse impacts on anadromous fish; however, there could be benefits to other fish that could accommodate warmer waters." The study recommended continued evaluation of the plans. A 2013 study of previous barrier options conducted by the State Water Resources Control Board Water Master reached a similar conclusion: that a western barrier would mainly be used to prevent upstream flooding during infrequent flood events or to preserve Delta water quality if levees failed, and that it should be studied further (Wilson 2013). CEQA directs that an EIR describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant effects of the proposed project. Although western salinity barriers have been studied, as an alternative to the proposed project it was screened from further consideration because it does not meet most of the basic project objectives such as the south Delta water supply reliability, climate resiliency, seismic resiliency, and operational flexibility screening criteria. Barriers would not meet the operational flexibility criterion because they would not provide for an alternate point of diversion or conveyance in the Delta that could be used when conditions at the south Delta SWP facilities would not allow for water supply exports. In addition, to be considered feasible in the future, substantial research for effective fish passage, ecosystem effects of changing tidal patterns and magnitudes upstream and downstream of a barrier, impacts on commercial and recreational navigation, water quality impacts in the Delta, water supply effects and potential downstream of barrier effects associated with sea level rise would need to be understood

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	releases of water from upstream reservoirs and reduce the amount of water available for water supplies to be used in other parts of California. -Isolate poor-quality water from Suisun Bay from high quality Delta water with a physical barrier In 1957 they identified that you could either build a salinity barrier or release enough water from the reservoirs to keep salinity out. Well, we used to have enough water for that option, but now it is too precious to use in such a wasteful manner and that option is not available. The only other real long-term solution is to use an operable physical barrier of some kind. We need to use 21st century technology, available today, to build operable gates with controls that when used in concert with reservoir releases could completely control Delta salinity and support the appropriate flows needed for fish and the ecosystem. This is the approach that needs to be evaluated with more than just a cursory look at 60-year-old reports. Effort needs to be put into evaluating this approach. If the barriers are going to be needed by our grandchildren due to continuing sea level rise, don't let us be spending money on something now that is going to be thrown away. The current project and this DEIR did not even do a technical evaluation of this alternative but instead relied on an earlier project, years ago, that eliminated this alternative. Excerpted from Section 3A.3.4.1: Early in the CEQA analysis of the BDCP, DWR considered, but	at a much higher degree of certainty than currently is available. The western Delta barrier concept would also not meet the coequal goal under the 2009 Delta Reform Act of "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta ecosystem and the fish, wildlife and recreation it supports" because this concept, as presented would fundamentally alter the Delta ecosystem's brackish water, tidally influenced environment to primarily a freshwater system. The consequences for such a change are not currently fully understood, but could include changes in species types, abundance, and biodiversity as well as effects on migratory fish patterns, recreational fishing, and other water-oriented recreation. While technology has changed in the last 60 years, what has also changed is the passing of federal and state environmental protection laws and policies that constrain solutions that might have been entertained in prior years. Regarding saltwater reaching the intakes and tunnel in the future, the project would operate under existing or future criteria for salinity in the Delta, as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Integration of North Delta Intakes with South Delta Facilities: "The north Delta intakes would operate in conjunction with the existing south Delta intakes. The proposed intakes would augment the ability to capture excess flows and improve the flexibility of the SWP operations such as for meeting the State Water Board D-1641 Delta salinity requirements. The Delta Conveyance Project would not change operational criteria associated with upstream reservoirs." Please also see response to comment 302-3 regarding the West Delta Salinity Barrier.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	screened out, an alternative to the conveyance component called Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative C3, Through Delta Conveyance with West Delta Salinity Barrier. At that time, DWR concluded (California Department of Water Resources 2016a:3A-50–3A-51) that this alternative would not meet the BDCP objectives of a brackish water system in the Delta that would support the estuarine habitat required by the BDCP covered species and would reduce the ability of fish passage for anadromous fish. This alternative would not support project objectives and aspects of the project purpose and need that focus on creating ecological improvements in the Delta ecosystem and contributing to recovery of declining listed species. Nor would the alternative meet the coequal goal under the 2009 Delta Reform Act of "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem." A more formal analysis of current state of the art operable barriers combined with the latest control technology needs to be performed. It is likely that the operation of these barriers and reservoir releases could closely control delta salinity and optimum flows for Delta environmental and ecosystem health. Tides, flows, everything can be controlled to get the most optimum solution during droughts or floods.	
302-5a	Once billions of dollars are spent on the tunnel conveyance, the ability to fund operable barriers is not going to be there when it is ultimately needed due to sea level rise. It is possible the tunnel project will ultimately cast the fate for the Delta to be a saltwater marsh simply by eliminating the funding for the real barrier solution when it is needed.	Please see responses to comments 302-3 and 302-4 regarding the West Delta Salinity Barrier. Constructing and implementing the project does not directly or indirectly affect the ability to fund other needed water supply projects in the future.
302-5b	If the tunnel or tunnels are built, ultimately, probably within the lifetime of my grandchildren, the salt will reach the tunnel inlet and then there will be another decision between barriers	Please refer to response to comment 302-4 regarding the consideration of salinity barriers in the western Delta and the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	or another tunnel project will reach further into the sierras to grab water, encouraging salt even further inland. Stop the salinity now before it ruins the Delta that we know today.	
302-6a	Please do the work on the most logical alternative [West Delta salinity barrier] for the resources of the people of the state of California. Take the time. Do the work. Get it right and don't just do what you think can more easily get past other agencies and special interest groups. We should all be better than that.	Please see responses to comments 302-3 through 302-5 regarding the West Delta Salinity Barrier.
302-6b	Per your DEIR commenting guidance, I am providing the comment that there has been no technical analysis done, to support eliminating the Western Delta Barrier alternative, using operable barrier technology that is available today. Referring to the project objectives listed at the top of this document [excerpt from first paragraph of EIR Exec. Summary section ES. 1, Introduction], there are three areas where I believe the salinity barriers can deliver the best results for the people of the state: 1. Cost Effective – With operable barriers, the final solution for sea level rise due to climate change is developed now and we will not have to pay for another multiple billion-dollar project down the road, rendering any current tunnel project useless and wasting billions of dollars and time. 2. Sea Level Rise – With operable barriers, the problem of sea level rise is completely eliminated as a risk for the Delta and all of its levees. 3. Operational Flexibility – Barriers can be more open when water is plentiful and more closed when droughts occur. Fish flows and tides can be simulated to deliver the best conditions possible for whatever situation. Complete operational flexibility that will last for years.	Please refer to response to comment 302-4 regarding the consideration of salinity barriers in the western Delta and the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
302-7	Two Comments on the Proposed Design Regarding the proposed designs for the Delta Conveyance presented in this DEIR, I have two comments that I believe are very important for the Delta and it's surrounding communities and people. Be Able To Deliver Flushing Flows to South Delta This tunnel project will flow massive amounts of water through and by the South Delta without providing any ability for that water to be used to flush the South Delta in times of emergency or poor water quality. Even going back to the Peripheral Canal Project, those designers recognized the need for flushing flows of fresh water into the South Delta to help with that ecosystem. This current design, 50 years later, delivers less value to the Delta than the design of the peripheral canal. Already today we see problems with water quality and algae due to stagnant flows. Studies are looking at airborne effects on people and wildlife due to algae blooms. Between algae, fertilizer runoff and other ways the water supply could be toxic and polluted as in a crazy terrorist, this project needs to be able to provide a flushing flow to the south Delta if it is ever needed. This capability can easily be accommodated in this project design, and it is not. A form of this could be accomplished with the Eastern or Central corridor solution because the accompanying new Southern Forebay would have an overflow into South Delta Sloughs which could supply some level of flushing without even trying. The Bethany Alternative with no Southern Forebay would require a little more design	The north Delta intakes are proposed to add flexibility to SWP operations. The objectives cited in the comment are all part of the project purpose, which is specifically tied to protecting the reliability of SWP water deliveries. "Although a lead agency may not give a project's purpose an artificially narrow definition, a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal." (In re Bay-Delta etc. [2008] 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1166, 1177.) In addition, a lead agency must identify potentially feasible alternatives to the "project as a whole, not to the various facets thereof that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects." (California Native Plant Soc'y v. City of Santa Cruz [2009] 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 993.) Releasing flushing flows into the south Delta, as a potential facet of a project alternative, would not be responsive to DWR's purpose and objectives for the project (to improve reliability of the SWP Delta infrastructure in the face of many challenges). The concept would release SWP water deliveries into the south Delta, which would reduce SWP water supplies. However, DWR acknowledges that there are times that releasing flows into the south Delta during emergency conditions could be a secondary benefit of some alternatives. If those alternatives are selected, DWR would incorporate this option into emergency management considerations. During emergency actions in the Delta (like a levee failure), DWR has a model that considers different ways to improve the conditions created by the specific emergency. DWR would incorporate releases from the new facilities as part of a suite of actions that could be taken. There is a potential to help address problems in a small area near the proposed Southern Forebay, but the area of potential benefit in the Delta is relatively small. Because this type of benefit is not a specific objective of the project,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	work. Speaking with DWR Delta Emergency Response experts, they indicated that the availability of flushing flows in the south Delta could be very beneficial in recovery of salinity intrusion due to a levee break in the south Delta. The flushing could more quickly clean the South Delta and make the water useable again by farmers and local water agencies. It is completely negligent that a large tunnel project does not deliver this important value to the south Delta. I personally have been raising this issue at meetings with DWR staff present for most of the last two years and it appears to not have any traction and has been ignored. The response is that being able to deliver this capability is not in the "project goals". Well, it needs to be in the project goals for the people of the state of California and the Delta. You don't need seat belts for your car to get you to San Francisco, but they are a pretty darn good idea if you are going to ride in the car. Same concept with this flushing capability. If this type of capability is not included, someone is going to find this letter years down the road when a terrorist as poisoned south Delta water, or the water is stagnating, green algae is everywhere, and kids and animals are sick around Discovery Bay homes and there is no way to flush the area out well. Or perhaps a levee goes and there is lots of salt that comes in and the water cannot be drawn into the canals going south so there is no way to flush the Delta. This capability would be very important to have in these situations. Everyone should be on notice now that this is the time to provide this necessary capability.	it was not a key factor in identifying a proposed project. The comment mentions that flushing flows were incorporated into the Peripheral Canal project, but those types of actions would not be effective for the Delta Conveyance Project. The Peripheral Canal included a proposal to release water into the Delta at 12 locations where the canal intersected Delta channels to help with water quality management and fish migration. However, the Peripheral Canal was an at-grade facility with a much higher capacity (over 20,000 cfs) and the Delta Conveyance Project includes a smaller tunnel 100-150 feet below ground, so this concept would not be applicable. Additionally, an improved understanding of fish migration indicates that adding Sacramento River water to Delta tributaries may confuse fish migration rather than help. While the proposed project and alternatives do not include a specific project component to release flushing flows into the Delta, the proposed project does not preclude this action. While not necessary to mitigate impacts of the proposed project and alternatives, this is an action that can continue to be considered as part of the Community Benefits Program.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	There are five project objectives listed in the excerpt at the top of this letter [excerpt from first paragraph of EIR Exec Summary section ES.1, Introduction]. One is to make it more cost effective to export water. The other four objectives all benefit from an ability to make water available to flush the south Delta. 1. Ability to respond to sea-level rise and climate change – The ability to flush the South Delta will help with salinity intrusion due to sea level rise and increasing water temperatures and resulting algae bloom issues. 2. Minimize delivery disruption due to seismic risk- Flushing would allow DWR to more quicky respond to salinity intrusion on islands after levee breaks due to seismic activity. 3. Improve water supply reliability – Flushing would improve the ability to respond to various accidents, terrorist acts, seismic activity and help assure local water suppliers to farmers and municipal districts. 4. Provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta – Frankly, I don't see any area where the conveyance project can be used to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta unless something like this flushing capability is included to support aquatic conditions. I fail to see how a tunnel being used to bypass the delta can improve any aquatic condition in the Delta and will only make them worse. The flushing capability could add back some value to improve aquatic conditions.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Providing an ability to flush the south Delta is the right thing to do if the tunnel project proceeds. Other than monetary "payoff" community benefits to the Delta Community, this is one of the only possible benefits of this project to the Delta Region if it is ever included.	
302-8	Two Comments on the Proposed Design Regarding the proposed designs for the Delta Conveyance presented in this DEIR, I have two comments that I believe are very important for the Delta and its surrounding communities and people. New Pumping Capability to be Completely Redundant to Existing Banks Pumping Station The current preferred Bethany Alternative includes a new pumping capability and conveyance to push water up to the Bethany Reservoir, completely separate from the existing Banks Pumping Station and the existing conveyance up to the Bethany Reservoir. It is irresponsible to spend resources of the state to build a new pumping capability that is not completely redundant to the aging Banks Pumping Station. The new pumps should be able to push through-Delta conveyed water to Bethany and the Banks pumps should be able to pump water to the Bethany Reservoir that was conveyed to the south Delta via the new tunnels. The state is expanding a very complex conveyance system and to not include strong operational redundancy and flexibility is very short sighted. Once a new tunnel conveyance to Bethany is in place, there	The Bethany Alternative would involve dual conveyance, which means that the proposed facilities would work together (and complement) the existing SWP south Delta facilities. The dual operation would provide backup and redundancy because there would be two options for the SWP to divert water. Additionally, the proposed Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant would have redundancy built in, similar to Banks Pumping Plant, by including an additional pump in case of outages or maintenance. The statement that the addition of the Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant would disincentivize maintenance of the Banks Pumping Plant is unfounded. The Delta Conveyance Project is proposed to add system redundancy (e.g., in the case of seismic disruption) and operational flexibility to the SWP. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the Banks Pumping Plant would continue to be heavily used and relied upon for SWP deliveries. The proposed north Delta intakes would be used to capture excess flows in the Sacramento River when they are available depending on hydrologic conditions. This operational flexibility is what would help the Delta Conveyance Project support aquatic conditions in the Delta, as the comment suggests. The proposed Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant would pump water from the below-ground tunnel up to the Bethany Reservoir. The Banks Pumping Plant lifts water that is at the surface up to an elevation similar to the Bethany Reservoir. The pumping facilities are designed to lift water of different amounts, so they are not interchangeable. An interconnection would involve the construction of additional facilities, which would

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	will be less incentive to maintain the aging Banks Pumping Station. There will be an incentive for less through delta conveyance which the south Delta needs to keep from becoming stagnated. If the new pumping stations cannot push water to Bethany conveyed to the Delta, it is likely that there will be less of a driver for through Delta conveyance which will hurt the people and communities of the south Delta. Making the pumping stations be completely redundant to each other delivers value to three of the project stated objectives: 1. Minimize delivery disruption due to seismic risk - Should either pumping station be affected by an earthquake, the other pumping station can be used to support either type of conveyance to the Bethany Reservoir. 2. Improve water supply reliability – South Delta water supplies would benefit in an emergency if any new pumps could be used for through delta conveyance if something happened to the Banks pumps. 3. Provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta – Again, if the new pumps could support through delta conveyance it would improve the flexibility to support aquatic conditions in the south Delta.	increase the potential for environmental impacts. DWR's focus in the environmental analysis is to work to identify ways to reduce effects. Because the system already has redundancy incorporated, adding facilities (that increase potential environmental effects) to provide additional redundancy is not warranted.
302-9	The statement in Section 3A 4.2 that "The dual conveyance Bethany Reservoir alignment would provide the same climate resiliency, seismic resiliency, and water supply reliability as the central and eastern alignment alternatives" is not true. The Bethany Alternative does not have a southern forebay holding water that could be used in emergency situations in the Delta to help control damage due to climate change and seismic	Please refer to the response to comment 302-8, which describes that the project and alternatives are all dual conveyance alternatives, meaning that south Delta export facilities and north Delta export facilities will be used together to meet the objectives of the project, such as improve operational flexibility. Please also refer to the response to comment 302-7 regarding flushing

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	activity. Not having a southern forebay with an overflow and passage to supply water and flush the Delta is a big disadvantage of the Bethany Reservoir alignment. See the comment above [comment 5] on the value of being able to flush the south delta.	flows into the south Delta.
302-10	Page ES-2, Lines 31-35 discusses salinity intrusion due to levee breaks due to seismic activity which is the exact scenario that the ability to flush the south Delta helps. See flushing comments above [comment 5].	Please see responses to comment 302-3 through 302-8 regarding salinity intrusion, levee breaks due to seismic activity, and flushing the southern Delta.
302-11	Page 3A-35, bottom half giving the reasons why the Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier was eliminated. I can argue against each of the reasons listed as to why this approach should be eliminated, and I have additional comments as to why it MUST be further analyzed: a. Regarding Water Supply Reliability – Operable barriers would give complete control on Delta salinity and could be operated in a manner to best support fish habitats. Wherever you take water will have fish constraints and that should not be used as a difference maker.	The assertion that operable barriers could be operated in a manner to best protect fish is not supported by previous studies, as discussed in response to comment 302-4. Furthermore, the EIR appropriately uses regulatory constraints related to aquatic conditions as a criterion for evaluating potential alternatives. As discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, the proposed project would create a dual conveyance system in the Delta with two complementary methods to divert and convey water, with new intakes in the north Delta and conveyance facilities to connect it with existing water supply infrastructure in the south Delta when pumping is constrained in the south Delta to protect aquatic resources. The dual conveyance system would support the project objective to provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta and better manage risks of further regulatory constraints on project operations. This comment is an opinion on the merits of the Western Salinity Control Barrier. Please refer to responses to comments 302-3, 302-4, and Appendix 3A of the EIR, as well as Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for further explanation about why this alternative was screened from further consideration. Salinity barriers can be effective in controlling salinity levels in the Delta, which can be useful for water supply, but barriers do not improve water supply diversion flexibility in the way the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		project's dual conveyance diversion would. Currently, when south Delta diversions are restricted because of regulatory constraints, water supply reliability can be adversely affected. Similarly, the potential for future seismic and/or levee failure events upstream of the barrier could affect south Delta water supply export reliability. The project is designed to address these potential effects by operating dual conveyance facilities to improve water supply reliability.
302-12	Page 3A-35, bottom half giving the reasons why the Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier was eliminated. I can argue against each of the reasons listed as to why this approach should be eliminated, and I have additional comments as to why it MUST be further analyzed: b. Regarding Climate Resiliency – The statement that "The south Delta divisions are likely to become more limited in use as water quality at the diversions becomes more degraded as sea levels rise." is completely false for operable Western Delta Barriers. These barriers are THE ONLY alternative that provides COMPLETE control against future sea level rise due to climate change. With operable barriers in place, the only way the delta water becomes more saline is if the operators choose it to be that way to accommodate other issues.	Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, of the EIR, section titled Criterion 1- Climate Resiliency, explains the approach for applying this screening criterion to the project alternatives. Barrier projects in part were determined to not meet the climate resiliency objective because they would not improve the SWP's ability to deliver water during large storm events through existing south Delta intakes, which are projected to be more common in the future under climate change conditions. Under current ESA regulatory constraints the SWP experiences restrictions on exporting water supply during large storm events. The proposed project would add an additional upstream diversion location allowing for more consistent SWP exports during larger storm events when excess water supply is available.
302-13	Page 3A-35, bottom half giving the reasons why the Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier was eliminated. I can argue against each of the reasons listed as to why this approach should be eliminated, and I have additional comments as to why it MUST be further analyzed: c. Seismic Resiliency – This comment in the document focuses on the risk of losing a barrier in an earthquake, which can be mitigated by design and this type of seismic risk is inherent in any of the alternatives. On the other hand, the most likely	Please refer to responses to comments 302-11 and 302-12. The EIR did not conclude that a salinity control barrier alternative would be unable to meet the seismic resiliency objective because of "the risk of losing a barrier in an earthquake." As explained in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, in the table titled Alternatives Eliminated at First-Level Screening, south Delta facilities are located near several fault zones. Barriers would not increase the seismic resiliency of the south Delta diversion facilities. The SWP and CVP diversion facilities are located near the West Tracy Fault zone, which has the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	thing to go are the fragile delta levees which the operable barrier eliminates the risk of salinity intrusion because it is blocked out. The operable barrier delivers the best seismic resiliency because the barrier will prevent salinity intrusion and it would be hard to argue that this alternative be eliminated for this reason.	potential to damage the facilities. A salinity control barrier would not minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a reduced quantity or quality of SWP water deliveries associated with potential damage to the facilities. In addition, seismic activity in the Delta that results in levee failure could affect south Delta pumping facilities even if salinity intrusion were controlled by a barrier. The proposed project in its upstream location improves the potential that critical water supply infrastructure would be unaffected by seismically induced or other levee failures, thereby minimizing the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a reduction in the quantity or quality of SWP water deliveries.
302-14	Page 3A-35, bottom half giving the reasons why the Western Delta Salinity Control Barrier was eliminated. I can argue against each of the reasons listed as to why this approach should be eliminated, and I have additional comments as to why it MUST be further analyzed: d. Operational Flexibility – With operable barriers and control on reservoir releases, operators will have complete control of delta salinity and flows. The system could be operated in a way to support tides which will help the ecosystem. Operable barriers provides a scenario that delivers ultimate operational flexibility, and again for it to be eliminated by this topic is not justified.	Please refer to response to comment 302-11. One basic objective of the proposed new intakes as an alternate point of diversion is to minimize effects of the SWP operations on fish passage and enhance through-Delta survival of migrating fish while continuing to reliably meet water supply obligations. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, also addresses real-time operational decision-making processes. Another objective is to manage for future regulatory constraints likely to be imposed to address climate change and changing environmental conditions. DWR must also consider the need to satisfy downstream regulatory requirements in the Delta, including Delta outflows and south-of-Delta exports (Chapter 5, Surface Water), flood protection (Chapter 7, Flood Protection), groundwater, and surface water quality factors in addition to salinity (Chapters 8, Groundwater, and 9, Water Quality), aquatic and terrestrial biological resources (Chapters 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources), and environmental justice (Chapter 29, Environmental Justice). The Chapter 5 section titled Methods to Identify Potential Changes to Surface Water explains, “During real-life operations, operators would use

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		allowable real-time adjustments in operation to satisfy regulatory, legal, and contractual requirements given the current conditions and hydrologic constraints to the maximum extent possible. In some cases, certain voluntary extraordinary water conservation and changes in regulatory requirements for water rights or for flow and water quality requirements may be imposed to accommodate extreme conditions, such as during the drought emergency of 2012–2016." DWR must also consider supplies and water quality for agricultural, industrial, urban, and environmental water uses. Operable barriers may provide some flexibility, but would not allow simultaneous diversion of water during high flow events and the protection of species, whereas the option to change the point of diversion would provide these benefits.
302-15	Section 3A.4 describes the process for eliminating alternatives to this project. When evaluating alternatives, the DEIR presents this elaborate scheme for identifying ways to eliminate alternatives. This elimination methodology reeks of being a method to use words to eliminate the alternatives not desired in order to get to the "right" one. Why is there not effort spent identifying or tabularizing the advantages of each alternative and why a certain alternative should be chosen? In your approach you only consider that each alternative can deliver the focused project goals, but an alternative could also bring additional benefits and advantages which should also be part of the process. The operable barriers approach for example, completely solves the climate change/sea level rise salinity issue FOREVER. No other alternative does that. Every other alternative will require another multibillion-dollar project someday to completely solve the climate change problem. And when that second project is done, the value of the first project will go to zero.	The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. CEQA does not require consideration of every variation of every alternative; CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
302-16	Section 14, The Summary Comparison of Alternatives, identifies that the tunnel-based conveyance project requires significant land acquisition, 2667 acres for the Bethany alternative and 4753 acres for the Eastern/Central alternative, along with years of construction effects all along the path of the tunnel. Many alternatives are eliminated for requiring too much acquisition or construction burden. The operable barriers approach [described in comment #2] completely eliminates the need for vast land acquisition in the Delta. Construction is limited to the location of the barriers and land immediately around it. There is no boring and handling of tunnel muck. It has so many advantages which have no place to be identified or discussed in this document.	The Draft EIR explains in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, that a number of salinity control barrier concepts have been studied in the past. CEQA requires analysis of alternatives to the proposed project that attain most of the basic project objectives. As explained in Appendix 3A, Delta barrier alternatives were screened from further consideration because they did not meet two or more of the stated project objectives. For example, Appendix 3A explains that the operable barrier alternatives would not meet the water supply reliability objective because water supply resiliency would only occur at the south Delta diversions. Similarly, Delta barriers do not fully meet seismic resiliency objectives because the existing Delta levees upstream of the barriers could be subject to seismic events that could affect Delta water quality in the areas where existing SWP and CVP pumping plants operate. Considerable uncertainty also exists related to the extent barriers could improve water supply diversion operational flexibility (refer to the table titled Alternatives Eliminated at First-Level Screening in Appendix 3A). Appendix 3A also notes that consideration of barrier options to the proposed new diversion facilities was rejected from further consideration because of potential effects barriers could have on the Delta's brackish water ecosystem and the potential to impede anadromous fish passage. Therefore, it was determined that the barrier projects considered in Appendix 3A would not meet most of the basic project objectives and were not considered further in the screening process. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description.
302-17	Page 3A-44, Table 3A-4, the row of No responses in every category for the Barrier option is completely untrue. For all the reasons listed above, I would put a YES in every category in that row and in the category of climate resiliency it delivers an ultimate solution. I would be happy to debate all the entries of that row in this table with any expert in any forum. Without any detailed analysis done on this option in the last 60 years,	Given the complexity of the Delta environment, the SWP, and the regulatory context, review of the range of alternatives by multiple subject matter experts during the screening process determined that an operable barrier solution alone would not meet two or more of the stated project objectives. Please refer also to responses to comments 302-15 and 302-16.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the DWR ability to list "N" for all those entries is no more justified than my ability to use my engineering knowledge to put "Y" in all those entries. If you think I cannot justify "Y" entries, then similarly you must realize that DWR cannot justify "N" entries.	
302-18	Chapter 34 on Community Benefits does not contain any mention of benefits that could be derived to the community from the actual project. This means from the results of the project, not from donations or community funds etc. For example, better emergency response capabilities for water pollution or poisoning events in the Delta. If the new project delivered an ability to supply fresh water to the south delta for flushing the delta that would be a community benefit. Are there any community benefits from the current physical project as proposed? In general, it appears like it takes land, pollutes, causes construction issues for years and gives back some funds for local community development and maybe a building or two to reuse. I believe the physical project can deliver value to the community and those ways should be explored and documented.	Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, evaluates the potential impacts of implementing the types of projects identified in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework. As mentioned in Chapter 34, the analysis is commensurate with the level of detail currently available about the potential projects and Community Benefits Program would pursue. As described in Appendix 3G, the Community Benefits Program Framework identifies the goals, objectives, and potential components of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project Community Benefits Program. The Framework was informed by public input received through interested parties from within local Delta communities, interviews, workshops, and public comments. The Framework also details the steps the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) will undertake in development of the Community Benefits Program, including ensuring opportunities for meaningful community participation. For example, community input will be used to develop the criteria for potential actions to be financed and the development of performance measures, including schedules and milestones. While approval of the Community Benefits Program as described in the Framework would be included in CEQA approval, specifics regarding implementation of the program would continue to be developed and finalized, with community input, after that approval. Appendix 3G was revised to include potential actions that would improve emergency response capabilities or address water contamination events. The revision does not result in a change to an impact determination or

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		require additional mitigation measures to which DWR is unwilling to commit. Please also refer to response to comment 302-7 regarding Delta flows.
302-19	Chapter 31 on Growth Inducement. In section 31.1 there is a statement "Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment." The chapter goes on extensively to document the high value to areas outside of the "surrounding environment," to areas like Santa Clara Valley, San Joaquin Valley, Southern California, etc. I don't believe discussion on the value of the exports is what people are looking for in a chapter on Growth Inducement. Taken in combination with the section on community benefits, it seems like the business advantage and differentiator for the local area, water availability, is being taken away by shipping the water to other communities so they can benefit. The next manufacturing plant does not come to the local area due to its good supply of water but instead goes to another town far away because this project makes it possible for that other town. More should be said about the local area in this chapter and less about the value to other parts of the state. This project appears to reduce the Delta area's ability to compete with other areas, limiting local growth not enhancing it.	Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, meets the requirements of CEQA to evaluate the potential indirect or direct growth induced by a project. The requirements are meant to identify if there would be indirect or direct growth induced, and then to identify any potentially significant impacts that may occur as a result of direct or indirect growth inducement. The potential of a project to limit growth is not the objective or requirement of the disclosure of information in the growth inducement chapter. For potential socioeconomic benefits, or effects, as a result of the Delta Conveyance Project, please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. For potential regional effects as a result of the Delta Conveyance Project, please see Appendix 17A, Regional Economic Effects of Water Conveyance Facility Construction.
302-20	Thank you again for the opportunity to supply these comments. I look forward to hearing the DWR response on these items that I have pointed out.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
309-1	I say no to the tunnels. Diverting massive amounts of water away from the Delta is to kill the Delta and all of its ecosystems and life. NO.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
310-1	Hello, please do not export our water from the California delta for corporate agricultural purposes.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
310-2	The fish and animals that live in the Delta have always depended on a certain flow of water, which is at a minimum these days with low rain amounts. Especially the salmonids. Please do not fall victim to corporate greed for sucking such a vital resource from its native habit.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta mentioned in the comment. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative in Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions.
313-1	Please do not approve the delta conveyance. Pumping fresh water from the Delta into the proposed pipelines would only exacerbate the current challenges and salinity infiltration into the Delta and valley farmland.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. Please refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, which considers how salinity in irrigation water can affect crop yields. Operation of the project would remain in compliance with all water quality standards set by the State Water Resources Control Board to be protective of Delta agricultural beneficial uses.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
313-2	This seems to be a plan to protect "water exporters" and not protect the resource itself, the customers, or the state. I understand there have been huge donations made to Governor Newsom from companies that benefit from this proposal at the cost to smaller farmers and the rest of citizens of California and natural life. The public is slowly waking up to the misuse of our resources and will no longer tolerate the abuse of this precious resource. Do not allow politics and greed to interfere with protecting our natural resources.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
315-1	I fully support the No Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because, you will be causing seawater intrusion up the Sacramento River.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
316-1	I fully support the NO Tunnel Option for the Delta Conveyance Project because it would negatively impact all aspects of the Delta: Farming, wildlife/fish habitat, environmental & recreational concerns.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR regarding an analysis of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources, including those raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of potentially significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to agriculture. Please see Chapter 16, Recreation, which analyzes the project's potential impacts on recreation, which were determined to be less than significant.
316-2	Please don’t destroy the Hamlet I’ve come to love and call home!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to response to comment 316-1 regarding the EIR’s analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
317-1	It's going to be a blemish on the beauty of the Delta!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, for a discussion of the visual impacts of the project and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
318-1	It will destroy the environment!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
321-1	It has been forever since we communicated. I have read through Chapter 19 of the EIR report, Cultural. I am quite shocked that there is no mention of any legacy towns as built environments, Hood, Courtland, Locke, Walnut Grove, Isleton and Rio Vista.	As described in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, the study area for cultural resources (the area in which an environmental impact could occur) is defined as the 0.25-mile area buffer around the project footprint, which is the combined footprint of all project alternatives. The area of impact for built-environment resources (AI-BE) is the area in which potential impacts on built-environment historical resources from field investigations, construction, operations, and maintenance of the project alternatives could occur. As described in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, sufficient research was conducted using online and in-person repositories to identify historical resources within the AI-BE. The analysis contained in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, demonstrates that sufficient research, documentation, and analysis was conducted to identify historical resources within the AI-BE. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the study area for resources analyzed in Chapters 7-32. Please also see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, regarding the approach to evaluating study area boundaries, which vary for each resource topic depending on impact mechanisms and the extent of the area in which impacts are expected to occur for a resource. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
321-2	I need you to help me to see if I miss the part in relation to the legacy towns somewhere in the EIR, I don't want to make any wrong accusation.	Please see response to comment 321-1 regarding the consideration of these towns in the analysis.
323-1	I registered but never got a link!	DWR responded to all requests for additional information and weblinks within the comment period.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
324-1	I am a homeowner and resident of Stockton, California. I oppose the delta conveyance project. I care very much for the stewardship of the delta region, the environment, wildlife, family farms and agriculture. No delta tunnels.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative and commenter preference for the No Project Alternative.
325-1	Thank you for the opportunity to make a public comment.	This information describes general introductory information. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
325-2	I am a native Californian and I'm totally opposed to the Delta Tunnel. Here's why -CA voters have voted it down - twice	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, the section titled Intended Uses of This Final EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities in Chapter 1 describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
325-3	I am a native Californian and I'm totally opposed to the Delta Tunnel. Here's why - in the face of climate change we shouldn’t be building this	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project’s ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
325-4	I am a native Californian and I'm totally opposed to the Delta Tunnel. Here's why - it is time for water rights to be re-adjusted to have more emphasis on the environment and downstream users/recreation	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the water rights process. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding water rights and contracts.
325-5	I am a native Californian and I'm totally opposed to the Delta Tunnel. Here's why - as decided by many court and biological opinions, we need more water going downstream out the bay: 40 – 60% - yes, that does mean we will have a contraction of the Ag industry in CA - but guess what, we are already having a construction of the Ag industry in CA	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
325-6	I am a native Californian and I'm totally opposed to the Delta Tunnel. Here's why - Lastly, we can no longer afford the CO2 emissions from a meg project like this, unless the project itself helps reduce emissions - that's why we should dump the tunnel and focus on our states resources on High Speed Rail	Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding project impacts and proposed mitigation related to greenhouse gas emissions. As described in Chapter 23, most potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant with mitigation. However, there could be significant and unavoidable impacts for AQ-5, result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial localized criteria pollutant emissions, and AQ-6 (for Alternatives 2a and 4a) result in exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminant emissions. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and scope of alternatives considered. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding sources.
326-1	It is disheartening but not surprising on the real agenda behind this document. Personal interest and outside benefactors to the water flowing through the state of California receive priority over its own citizens. It's just another list of a thousand showing the corruption in our government and agencies that have long forgotten their citizens. NO on the Delta Conveyance tunnel project. Even a second grader can see the ignorance of this proposal. The people are waking up and you will no longer be able to pass such items through. We stand for each other, our environment, our animals, and for the one true God of creation.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits.
327-1	Stop the delta tunnel project!!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
328-1	This project will drain the Delta River system of hundreds of millions of gallons of water, severely impacting both the human population and the natural wildlife in the area.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5 through 32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, in Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
328-2	The water crisis is only going to worsen, and LA needs to have a more dynamic, long term solution, rather than pillaging our natural resources.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Common Response 3 also contains information regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
329-1	I am against the Delta Conveyance Project. Building and operating the Delta Conveyance would have many negative impacts on Delta communities, including the loss of farmland, more saline water and less crops.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7 - 32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities, agriculture, and salinity. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for an analysis of potentially significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to agriculture. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) resulting from facility operations and maintenance, which were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in the impact analysis for Chapter 9, the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedances of water quality objectives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
329-2	Building it [the DCP project] would involve over 13 years of disruptive construction across six counties with more than four million truck trips on Delta roads. That greatly increases the risk of accidents.	Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding the analysis of potential transportation impacts. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects to local and regional roadways including Interstate 5, SR 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road and Hood-Franklin Road, discussed in Chapter 20, section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation.
329-3	Also, many communities would experience poorer air quality, increased noise, less agriculture, and loss of aesthetics.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta mentioned in the comment.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to response to comment 329-1 regarding the impact analysis related to agricultural resources and the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gases, which includes quantitative modeling and proposed mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, regarding potential noise impacts and mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, for a discussion of the visual impacts of the project and the mitigation proposed to reduce these effects.
330-1	I would [like] to voice my concern and objection to the delta conveyance project. I believe it will have strong adverse impacts to the environment and the surrounding communities.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to the table Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Executive Summary for a list of CEQA impact determinations on all resources evaluated. As shown in this table, the analysis in the EIR concludes that most significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
330-2	The state's atrocities in water management can go no further. NO TO THE DELTA TUNNELS.	Please see response to comment 330-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
332-1	No Delta Tunnel! The project now seemingly including one tunnel does not provide enough data on long term environmental impacts. It is certain that as is once the Delta Tunnel is completed there would be significant negative impact on our Rivers causing toxic algae levels. Dams that slow flow add to the increasing toxic algal blooms that we have seen in our rivers in recent years.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and regarding the CEQA environmental baseline. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact of project alternatives would be less than significant. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms and the water quality impact analysis.
332-2	The Delta Tunnel is linked to the proposed Sites River and together the projects would take much more water from our rivers, Bay and Delta.	The Sites Reservoir Project is included on the cumulative project list in Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, and in the cumulative analysis in each of the resources chapters as appropriate. The Sites Reservoir Project is an independent project, being pursued by an independent agency. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations.
333-1	Get Southern California to stop watering their lawns first...then we'll talk about desalination plants as a cheaper option.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding the alternatives screening process, the range and scope of alternatives considered, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
334-1	I have enjoyed the California Delta my entire life. I began water skiing there with my family in the 60s. We called the Delta, "The Sloughs." My father spent time boating and skiing there in his youth as well. He introduced his family to this wonderful playground in the 60s.	This information describes background of the individual commenter and general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
334-2	My husband and I have a boat we keep on Bethel Island and love boating year-round. I have been dismayed by the serious algae blooms found in areas of the Delta during the summer. Less fresh water, as a result of the Conveyance Project can only further degrade our beautiful Delta.	Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact of project alternatives would be less than significant. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms and the water quality impact analysis. Please refer to the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, in Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Chapter 5 provides the simulated changes in river conditions which demonstrate that long-term average monthly flows under project operations would be similar to existing conditions. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding project operations. DWR is committed to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
334-3	California has always led the country in innovative environmental policies. The Delta Conveyance plan as it looks to me will be a monument to the destruction of the nation's largest estuary west of the Mississippi. Once we destroy the land and water we cannot easily reverse the impact. Ours to protect or destroy. These are consequential choices	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources.
335-1	The purpose of this email is to provide draft review comments for the Delta Conveyance Project EIR Draft Review.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
335-2	1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY section: Impacts and correlation between ecology and hydrology pre- and post- projects should be highlighted/better defined in the executive summary. It is difficult to go through all the documents and find out climate change as well as project impacts to salmon sensitivity to flows.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. Please also see the following sections in Chapter 30, Climate Change: Climate Change Trends and Associated Impacts on the Study Area; Impacts of the No Project Alternative with Climate Change; and Impacts of the Project Alternatives with Climate Change. An analysis of potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures for fish and aquatic species is provided in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources.
335-3	Appx05A_SectionB_Modeling_Technical_Appendix_Hydrology_Systems_Operations_Modeling section: This chapter noted that CalSim3 cannot be fully calibrated. The existing condition flows later in the same appendix chapter appears not suitable for aquatic animals. Flow monitoring should be compared to calibrate how realistic the flows are.	Please see Common Response 9, Hydraulic Modeling, regarding comments about model assumptions, uncertainties, and limitations. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of the appropriate CEQA baseline for the analysis in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
335-4	Looking forward to your response and the inclusion of these detailed and technical concepts being discussed in the next Draft or Final Update.	This information describes general concluding text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
336-1	This is a crazy, environmentally HORRIFIC idea and you guys must STOP this from happening. With drought and destruction of our wildlands this is a crushing blow to our fish and wildlife and a huge taxpayer welfare giveaway. STOP THE DELTA TUNNEL!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding sources.
337-1	No, no, no. Leave the river alone.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
338-1	Please do not do further damage to the delta by building any tunnels. The delta is a fragile area that needs all the water it has and shouldn't have to lose any to Southern California. The delta is an important Northern California ecosystem and should be left alone.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting all regulatory requirements. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
339-1	I am opposed to this project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
339-2	I live in Southern California, and we waste so much water. We should conserve more water, and recycle water first, before stealing this pristine natural water from Northern California.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments about infrastructure and water management alternatives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Demand Management, Water Conservation, and Other Actions by Participating Water Agencies, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
339-3	Fish populations will be decimated if you do this.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts on fish are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation.
339-4	Farmers in the central valley waste so much water too. They can plant less water-intensive crops and do more drip irrigation to be more efficient with water use.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Demand Management, Water Conservation, and Other Actions by Participating Water Agencies, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
341-1	Hello, I am opposed to the Project because we as Californians are not doing enough to value water as a truly precious resource. If we were, we would be working harder to	The No Project Alternative, one of the feasible alternatives considered in the EIR, includes ongoing and possible future actions related to water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	incorporate conservation and efficiency into our everyday household, commercial, and agricultural practices. The public has shown, and continues to show, that it will answer calls to action: [internal web link] Water use drops significantly in Santa Clara County; drought targets met by increased conservation (mercurynews.com) To be specific regarding the Draft EIR, it does not include any analysis of an alternative that would promote conservation and efficiency as a means to improve water supply reliability.	projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments that suggest infrastructure and water management alternatives, and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, for a description of the effects of implementing the No Project alternative. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
342-1	I am completely disappointed and frustrated with the state agencies (specifically the DWR, the Governor, et al) responsible for the health and welfare of the state treasure known as the Delta. You are tasked with the co-equal goals of utilizing this resource for the benefit of the citizens, while protecting it and its denizens.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and co-equal goals.
342-2	While you have done a good job of providing water to farmers (even in the desert of the West Side San Joaquin Valley) and Southern California lawns and pools, your track record on enforcing the precepts of the Endangered Species Act is miserably poor. Historic runs of Salmon and Delta smelt are nearly extinct. Almonds exported to China should not take precedence over species protection, even in the face of mega political donations. It is very apparent where your priorities currently lie.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
342-3	You are already over-pumping the Delta, causing excessive expansion of gross environmental damage, weeds, chemicals, and insufficient flows. The implementation of the proposed conveyance project would further exacerbate the issues and is wholly unsupported by science and guarantees complete destruction of this irreplaceable resource. Coupled with the decision to turn down the Desalinization plant in SoCal, these choices are completely idiotic.	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Please refer to Chapters 7 through 32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including impacts on water quality and proposed mitigation in Chapter 9, Water Quality. Please refer to response to comment 342-2 regarding DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science in the preparation of the EIR. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, and project operations.
342-4	The state must start making hard choices. 1) Reduce the flows, not increasing.	Please see responses to comments 342-2 and 342-3 regarding reducing exports, project operations, and surface water flows.
342-5	The state must start making hard choices. 2) Cut off unsustainable farms on the West Side.	Please see response to comment 342-2 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
342-6	The state must start making hard choices. 3) Eliminate lawns and pools in SoCal.	Please see response to comment 342-2 regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports and existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
342-7	The state must start making hard choices. 4) Establish proper flows BEFORE you start pumping even more.	Please see response to comment 342-3 regarding project operations and surface water flows.
342-8	You can Not allow further degradation of this West Coast estuary.	Please refer to response to comment 342-2 regarding DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
343-1	ACROSS 6 COUNTIES 13 YEARS OF DESTRUCTION ALMOST 5,000 TRUCKS ON CONGESTED BROKEN ROADS ALREADY OVERLOADED BY BIG RIGS AND ACCIDENTS ALMOST 4,000 ACRES OF REDUCED CROPS BY SALINE, ETC DISRUPTIVE CONSTRUCTION AND DESTRUCTION NOT CONSTRUCTIVE TO ANY ONE OF US Just stop it already!!!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding transportation analysis and proposed mitigation measures, and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agricultural resources and proposed mitigation measures in the Delta.
344-1	AGAINST this Delta pipe project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
345-1	Desalination is the way of the future, stop raping the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives such as desalination.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
346-1	Please don't pass this plan [the DCP]. The environmental impact, the cost and the water impact are not worth it and would be disastrous.	Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, regarding potential changes to surface water resources that could result from implementation of the project alternatives. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about project costs.
348-1	Dear California Department of Water Resources: I am writing to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, and general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
348-2	General Concerns (Unaddressed) -A reduction of water flows will impact dozens of marinas, launches, ramps, public docks, riverside businesses and even the public infrastructure (bridges, private agriculture pumps, thousands of miles of levees and sloughs, etc.). -Our communities have been built and planned around the waterways, including some with historic importance and significance (e.g. the Boathouse in the town of Locke). -Although much of the large-scale transport (via the river) occurs in the deep-water channel, there is significant use of the Sacramento River by large recreational and working watercraft (cranes, barges, etc.). Undoubtedly, the function of some of the aforementioned boats and ships will be	Please see Chapters 7–32 regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources which address the issues raised in the comment. As stated in Chapter 5, Surface Water, longer-term average monthly flows for the project alternatives are expected to be similar to existing conditions. Please see Chapter 7, Flood Protection, regarding flood protection and levees in the Delta, Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding agricultural and environmental resources in the Delta, Chapter 16, Recreation, regarding analysis of impacts on recreational activities, and Chapter 17 Socioeconomics, regarding evaluation of socioeconomic effects on businesses in the Delta. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	impacted…including the perennial levy repairs on all sections of the river system. -Levy repairs are currently being made using historic river flows (and water levels), a significant reduction in flows will certainly impact past, current and future public safety improvement projects…billions of dollars in repairs over the past two decades (on levees designed to protect/convey, based on historic flows/levels).	regarding comments about property tax revenue effects and costs to taxpayers and Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding comments about the evaluation of recreational opportunities. All recreation impacts were determined to be less than significant.
348-3	Personal Concerns	This information describes general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
348-4	-I am concerned about the potential impact on property values (I am one of many landowners contiguous to the river). This includes the direct impact because of a changed/altered waterway, but also the impacts on properties adjacent to the intakes and tunnels (that will affect the general property values in the area).	The EIR evaluates the socioeconomic effects of the project. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for more information regarding socioeconomic effects and proposed mitigation measures. Please refer to the Chapter 17 section titled Government and Finance in the Delta Region for information on local government finance for the six counties in the Delta region, including details on public revenues and expenditures such as property values.
348-5	I have yet to see a plan (overview of impacts, mitigation, etc.) for the thousands of private docks and marinas up and down the Sacramento Delta.	The EIR presents and analyzes recreation and boating activities in detail in Chapter 16, Recreation. See the Description of Existing Conditions in the Study Area for description of recreation resources, including boating and marinas. Impacts on those resources are analyzed and discussed in Chapter 16, in the section titled Environmental Impacts. There were no significant adverse impacts identified for recreation and boating or on marinas. Therefore, there are no specific recreation mitigation measures.
348-6	-The impact on my private well and the aquifer is unknown, but it is likely to be tremendous. I am concerned about both the quantity and quality of the well water (our only water source) with a compromised river flow.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, regarding groundwater resources in the Delta. As described in Chapter 8, Impact GW-2 evaluates the changes to groundwater elevations across the region and Impact GW-7 assesses changes to groundwater gradient and their corresponding impacts on water quality. The analysis within Chapter 8 concludes that Impact GW-2

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and Impact GW-7 would be less than significant.
348-7	-Impacts during construction (accessibility and more) – how much impact will there be because of closed roads during the months/years of construction? Many of us have only one or two routes in and out of the area.	The EIR evaluates potential impacts on transportation in the Delta region. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding transportation analysis and proposed mitigation measures. Please see Common Response 14, Transportation, regarding the methodology and approach to impact analysis.
348-8	It is erroneous at best, deceiving at worst, for the State to conclude that water conveyance of this magnitude will have minimal or no impact on me as a property owner, or on us as a community. Further, I am not aware of any significant mitigation measures being discussed or proposed. This is unconscionable. I cannot think of any project, public or private, that is not required to address losses to impacted stakeholders.	Project impact conclusions made in the EIR were performed under CEQA requirements. Please see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, in the section titled Approach to CEQA Analysis for information regarding methods used to determine project impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed where project impacts are determined to be significant. Please see the Executive Summary section titled Approaches for Addressing Potential Environmental Impacts for information regarding methods for mitigating project impacts. In addition to mitigation measures please see Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, for more commitments made by project proponents, beyond the mitigation measures required by CEQA.
348-9	Finally, it is UNFAIR to local residents and businesses who have been obliged to monitor the progress on this ever-changing project. Locals have collectively spent thousands of hours gathering information and sorting through the volumes of data in an attempt to understand this project. Arguably, project proponents have even intentionally hidden behind and distracted stakeholders with the never-ending changes - in a very purposeful war of attrition.	Please see Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for information about public outreach requirements. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and DWR's extension of the comment period, the public meetings held during the public review period for the Draft EIR, and for additional information regarding public outreach requirements and activities.
348-10	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	The contact information provided by the commenter has been added to project email list as requested.
349-1	Dear Governor Newsom and the CA Dept. of Water Resources, I urge you to reject the Delta Tunnel project and instead rein in the water abuses by big agribusiness and fossil fuel	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Chapter 1 section titled Intended

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	corporations. This tunnel project is not a solution to our water problems, but a gift to big corporations at the expense of everyday Californians. Despite our ongoing drought, big almond growers who make billions exporting these water intensive crops have expanded their production and water use. Oil corporations continue to apply for and are granted permits for new oil drilling, despite their dirty product driving the climate crisis and the drought. Pouring billions of dollars into the Delta Tunnel won't help our long-term water situation. It would also have a negative impact on the vital local wildlife habitat and further degrade the Delta's water quality. Reject the Delta Tunnel. Reject taxpayer handouts for Big Ag and Big Oil. Invest in people-first infrastructure in California.	Uses of This Final EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and plant species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on species and habitats. As shown in these chapters, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. An analysis of potential water quality impacts associated with the project is provided in Chapter 9, Water Quality, and such impacts were determined to be less than significant. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The project would be a part of the State Water Project, and as described in Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
352-1	Ladies and Gentlemen: I am sending a hard copy of my comments regarding the Delta Tunnel project to you via U. S.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, and general

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Mail. They are essentially the same as what appears below: [see comments 2-5]	introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
352-2	I would like to share my own personal thoughts with you regarding the proposed delta tunnel project. I live in Rio Vista, a city where we drink ground water whose source is aquifers charged by percolation from rain and the Sacramento River. The success of our city is highly dependent upon the success of our farmers. Yes, we did thrive on gas royalties for many years. Yes, there are lucrative wind farms owned by non-local corporations nearby. And yes, legalized local cannabis growers are helpful. The local Del Chiaro brothers used to farm asparagus on Sherman Island, but they were forced to sell out to the State when salt incursion into their irrigation water from the river decimated their crop yields. As more water is drawn out of the Sacramento River (via the Delta Cross Channel at Walnut Grove,) the salinity downstream increases to levels unsuitable for irrigation or drinking. As you know, Cross Channel water ends up in Southern CA, via the Tracy pumps and the leaky, open-air CA Aqueduct.	This information describes the background of the individual and clarification on the submittal of the comment letter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple resources in the Delta. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, regarding impact analysis of groundwater aquifers and proposed mitigation measures, Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding impact analysis of agricultural farming and proposed mitigation measures, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding socioeconomic effects on agriculture and proposed mitigation measures.
352-3	In So. Cal. You have an entire ocean beside which you can build desalination plants driven by green energy from coastal winds and sunshine. And we should all be using grey water for urban landscaping…but most of us don't have the plumbing in our homes to do that.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives, including desalination and water recycling projects.
352-4	Our state's current water situation is not a pretty one. Governor Brown's relatively "inexpensive" $7B Peripheral Canal was rejected by the taxpayers, years ago because it was too pricey. But the southern interests have not given up…they	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	still want our water, and they still want us to help pay for it. This isn't just unfair…this is crazy! Please kill this ill-advised measure before it divides us into 2 (or 3) different states!	Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to taxpayers.
352-5	Thanks for considering my thoughts.	This information is general concluding text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
353-1	I am deeply saddened to hear that the Delta Tunnel is still being pushed by the Newsom administration. I cannot for the life of me understand how this bad solution is still under consideration, by a supposedly progressive state government. Know that decisions you are making have world impact. Please reconsider.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
353-2	I was raised in California, owned land in Trinity County, and now live in North Carolina.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
354-1	And, you know, I (personally) am really tired of footing the bill for people who've decided to live in (what was) a desert, have their lush landscaping and their fancy swimming pools at MY expense. Please pass the bill on to those who are using and abusing our precious water resources.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about costs to taxpayers. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
355-1	Why do you not listen? We do not want the tunnels! We have not voted for tunnels!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
356-1	I urge you to reject the Delta Tunnel project and to instead rein in egregious water abuses by big agribusiness and fossil fuel corporations. This tunnel project is not a solution to our water problems, it is an unnecessary gift to big corporations at the expense of everyday Californians.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
357-1	There's a lot that can be done from a water conservation standpoint before this tunnel should even be considered.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments about suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives.
358-1	Don't succumb to agribusiness and it's dream of Tunnel Vision — paying to take water from the people and open the spigots to a small number of profiteering corporations and millionaires. Don't opt to poor taxpayer dollars (and nature's increasingly rare water reserves) down a "hole in the ground."	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about costs to taxpayers.
359-1	implement more stringent water infrastructure improvements to curb general waste. Northern California should not be diverting its precious resource (water) to egregious use in Southern/Central California where they maintain egregiously high water consumption in places that are essentially ecologically desert or near desert in terms of soil and weather. Golf courses and lush lawns, swimming pools, massive fracking, agricultural drain etc. is just wrong and should not be shouldered by other areas who are also struggling with	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	shortages and where the ecological ramifications are so huge. Southern California has been sucking and enjoying water poached from tender resources in the South West since the beginning and now that they have drained those are crying for ours? Where does it end? When Northern California suffers desertification? It's already experiencing lower than low lake levels, drying springs and wells, even oaks and other forest trees are showing the ravages of drought.	Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
359-2	Stop fracking, stop wasting time on these sad and destructive ineffective temporary fixes and get fully serious about changing the future to clean energy-- that means no nuclear and yes to roof-top solar!! Solar shade in parking lots, on top of commercial buildings, all new construction. We must do this now. You can't cut off the top of the blanket and sew it on the bottom and get a longer blanket, you just end up with a damaged stitched up blanket.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
360-1	Another appalling idea. Why continue this when there is such a terrible drought? And there just isn't the infrastructure for all the building. Agribusiness is irresponsible in the extreme!	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
361-1	Water should stay within the drainage basin where it originated. It is a valuable resource to the people, wildlife and farmers in the region. It is not the property of any other economic high-rollers.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
362-1	Spend the money on helping agriculture install much more efficient systems, or convert to less water-intensive crops. We must think long term.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments about suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
363-1	I have watched the tunnel project with horror for years now. The current version is no better than the past ones. I urge you to reject the Delta Tunnel project and instead rein in the water abuses by big agribusiness and fossil fuel corporations.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
365-1	I'm tired of paying for water projects that benefit only agriculture! They use 80% of the water in our state, so why aren't they paying 80% of water development projects!?	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about costs to taxpayers.
366-1	I am sending this letter to protest the proposed building of the tunnel between Hood and Byron for several reasons; pollution, cost, lack of information about future impacts of the project, and lack of stable cost benefit analysis.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapters 7–32 regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for multiple environmental resources, including analysis of air pollution in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases. Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, contains information regarding the analysis of potential socioeconomic effects on the Delta communities, agriculture, and businesses. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, a Community Benefits Program was developed to address local effects that may occur. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for more details regarding the Community Benefits Program and a project-related benefit-cost analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
366-2	You refer to dumped tunnel boring material as “reusable tunnel material.’ But that’s not what it is called. It is called Tunnel Muck. They call it muck because it is foul mud. I object to you dumping this muck on Delta Islands. We live here. How would you like it if it was dumped in your back yard? This muck needs to be hauled away to an appropriate waste facility, not dumped on beautiful Delta Island. There has not been an adequate analysis of this muck and what can be done with it. We need a full report on what is in the muck and whether or not it can really be reused or will sit in the Delta until it dries up and blows away, creating dust storms.	Basic information about Reusable Tunnel Material can be seen in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Reusable Tunnel Material. For additional information please see Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, section titled Evaluation of Construction Activities, subsection titled Reusable Tunnel Material, for additional information on the disposal of Reusable Tunnel Material. The potential impacts associated with excavation and storage of reusable tunnel material are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR.
366-3	I understand that this Project will consume 1396 additional gigawatts above what the State Water Project now uses, but you are not proposing any mitigation measures to offset this huge increase in electricity consumption. Why is it that I have to pay $13 to buy a lightbulb that used to cost 98 cents because we all have to conserve electricity to fight climate change, but you, the state, do nothing? Is this fair? Are you setting a goof example for the public? Do as I say not as I do doesn’t cut it in my book. Please put together conservation measures to offset this huge increase in electricity usage.	Please see Chapter 22, Energy, which analyzes impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the Delta Conveyance Project. As described in the analysis, less-than-significant or no impacts are anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.
367-1	I am a 25-year resident of the Delta and am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel). In the past 25 years, I have served for 6 years on the Rio Vista Planning Division, 8 years on the City Council (4 of those years as Mayor), and 3 years on the Delta Protection Commission Board. I am currently a member of the National Heritage Area Management Plan Advisory Committee.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
367-2	I strongly oppose the "new" water conveyance, as I have opposed all the projects since the Peripheral Canal proposal. I oppose moving water to the southern San Joaquin Valley and	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the Los Angeles area, particularly as it would be to the significant detriment to the fertile and productive San Joaquin Delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, as well as a detailed explanation of the history and complex issues that have led to the development of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts dating as far back as the early 1960s are described under the section titled Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Chapters 7–32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including impacts on agriculture.
367-3	I am deeply concerned about the proposed Delta Tunnel and the negative impacts it would have on water availability for the Delta, the ability of agriculture to be sustainable in many parts of the Delta, and the impact on wildlife, particularly the large areas in the Pacific Flyway necessary for overwintering birds.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding water availability. Chapters 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, acknowledge that the changes to surface water resources and water supply are evaluated and disclosed, but CEQA impact determinations are not made. CEQA impact determinations are not made because the impacts associated with changes to surface water and water supply are associated with other resources dependent on hydrology or water supply. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the evaluation of water-dependent resources that consider changes in water supply or surface water. Please also refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on agriculture. While Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 were found to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce the extent of these impacts, and Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation. The project is not expected to affect the overall ability of the Delta region to sustain agriculture. Please also refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife, including sensitive habitats and birds. Overall, the impacts on wildlife were found to be less than significant with mitigation.
367-4	The DEIR is inadequate and fails to outline and address the true extent of the environmental impacts that will likely occur. In looking at the route of the proposed project, Alternative 5, the severe damage the tunnel would have on farmland, towns, and water availability is staggering.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. The EIR discloses potential changes in water supply and evaluates potentially significant environmental impacts on agriculture, land use, and other resources as required by CEQA. Please refer to response to comment 367-3 regarding changes in water supply and water availability. Please refer to response to comment 367-3 regarding potential agriculture impacts. Efforts to avoid or lessen agricultural impacts included reducing the extent of permanent conversion of farmland during the early planning processes and targeting areas temporarily affected with land reclamation and remediation for return to agriculture. As discussed in the summary comparison of Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, impacts and mitigation are considered using a conservative methodology for determining agricultural impacts (e.g., estimate of loss accounting for remnant farmland).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Chapter 14, Land Use, which identifies impacts as less than significant. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
367-5	The Delta has some of the richest and most valuable farmland in California providing a variety of fruits, vegetables, and grains for export to other parts of the country and the world. Starting in the 1980s the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has actively pursued an unsustainable water conveyance system that would remove freshwater flows from the Delta for the benefit of other parts of the state, including water for what is basically a desert in the San Joaquin Valley. The current water crisis is severe, and due to climate change is likely to get worse. Sacrificing the rich Delta farmland for marginal farmland does not make sense.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 367-2 regarding a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis.
367-6	I do not see how the small historic Legacy community of Hood could survive the impact of the truck traffic and hauling that would be necessary to build the intakes.	The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has developed specific construction management requirements, discussed in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation in Chapter 20, Transportation, for the contractor to reduce potential impacts on the regional transportation system serving the community of Hood. These

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		requirements include (1) prohibiting construction traffic on State Route 160 except during connection of highway relocations and repaving; (2) requiring all construction traffic to use a new haul road located adjacent to the abandoned railroad track embankment; (3) establishing a park-and-ride lot near the Interstate 5 Hood-Franklin Road offramp and requiring use of the lot by most construction workers at the intakes; and (4) prohibiting all construction traffic along Hood-Franklin Road to electric vans that would move all workers from the park-and-ride lot to the intakes and the crossing of this road by the new haul road. The park-and-ride facility that would be constructed on the east side of the I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange would be designed to provide adequate parking to consolidate worker vehicles and allow for conveying workers to the intake sites on clean fuel buses or vans. A new intake haul road would also be constructed by DWR between Lambert Road, crossing Hood-Franklin Road and accessing the Alternative 5 Intakes B and C. These specific DWR-developed construction management and design requirements would avoid the use of SR 160 and Hood-Franklin Road (west of Snodgrass Slough) to access the Alternative 5 Intakes, thereby reducing potential traffic impacts on the community of Hood.
367-7	According to Table ES-4, the water supply for the State Water Project (SWP) would only be increased by approximately 543-thousand-acre feet annually during the contract year. However, water would continue to be diverted through the tunnels even during dry conditions. Currently, salinity is increasing in the Delta. Already, farmers just south of Rio Vista often cannot pump needed water for crops due to the increased salinity. This would worsen and creep further upriver if the tunnel is built and more water is diverted through the Delta to the south.	The comment assertion regarding worsening water quality for crops is not consistent with the analyses contained in Chapter 9, Water Quality and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources. Chapter 9 provides a complete analysis of the project impacts on Delta salinity. The water quality impact analysis concludes that there could be some increases in EC (Impact WQ-5) at some Delta locations in some months but impacts on these constituents would be less than significant. For example, in the Sacramento River at Rio Vista, the modeled average increase in EC would be less than 10 umhos/cm in 10 of 12 months (refer to the Chapter 9 table titled Monthly Average Electrical Conductivity [in micromhos per centimeter] at Delta Assessment Locations for the Full Simulation Period under Alternatives 1 and 3, and Difference from Existing Conditions and similar tables for other alternatives evaluated), and less than 15 umhos/cm in the remaining months. In

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		addition, Project facilities would be operated in real-time to meet EC objectives, and other regulatory, legal, and contractual requirements at the time and at the same frequency that occurs under existing conditions. Thus, the project would not degrade EC by measurable levels on a long-terms basis such that water quality would be made discernibly worse. A detailed description of the modeling tools and approach, including a description of the modeling limitations, is provided in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. The Chapter 15 section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Farmland Productivity describes how the timing and magnitude of the increases in EC would not result in substantial effects to cropland that currently receive somewhat saline irrigation water.
367-8	Climate change cannot be ignored. California has been in drought conditions for the past 12 years; this will likely get worse. Even this year, at the end of November, there ahs been only a minute rain in the valley and snow in the mountains. The DEIR has assumed that water will be available from the watershed as it has in the past. However, it is clear that water will be less available as climate change progresses, yet the plan to move water from north to south has not changed.	The EIR provides an analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding observed trends and projected impacts of climate change, including drought, on water quality and supply in California. Additionally, please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, for more information regarding potential changes to water availability in the study area. The analysis in Chapter 30 describes how projected changes in precipitation and temperature as a result of climate change will lead to more variable runoff in the Delta, which will increase the severity of dry and wet conditions in the region. The project alternatives are expected to make California's water system more resilient to climate change by capturing and moving excess flows from locations where runoff is projected to increase to locations that face reduced water availability. Please see Appendix 5B, Surface Water 2040 Analysis, for more information regarding future changes to surface water resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
367-9	Although the DEIR claims that biological impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels, this is not the case.	The assertion that the impacts on biological resources would not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures on terrestrial biological resources are evaluated in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. With the implementation of the environmental commitments described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices, the mitigation measures described in Chapter 13, and the Compensatory Mitigation Plan found in Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, the impacts on terrestrial biological resources would be avoided, minimized, and compensated for to a less-than-significant level.
367-10	Over 4,000 acres of prime agricultural land would be significantly impacted and/or removed from cultivation. The Delta has traditionally been the market basket for California and beyond. Decreasing viability of ag land in the Delta to prop up ag [sic] in the desert of the San Joaquin Valley is not an intelligent decision, and only supports the large farms and water districts south of the Delta.	The comment states that the project will result in conversion of thousands of acres of prime farmland within the Delta, which is an important agricultural region for the state and beyond. This issue is carefully considered in the EIR. The EIR provides a detailed analysis of the effect of the project on prime farmland and other Important Farmland types in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources. As described in Chapter 15, less than 1% of Important Farmland within the study area would be affected by construction of the project. While the conversion of Important Farmland within the study area would be considered significant, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would require that any permanently converted Important Farmland be mitigated at an acreage ratio of at least 1:1 through a combination of acquisition and dedication of agricultural land, acquisition of development rights or conservation easements to permanently protect agricultural land, or payment of in-lieu fees to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such real property interests by a third party. Additionally. Appendix 15B, Agricultural and Land Stewardship Considerations, describes the methodology employed during the initial siting and design process to greatly minimize the extent of farmland that would be permanently converted.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
367-11	The issue of water and fish habitat is serious and of great concern. Without the fishery that exists in the Delta all wildlife and tourism would be negatively affected. The Delta depends on tourism to further the economy. Without fish and tourism the economy in the heart of the Delta may fail. The DEIR does not take aquatic conditions into account.	Economic effects related to recreation and tourism, including fishing and wildlife viewing, are addressed in ECON-5 in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Potential impacts on aquatic resources attributable to construction, operation, and maintenance of the Delta Conveyance Project are addressed in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation.
367-12	The delta smelt is almost gone; other species are in danger and disappearing. Other species that depend on fish will decline. Salmon runs are vital not only to the health of the Delta waterways but the health of the San Francisco Bay estuary and the salmon fisheries in the Pacific Ocean. These salmon runs have been seriously impacted by lack of water in the rivers and will be further depleted if more water is taken out of the Delta.	The comment does not directly concern the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. Regarding potential changes in flow downstream of the new north Delta intakes (and other potential effects), as shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, the analysis concludes that Impacts AQUA-1 through AQUA-19 would be less than significant after mitigation for all alternatives.
367-13	I have grave concern about the impacts on wildlife, particularly in the preserves nearest the project. 1. The area just east of the construction of the two intakes is Stone Lakes Nature Preserve, a dedicated wildlife area that not only is an important wintering ground for migrating water birds, but a permanent sanctuary for many kinds of wildlife. Not only would Stone Lakes be negatively impacted by the construction and ongoing operation of the intakes, but the traffic along the Hood-Franklin Road would permanently disrupt the operations and viability of the preserve.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources mentioned in the comment. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts, environmental commitments, and mitigation measures regarding wildlife in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Please see, for example, the discussion of impacts on sandhill cranes, which roost and forage the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, in Impact BIO-33. This analysis concludes that impacts on sandhill cranes would be avoided, minimized, and compensated for to a less-than-significant level. See also the following mitigation measures and environmental commitment related to traffic impacts on wildlife: Mitigation Measures NOI-1, BIO-2b, AES-4b, AES-4c, and BIO-33 and Environmental Commitment EC-14. The analysis in the EIR is not consistent with the assertion that traffic along the Hood-Franklin Road would permanently disrupt the operations and viability of the preserve. The EIR analyzes potential impacts from construction and operation of the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		project on transportation in Chapter 20, Transportation, and on noise in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration. During construction, all construction traffic would use Lambert Road and then turn north onto a new dedicated intake haul road that would be sheltered from Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge by the raised embankment that was used for the now-defunct railroad spur. The only traffic on Hood-Franklin Road would be a limited number of electric vehicles used to transport workers between the intakes and the park-and-ride lot near I-5. Project operation and maintenance activities would involve a small number of personnel traveling to the north Delta intakes who would access the intakes by Lambert Road and the dedicated intake haul road, which would not significantly increase noise or traffic on roads. Please see, for example, the discussion of operation and maintenance impacts on average vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in Impact TRANS-1, which concludes that project operations and maintenance would not cause the average VMT per employee to exceed the regional average. DWR has been coordinating with Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge throughout the project planning process. For additional information regarding the design planning to minimize effects on Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, see the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda of the Engineering Project Reports (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
367-14	I have grave concern about the impacts on wildlife, particularly in the nature preserves nearest the project. 2. The Cosumnes River Preserve is a critical resting place for numerous waterfowl, particularly Sandhill Cranes and Canada geese. The Preserve is at the confluence of the Mokelumne and Cosumnes Rivers and provides both flooded areas for winter birds and dry-land forest for many other kinds of wildlife. The large complex at Twin Cities Road and Franklin Boulevard would be extremely disruptive to the wildlife. The	As described in the Methods for Analysis section of Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, impacts of constructing the project alternatives consist of habitat removal, construction-related disturbances (e.g., disruption of breeding and foraging behaviors from noise, light, pedestrian movement), injury and mortality of wildlife individuals, immediate displacement of wildlife, and immediate degradation of habitats. Impacts on foraging habitat, including impacts from the construction of the Twin Cities Complex, are analyzed in Chapter 13 for wildlife species that forage in the terrestrial biological study area. The terrestrial biological resources study area overlaps with the Cosumnes River Preserve and adjacent land

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	cranes and other wildlife do not just feed in the Preserve, but can be found extensively in adjacent fields.	cover. Chapter 13 also describes the environmental commitments and mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts to a less-than-significant level. For example, Impact BIO-33 analyzes project impacts on sandhill cranes and Impact BIO-41 analyzes impacts on other migratory birds, such as waterfowl. See also the following mitigation measures and environmental commitment related to disturbance impacts on wildlife: Mitigation Measures NOI-1, BIO-2b, AES-4b, AES-4c, and BIO-33 and Environmental Commitment EC-14. The CEQA conclusions for Impact BIO-33 and Impact BIO-41 are less-than-significant with the implementation of the above-mentioned environmental commitments and mitigation measures. In addition, the CMP provides measures to compensate for impacts on special-status species habitat, including foraging habitat for sandhill cranes. Please see response to Comment 367-13 in regard to DWR coordination with Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge during the project planning process and the efforts to minimize Delta community effects.
367-15	I have grave concern about the impacts on wildlife, particularly in the nature preserves nearest the project. 3. East of Franklin Blvd., Twin Cities Road continues to Galt through a significant wildlife and winter flood zone. Any increase in heavy truck traffic that goes east of Hwy 99 rather than west to I-5 would seriously impact the wintering birds.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts, environmental commitments, and mitigation measures regarding wildlife, including wintering birds in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Please see, for example, the Impact BIO-33 discussion of impacts on sandhill cranes, which roost and forage in the study area, including Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and Cosumnes River Preserve. Impact BIO-33 includes an analysis of truck traffic and also considers noise and visual disturbance from truck traffic and other construction-related vehicles. See also the following mitigation measures and environmental commitment related to traffic impacts on wildlife: Mitigation Measures NOI-1, BIO-2b, AES-4b, AES-4c, and BIO-33 and Environmental Commitment EC-14.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
367-16	The impact on roads in the Delta will be severe. There are no plans to mitigate the impact of increased cars as well as heavy trucks and land moving equipment. 1. Hwy 160 and Hood-Franklin Road: The two intakes along Hwy 160 would create massive disruption of farm, truck, and automobile traffic, making the road unavailable to traffic at least for all of the construction years and probably permanently. Hood-Franklin Road is the main access from I-5 for the town of Hood; the heavy machinery and the limited access to the town may very likely destroy the viability of Hood. For years the only way in and out of the town will be along heavily impacted Hood-Franklin Road; Hwy 160 will be inaccessible in both directions (under Alternative 5).	DWR has developed specific construction management and design requirements that will reduce potential traffic impacts on the community of Hood. As described in Chapters 3 and 20, no construction traffic would be allowed on State Route 160 between State Route 12 and Cosumnes River Boulevard except for realignment of this highway at the intake locations, installation of SCADA cables, or for individuals or vehicles traveling from homes or businesses along these affected routes. Refer to response to comment 367-6 for additional discussion.
367-17	The impact on roads in the Delta will be severe. There are no plans to mitigate the impact of increased cars as well as heavy trucks and land moving equipment. 2. Hwy 160 at Randall Island: Intake C would be at the corner or Hwy 160 and Randall Island. This is an area of pear trees and grape vines that have been grown there for many, many years. Both of these crops require good access for winter pruning and major trucking during harvest. Both the construction and operation of the intake would destroy crops and homes. There are two beautiful historic homes between Hood and Randall Island that would be severely impacts.	Intake C is proposed to be located north of the State Route (SR) 160 (River Road)/Randall Island Road (north) intersection (see Mapbook 3-1, Sheet 4). Access to the proposed Intake C construction site would be provided via the new intake haul road constructed by DWR, connecting Lambert Road and Intake B (north of Hood-Franklin Road). DWR has also developed construction management and design requirements that would construct a new park-and-ride facility on the east side of the I-5/Hood-Franklin Road interchange and avoid the use of SR 160 to access the Intake B construction site, thereby reducing potential traffic impacts on the Randall Island community and SR 160. See responses to comments 367-6 and 367-16 for additional discussion. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts on various resources in the Delta including transportation in Chapter 20, Transportation, agriculture in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, and built-environment historical resources in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
367-18	The impact on roads in the Delta will be severe. There are no plans to mitigate the impact of increased cars as well as heavy trucks and land moving equipment. 3. New Road between Hood-Franklin and Lambert Road: This road will run along a large part of the Stone Lakes Nature Preserve. Truck traffic to access Intake C would be very disruptive to the wildlife living and breeding there. Currently Lambert Road is mainly for local and agricultural traffic. There is no access to I-5. The proposal would make this a main access to Intake C and all the way past to I-5 to Franklin Boulevard where a concrete batch plant would be constructed, further disrupting agricultural trucks.	The assertion that there are no plans to mitigate construction phase impacts of the project is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. The construction of the Intake Haul Road was included in the conceptual design of the project alternatives to reduce construction traffic on Delta roadways, including Hood-Franklin Road and State Route 160. The proposed alignment of the DWR constructed Intake Haul Road would be west of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to the west of the abandoned railroad track embankment between Lambert Road to the south and Hood-Franklin Road to the north. This will reduce construction traffic and congestion near the Stone Lakes Nature Preserve. The proposed project would also widen 3.2 miles of Lambert Road and provide access from the concrete batch plant to Intakes B and C. In combination, these major roadway improvements would reduce potential traffic impacts on the primary access point to the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge on Hood-Franklin Road and the community of Hood. This is discussed in Chapter 20, Transportation, in the section Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Effects on wildlife species and agriculture from construction activities are described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, respectively.
367-19	The impact on roads in the Delta will be severe. There are no plans to mitigate the impact of increased cars as well as heavy trucks and land moving equipment. 4. Franklin Blvd. and Twin Cities Road: A huge complex is planned between I-5 and Franklin Blvd as far south as Twin Cities Road. Just south of there, along Franklin Blvd and on both sides of I-5 is a very large area of riparian habitat and the conjunction of the Cosumnes and Mokelumne Rivers as well as bisected by Snodgrass Slough. The disruption as a result of this large complex could negatively or permanently impact the	Please see responses to comments 367-13 and 367-14 regarding the evaluation of impacts on terrestrial biological resources, including mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to traffic and the efforts to minimize Delta community effects during the project planning process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	wildlife that frequent this area. This area would include a tunnel shaft pad up to 36 feet high surrounded by a levee of 25-30 feet high. In addition, it would be a repository for tunnel muck over approximately 214 acres and up to 15 feet high.	
367-20	The Delta has been an important source of fruits and vegetables for over 100 years. The land, with its fertile peat soil provides the base for this flourishing industry. The conveyance, which would allow diversions of 6,000 cfs all year, and would reduce water available to farmers in the heart of the Delta. As well, approximately 3,700 acres of prime agricultural land would be converted to other, less productive, uses.	The commenter makes an assertion that is not consistent with the project description. While Alternative 5 contains conveyance capacity of up to 6,000 cfs, less flow than its total operating capacity would be conveyed due to regulatory restrictions. As described in the section of Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, titled Intake Operations and Maintenance, maximum allowable diversions will be regulated by regulatory restrictions and several new operational criteria that vary by season (winter/spring and summer/fall). As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, considerations for how much the intakes would divert at a given time would be determined by a number of factors, including how much water is actually available in the system (e.g., based on river water levels and flow), the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. As described in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, less than 1% of Important Farmland within the study area would be affected by construction of the project. While the conversion of Important Farmland within the study area would be considered significant, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would require that any permanently converted Important Farmland be mitigated at an acreage ratio of at least 1:1 through a combination of acquisition and dedication of agricultural land, acquisition of development rights or conservation easements to permanently protect agricultural land, or payment of in-lieu fees to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such real property interests by a third party. Additionally. Appendix 15B, Agricultural and Land Stewardship Considerations, describes the methodology employed during the initial siting and design process to greatly minimize the extent of farmland that would be permanently converted.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
367-21	As a long-term resident with deep roots in the Sacramento/Delta area, I strongly urge the State Department of Water Resources to cancel plans to take additional water from the Delta and move it to the San Joaquin Valley and beyond. In a long period of drought that may become permanent, it does not make sense to destroy prime agricultural land in the Delta for marginal farm land at best in the SJC Valley and support the ever-growing wants of the Los Angeles area. It is not too late to stop this project.	The fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio, as described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Common Response 3 also contains information regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports, as well as information on water rights and contracts. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1, for a detailed analysis of the effect of the project on prime farmland. As described in Chapter 15, less than 1% of Important Farmland within the study area would be affected by construction of the project. While the conversion of Important Farmland within the study area would be considered significant, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would require that any permanently converted Important Farmland be mitigated at an acreage ratio of at least 1:1 through a combination of acquisition and dedication of agricultural land, acquisition of development rights or conservation easements to permanently protect agricultural land, or payment of in-lieu fees to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such real property interests by a third party.
370-1	***We need to stop moving water from one part of the state to another and figure out how to recycle and store the water that's being used more effectively where it is!***	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also see Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
371-1	California industrial agriculture tycoons have been sucking up our water out of all proportion to their contribution to our state. Instead, they've made fortunes by exporting their water-needy products like almonds. I very strongly urge you to reject the Delta Tunnel project and instead rein in the water abuses by big agribusiness and fossil fuel corporations.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
372-1	Another CA boondoggle. Reasons not to construct tunnel - Does not solve water problems in CA - Road traffic will be unbearable - Back up at bridges, bridges are old and will fail - Disposal of excavation materials. Mercury will exceed healthy levels - Costs are prohibitive, look at the rail costs, 5 times and no progress - Need to construct more reservoirs - Farmland will disappear - Salmon at risk - Already not enough water to keep the Delta healthy and flourishing - Moving water, we don't have enough of! - Stop building so many homes! - Devastating to every community that surrounds the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. As described in Chapter 20, Transportation, although most potential impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project is expected to increase average VMT to a level that could be significant and unavoidable even with the implementation of mitigation. Discussions of disposal methods of reusable tunnel material are discussed in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, and Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, section titled Evaluation of Construction Activities, subsection titled Reusable Tunnel Material, for additional information on the disposal of Reusable Tunnel Material. Potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding potential impacts on Delta water quality. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding information on potential impacts on fish. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding impacts on terrestrial wildlife and their habitat. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding potential impacts on farmland. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for an analysis of potential changes to water supply under all project alternatives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		A Community Benefits Program was designed to help address any potential impacts of the project on local communities. Please see Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, for more information.
375-1	Enabling major new north-to-south water diversions going forward into the unknown – but definitely more arid -- water future is a real gamble. And the current diversions are supporting unsustainable growth in areas that are well beyond their carrying capacity based on their local water supplies. Increasing that imbalance will only aggravate future water supply problems.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
376-1	This tunnel project is obviously not a solution to pollution-based climate change or our resultant water problems, but if allowed, would be a polluter friendly give away to big corporations at the expense of Californians.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
377-1	Rather than building the expensive, destructive, and unnecessary tunnel, Governor Newsom and the DWR should rein in the water abuses by big agribusiness and fossil fuel corporations.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about costs to taxpayers.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
378-1	Water providers in my area [San, Jose, CA] have not developed an equitable system for water using the 50 gallons a day rule, but instead use a 4 person household rule, which gives small households too much water and large household not enough so they pay water fines	This information describes background on the individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
379-1	This project will create a 'corporate funding' IOU to California taxpayers, while risking a valuable ecosystem. The project will create more greenhouse gases, and damage more of our already compromised ecosystems; These centuries old interacting biological systems of macro to microscopic plants and animals have the most potential for saving our earth and state. They have evolved through surviving in a sustainable way. California needs to survive in a more sustainable way as well. Stealing water from the north for larger corporations in the south is not wise, sustainable, or fair, and poses grave risk of harm to millions of creatures.	Analysis has been performed to determine other potential project alternatives. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please see Chapters 7-32 regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources, including Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, as well as Chapter 12 Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on the ecosystem, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments about costs to taxpayers.
379-2	This tunnel project is not a solution to our water problems and extends more stress and demand on our already depleted reserves. The rain and rivers designed to provide this water are tapped out, already affecting life cycles they evolved to support. Man-made Lake Powell is also tapped. The Eel River stopped flowing for 2 consecutive years. Where will the water for this boondoggle come from?	Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding adapting to a hotter, drier future and water supply reliability and climate change. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose, and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for more information about potential changes to water supply as a result of the project.
379-3	What is needed is smart water use mostly by agribusinesses; communities are largely doing their parts, but Everyone needs to conserve. Localities need more storage. And state support for such.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management, reducing or eliminating exports, suggested infrastructure, and water management alternatives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
379-4	Despite our ongoing drought, oil corporations continue to apply for and are granted permits for new oil drilling. This occurs despite their dirty product, poisonous effects, excessive water waste, and being a major cause of the climate-drought crisis we're living with.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
380-1	We in Northern Cal have been trying to protect our natural water from water grabs by the rest of the state for decades. Rather than taking the water which we are managing properly to be squandered in the Central Valley and SoCal, have the wasters learn and practice water wise usage. Don't wreck our Delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
381-1	STOP MILKING CALIFORNIANS LIKE CATTLE FOR YOUR OWN NARROW INTERESTS. THAT'S AS TO THE POINT AS I CAN BE.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
382-1	HOW DO YOU POSTURE TO CARE ABOUT OUR ENVIRONMENT, OUR BIODIVERSITY, THE HEALTH OF OUR STATE, OUR OWN HEALTH, WHEN YOU PROPOSE THIS DELTA TUNNEL? I urge you to REJECT the Delta Tunnel project AND REIN IN THE ABUSES, ABUSES, OF BIG, POLLUTING, AGRIBUSINESS & TOXIFYING FOSSIL FUEL corporations.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
383-1	Dear Governor Newsom and the CA Dept. of Water Resources, I urge you to support the Delta Tunnel project. The project makes a lot of sense to bring needed water to the central and southern parts of the state; and it was designed specifically to protect the environmental areas and native wildlife from habitat destruction. It is long past time to fund and deliver the Delta tunnel. Please support the project. DON'T: Reject the Delta Tunnel. Reject taxpayer handouts for Big Ag and Big Oil. Invest in people first-	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support for the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	infrastructure in California.	State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
384-1	I urge you to approve the Delta Tunnel project. It is vital in our efforts to maintain a water supply especially in the event of a major earthquake.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general support to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
385-1	I would like to comment on the DCP. What time on 12/16/2022 does the comment period close? Is it 5pm? I cannot find this info on the DEIR website. This is all I can find.	Requests for information regarding the public comment period were responded to within the comment period. Please also refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the duration of the comment period and information request responses.
386-1	Dear Department of Water Resources: I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel).	This information is general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
386-2	As a California resident, I understand that the state faces a difficult task in combating the current water crisis. However, the Delta Tunnel would be detrimental to Delta region from the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the project. Not only is the cost of the Delta Tunnel exorbitant and probably underestimated, it will have a huge negative impact on the City of Rio Vista.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of many environmental resources. Please see Chapters 7-32 of the EIR regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources in the Delta. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for information regarding potential socioeconomic effects on the Delta communities, agriculture, and businesses.
386-3	Currently Hwy 12, which is already one of the most congested and dangerous highways in the region, will be flooded with truck traffic moving materials from the site. There has been no discussion of widening and/or maintenance on this route.	Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding information on selected study areas and the analysis of potential transportation impacts. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects to local and regional roadways including Interstate 5; State Routs 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road, and Hood-Franklin Road, discussed in Chapter 20, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 14, Transportation, regarding the methodology and approach to impact analysis and road rehabilitation.
386-4	The DEIR also fails to analyze the water quality, agricultural and other impacts associated with removing up to 6,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Sacramento River. Removing what is about one-third to one-half of the average flow of the river is sure to create increases in salinity as well as increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms (HABs). Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts will magically be less than significant and offering no mitigation measures for salinity or HABs. Rio Vista agriculture could be decimated by the tunnels.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. The Draft EIR determined that there would be no significant impact regarding water quality and cyanobacterial harmful algal blooms, therefore no mitigation is necessary. Please see Chapter 9 and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding more information on the analysis of potential impacts on water quality and agricultural resources, respectively.
386-5	Additionally, the DEIR does not adequately analyze and mitigate the impacts on Delta communities. A so-called " Community Benefits Program" would not even attempt to address the very real impacts to residents during and after construction. This is unacceptable given the extensive and lasting impacts the project would have in the region. For example, criteria and toxic air pollutant s, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, across the region because of project construction, endangering the health of Delta residents.	The Community Benefits Program was developed in addition to environmental mitigation required through CEQA and other environmental regulatory compliance processes. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding information about the Community Benefits Program. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding information about feasibility or effectiveness of air quality environmental commitments and mitigation. The Draft EIR was written under CEQA guidelines and considers potential significant impacts on surrounding communities. The Draft EIR analyzes potential significant impacts on air quality and mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding toxic air pollutants as well as mitigation proposed to reduce impacts. As described in Chapter 23, most of the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. However, Impacts AQ-5 and AQ-6

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		may remain significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. For more information on the Community Benefits Program please see Chapter 34, Community Program Benefits Analysis.
404-1	I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel Project).	This comment provides general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
404-2	The proposed Tunnel Project will have tremendous negative impacts on Delta agricultural resources. The primary negative impacts will be caused by conversion of agricultural lands to other uses, degraded water quality caused by intrusion of salt water into the Delta, and negative impacts to infrastructure such as flood control and drainage. In addition, there will be severe secondary impacts to these Delta agricultural resources caused by collective impacts which could destroy the Delta economy. Key ingredients for viable and resilient Delta agriculture are land, good quality water, and infrastructure--the Tunnel Project will severely damage all three.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on water quality and flood control and drainage are not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of CEQA impact determinations for impacts on water quality and flood protection. As shown in this table, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on water quality and flood protection would be less than significant or mitigated to less than significant levels. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality Impact WQ-5, which concludes that while there could be some increases in salinity (based on modeled electrical conductivity) at some Delta locations in some months, these effects would be less than significant. Please refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding a discussion of agricultural resources and conversion of agricultural lands, and mitigation to reduce identified potentially significant impacts. Chapter 15 also discusses the use of agricultural lands and indirect effects. While the conversion of Important Farmland within the study area would be considered significant, Mitigation Measure AG-1 would require that any permanently converted Important Farmland be mitigated at an acreage ratio of at least 1:1 through a combination of acquisition and dedication of agricultural land, acquisition of development rights of conservation easements to permanently protect agricultural land, or payment of in-lieu

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		fees to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such real property interests by a third party. Additionally, Appendix 15B, Agricultural and Land Stewardship Considerations, describes the methodology employed during the initial siting and design process to greatly minimize the extent of farmland that would be permanently converted. Please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, section titled Agricultural Economics in the Statutory Delta and Project Area, regarding potential socioeconomic changes in the Delta associated with agricultural resources. Depending on the alternative, the project is expected to result in a minor reduction in agricultural employment as a result of conversion of agricultural lands, from between 49 full-time equivalent (FTE) annual jobs to 69 jobs. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments stating opinions regarding general opposition of the project.
404-3	Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin County General Plans value and protect Delta agricultural resources and recognize that agriculture is the foundation of the Delta's economy. The Delta Protection Act of 1992 in Section 29703 (a)(c) describes the Delta as an agricultural region of great value and states that the Primary Zone should be protected from the intrusion of nonagricultural uses. This act created the Delta Protection Commission and directed it to create the Land and Resource Management Plan, which has five land use policies that protect agricultural resources. In addition, pursuant to the Delta Reform Act, The Delta Protection Commission prepared the Delta Economic Sustainability Study, which clearly shows that agriculture is the backbone of the Delta's economy.	Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act, including the Act's coequal goals. Consistency with the Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP) is described in Chapter 14, Land Use, under Impact LU-2. While the EIR acknowledges project alternatives could have incompatibilities with LURMP policies Land Use P-7 and Agriculture P-2, it should be noted that actions taken by the state are not required to be consistent with the LURMP. Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, acknowledges the project would result in temporary or permanent conversion of approximately 2,150 acres of Important Farmland under Alternative 5 to approximately 3,900 acres of Important Farmland under Alternative 2a. DWR has proposed Mitigation Measure AG-1 to mitigate the permanent conversion of Important Farmland. Mitigation Measure AG-1 would preserve agricultural land of equal or better farmland quality at a ratio of at least 1:1 through a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The Delta Reform Act established the coequal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration and conditioned their achievement on protection and enhancement of Delta resources to include agriculture. Section 29702 (a) states that "The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resources and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." The Delta Reform Act also created the Delta Stewardship Council and directed it to develop the Delta Plan. Chapter 5 of the Delta Plan establishes policies and goals to protect Delta agricultural resources (Delta Plan: Pages 183 and 192-198). The Tunnel Project draft EIR does not demonstrate consistency with County General Plans, the Delta Protection Land and Resource Management Plan, and the Delta Reform Act.	combination of acquisition and dedication of agricultural land, acquisition of development rights or conservation easements or payment of in-lieu fees to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such real property interests by a third party. Impacts on Important Farmland would remain significant and unavoidable because conservation of agricultural farmland at a ratio of 1:1 or greater would not avoid a net loss of Important Farmland in the study area. Appendix 15B, Agricultural and Land Stewardship Considerations, describes the detailed siting criteria and design process DWR will follow to minimize the extent of farmland that would be permanently converted as a result of project buildout. Regarding consistency with County General Plans, it should be noted that State agencies, such as DWR, are generally immune from local regulation and land use controls based on the doctrine of sovereignty and therefore are typically not bound by city and county general plans or local ordinances. Nevertheless, the EIR assessed potential land use effects associated with each alternative based on the compatibility of constructing, operating, and maintaining the alternatives with the existing and planned land uses in the study area. Any incompatibility was then assessed to determine whether it would lead to a potentially adverse indirect effect on the physical environment. The analysis in EIR Chapter 14 concluded the construction of the project's water conveyance infrastructure would result in temporary and permanent changes in land use in the study area, which may be incompatible with the general land uses presently designated in these areas. However, an incompatibility does not by itself constitute an adverse physical effect on the environment, but rather may indicate the potential for a proposed activity to indirectly have a physical effect on the environment. Although some of these changes in land use could result in a conflict with policies adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, the conflicts would be unlikely to result in a significant physical effect on the environment; therefore, the potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		impacts of all project alternatives on local land use plans and policies would be less than significant.
404-4	The establishment and operation of the State Water Project (SWP) and the Central Valley Project (CVP) are based on water law that includes the common pool principle, area of origin priorities, and limits water exports to surplus water. Flow is critical to maintain water quality in the Delta. Page 11 of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) permit (33 C.F.R. 325) application to the Army Corps of Engineers submitted on August 24, 2015 states the following: "Changes in water inflow and outflow throughout the Delta affect the water quality within the Delta, particularly with regard to salinity. It has been estimated that seawater is pushing 3 to 15 miles farther inland since development began in the Delta over 159 years ago." (Contra Costa Water District 6/2010) Changes in flow patterns have already damaged Delta water quality. Figure 7b of the Delta Vision Report details a steep decline in Delta outflow from 81% of unimpaired flow during 1930-1949 to 48% between 1990-2005. During the same time periods, State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) exports (not including Contra Costa Water District diversions) went from 0 to 17%, and in- Delta watershed diversions (before reaching the Delta) increased from 14% to 31% (some of these are exported from the Delta watershed). As a result, water quality in the Delta and the San Francisco Bay has been severely impacted by saltwater intrusion, increased residency time and frequent toxic algae blooms.	This comment provides information about past studies and information developed regarding flow and water quality in the Delta. The existing conditions section in Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes baseline conditions from which to measure potential impacts of the alternatives on water quality. Chapter 9 includes information regarding chloride and electrical conductivity (indicators of salinity), residence time and CHABs in Impact WQ-4 (chloride), Impact WQ-5 (electrical conductivity) and WQ-14 (CHABs). The hydrologic and water quality modeling conducted to support these impact analyses is based on the historical hydrology and changes in Delta inflows as a result of project operations. As described in the impact analysis, impacts would be less than significant for these water quality constituents and the project alternatives would not cause more frequent exceedance of water quality objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
404-5	Because of the importance of protecting water quality in the Delta, the changing definition of surplus water and the need to recognize environmental needs in that equation, a series of steps has been taken over time to establish standards to protect water and Delta environmental quality. 1. The 1995 Bay-Delta Plan established salinity standards throughout the Delta. 2. The State Water Resources Control Board in Decision 1641 (D-1641) Chapter 10 assigned responsibility for achieving salinity standards to the SWP and CVP. Because salinity intrusion into the Delta is determined by outflow, Chapter 13 also assigns responsibility for achieving flow standards to the SWP and the CVP. 3. In 1981, the State of California and the North Delta Water Agency entered into a contract that established legally enforceable salinity standards in the North Delta. The Delta Protection Commission recognized that water quality is a key consideration in protecting the resources of the Delta and included policies to protect Delta water in its Land and Resource Management Plan.	This comment summarizes different actions different organizations and government agencies have taken in the Delta overtime. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding information on the plans, policies, and programs identified by the comment.
404-6	The Tunnel Project recognizes the following: 1. The Project has the potential to affect water quality by changing Delta flow patterns (page 9-1).	The comment is identifying descriptive content of the types of potential Delta flow effects that are evaluated in Chapter 9, Water Quality. Here is the full text: “Operation of project alternatives’ facilities has the potential to affect water quality through differences in Delta inflows from the Sacramento River, relative to existing conditions, resulting in increased proportions of the other Delta inflow waters (eastside tributaries, San Francisco Bay, San Joaquin River) in some regions of the Delta.” Effects of the project alternatives on Sacramento River inflow, and resulting effects

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		on Delta water quality, are directly accounted for in the flow and water quality modeling of the alternatives and comparison to modeled baseline conditions and impacts are determined to be less than significant as disclosed in Chapter 9 for all water quality constituents.
404-7	The Tunnel Project recognizes the following: 2. There are consistent decreases in flows for all months downstream of the proposed intakes (page 5-2).	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding a discussion of Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, and the evaluation of water-dependent resources throughout the EIR. The comment is identifying descriptive content of the types of potential Delta flow effects that are evaluated in Chapter 5. The full text is: "Generally, long-term average monthly flows for the project alternatives are similar to existing conditions for all locations examined. However, there are consistent decreases among project alternatives in long-term average flows for all months on the Sacramento River north of Courtland (i.e., downstream of the proposed north Delta intakes) due to the diversions of available excess water at the proposed north Delta intakes beyond the needs to satisfy downstream regulatory requirements in the Delta, including Delta outflows and south-of-Delta exports." The analysis in Chapter 5 describes the predicted changes in river flows and reservoir storage as compared to existing conditions and the No Project Alternative. As discussed in Chapter 5, the changes in flows downstream of the intakes primarily occur in winter and spring months, typically times when there is major concern with flood water levels being too high, and in wetter years when the Delta is in excess. The decreases are smaller or nonexistent in the summer of drier years. In the summer and early fall, the decreases on the Sacramento River, downstream of the proposed north Delta intakes are due to three reasons. First, releases for exports from upstream reservoirs can be lower in these months because San Luis Reservoir is fuller entering the summer; this is due to the diversions of excess water at the proposed north Delta intakes in the winter and spring months, as previously discussed. Second, in months when there is shifting of exports from the south Delta to the north Delta to reduce carriage water requirements, flow at Hood is reduced

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		because water that was previously exported in the south Delta is now exported at the north Delta intakes. Third, while in many cases all carriage water savings are exported, in cases where that is not possible due to regulatory or physical capacity limits and there is an ability to store that water by reducing upstream reservoir releases, backing up of carriage water savings also decreases flows north of Courtland.
404-8	The Tunnel Project recognizes the following: 3. Flow affects water quality (pages 9-5 and 9-6).	The comment is identifying descriptive content in Chapter 9, Water Quality, related to variables that affect water quality, one of which is recognized as river flow rates. The content in Chapter 9 identifies a multitude of variables that affect water quality including point and nonpoint sources of pollutants to surface waters in the Delta, as well as watershed hydrology, water management activities, such as reservoir operations and diversions, tributary inflow and the tides, which bring seawater into the Delta.
404-9	The Tunnel Project recognizes the following: 4. Operation of the Tunnel Project will damage water quality by increasing bromide, chloride, and EC (pages 9-1, 9-2 and 9-3).	The comment assertions regarding damage to water quality are not supported by the analyses contained in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The water quality impact analysis concludes that there could be some increases in bromide (Impact WQ-3), chloride (Impact WQ-4), and EC (Impact WQ-5) at western Delta locations in some months, but increases would not adversely affect beneficial uses, including water supply, and impacts on these constituents would be less than significant. Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Farmland Productivity, describes how the timing and magnitude of the increases in EC would not result in substantial effects to cropland that currently receive somewhat saline irrigation water.
404-10	The Tunnel Project recognizes the following: 5. EC thresholds are frequently exceeded (page 9-3).	The comment assertion that electrical conductivity (EC) thresholds are frequently exceeded is not supported by the analyses contained in Impact WQ-5 in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As stated in Impact WQ-5, the modeled exceedance of the Bay-Delta WQCP EC objectives is a modeling artifact attributable to the monthly timestep of the hydrologic modeling conducted by CalSim 3, as compared to the 15-minute timestep of DSM2. EC objectives would not be exceeded more frequently under the project alternatives relative to existing conditions due to real-time operational

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		decisions to meet Bay-Delta WQCP EC objectives as implemented through State Water Resources Control Board Decision 1641.
404-11	The Delta Reform Act of 2009 included a mechanism for the BDCP [Bay-Delta Conservation Plan] to be included in the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan. Water Code Section 85320 lists requirements that BDCP must achieve in order to be included in the Delta Plan. One of them is Water Code 85320 (b)(2)(A), which requires that a series of studies be completed which "will identify the remaining water available for export and other beneficial uses." The studies may have been performed, but the amount of water available for export has not been determined. The Tunnel Project analysis relies on removing only "excess" (page 5-2 and 5-27) water at the proposed diversion sites in order to avoid damaging water quality in the Delta without any definition of what excess water might be. Certainly in critically dry years, there is no excess water, and yet according to Table 5-0 (page 5-3) flows downstream of the proposed diversions in Dry/Critical Years are consistently decreased.	The term "excess flow" means the period when the SWP and CVP are developing their supply, including capturing and storing runoff. This term has been included in the Final EIR Glossary, Chapter 38, in response to this comment. Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision-making and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic biological resources. Operation of the project is described in the section titled Intake Operations and Maintenance, ensuring that the operation of the project would be "governed by the applicable regulatory requirements specified under the State Water Board Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Plan) and assigned to the SWP in the applicable water right decision, applicable biological opinions under ESA, applicable incidental take permit under CESA, and USACE Clifton Court diversion limits. The operations of the proposed north Delta intakes would remain consistent with these existing regulatory requirements. The proposed project is seeking a new point of diversion and is not seeking to expand water right quantity." Furthermore, the Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria table in Chapter 3 describes the criteria under which the north Delta diversions would operate and identifies specific flows the Sacramento River must meet before the diversions can occur. Finally, refer to RTC 404-7 regarding flows downstream of the intakes.
404-12	In addition, as explained in Water Code section 85021, the Delta Reform Act of 2009 requires that reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water needs to be reduced. Certainly the Tunnel Project, a $20-$50 billion project operating long into the future, seems to increase rather than reduce dependence on the Delta as a source of future water.	Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding consistency with the Delta Reform Act, including dependence on the Delta as a source of future water.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
404-13	Before there can be any confidence in the degree of damage to the Delta's water quality from operating this project, there must be much more than trust us we will only divert excess water and will operate the project in a manner to satisfy downstream regulatory requirements in the Delta. There must be legally binding limits placed on the operations of this project in order to protect Delta water quality.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a discussion of operational criteria (specific to diversion of excess flows) and an explanation that operation of the proposed intakes would be consistent with applicable regulatory requirements and as prescribed by federal and state environmental permits.
404-14	The efforts to design mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to Delta agricultural resources, Delta agricultural operations, Delta water quality, and the inhabitants of Delta Legacy Communities are inadequate. They demonstrate a complete disregard for the Delta, the fish and wildlife that Delta water supports, and the people who live and work there. In one instance, DWR told a Hood resident that she could go live somewhere else for 15 years and then return to her home after the tunnel construction is finished. In this draft EIR, DWR shows the same disregard for businesses that will be forced to close and agricultural operations that will be severely limited for the duration of the construction period and then be faced with impaired water quality into the future.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding CEQA requirements and the adequacy of mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, which describes the numerous public meetings DWR held with in-Delta and out-of-Delta communities. Please see Chapters 7–32 in the EIR regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources, including Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding agriculture in the Delta; Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding water quality; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, which discusses socioeconomics and limited effects on businesses. Chapter 15 describes impacts on agriculture and proposes mitigation measures for potential impacts. While some impacts are identified in Chapter 15 as significant and unavoidable even with mitigation, efforts to avoid or lessen impacts included reducing the extent of permanent conversion of farmland during the early planning processes and targeting areas temporarily affected with land reclamation and remediation for return to agriculture. Please refer to the construction schedule figures provided in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives. As shown in these figures, the duration of construction would vary by facility and would not be ongoing at each location across the project area for 15 years. The EIR evaluates construction-related effects throughout multiple chapters

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		including impacts related to noise and sensitive-receptors. For example, please refer to Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, and the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, for a summary of all construction-related impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
404-15	The Tunnel Project will devastate the Delta and will not make California's water supply more reliable, will not restore the Delta environment and will not reduce reliance on the Delta.	Please refer to the Executive Summary, table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, for a list of CEQA impact determinations for impacts on resources found within the Delta (e.g., wildlife and plant species, water quality). As shown in this table, the analysis in the EIR concludes that most impacts would either be less-than-significant or would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on the Delta are thus not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The Delta Conveyance Project is one of many solutions in the Water Resiliency Portfolio aimed and addressing California's water management challenges. Please see response to comment 404-3 regarding the coequal goals and reliance on the Delta for water supply. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments stating opinions regarding general opposition of the project.
404-16	The Tunnel Project will waste valuable financial resources which could be employed to implement projects to advance water reliability for the State of California -- projects that impact the supply/demand equation by reducing demand and increasing supply. There are more efficient and effective ways to improve California's water reliability that can "be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural,	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives regarding the purpose of the project and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	recreational, natural resources and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place" in accordance with the Delta Reform Act of 2009.	Considerations, regarding funding for the proposed project. Please see response to comment 404-3 regarding the Delta Reform Act, co-equal goals and reliance on the Delta for water supply.
405-1	The Draft EIR (DEIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project is deficient in many ways. The DEIR must be thoroughly amended and rewritten to correct these many deficiencies. Below [See comments 2-21] I describe only some of the many problems with this DEIR.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the adequacy of the EIR and meeting CEQA requirements. Please see responses to comments 405-2 through 405-21 regarding detailed responses to comments contained herein.
405-2	The Delta Conveyance Tunnel Project is a water project. It involves massive new intakes and a long tunnel to divert quantities of water from the Sacramento River that would decrease freshwater flows through the Delta downstream from the new intakes. The Project is about water. Despite that, the Draft EIR does not evaluate the impacts of the water Project on water under CEQA.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. The EIR analyzes impacts and mitigation, as appropriate, on surface water in Chapter 5, water supply in Chapter 6, groundwater in Chapter 8, and water quality in Chapter 9, and evaluates impacts on water-dependent resources in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the evaluation of water-dependent resources that consider changes in water supply or surface water.
405-3	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. CEQA requires that "...public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. [Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21002]	The analysis in the EIR does not support the assertion that the No Project Alternative analysis does not comply with CEQA. CEQA requirements for describing and evaluating a No Project Alternative in an EIR can be found in Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the adequacy of mitigation measures and approval of a project with significant and unavoidable impacts. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Finally, please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The analysis of the No Project Alternative alternatives in the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) does not comply with this fundamental principle.	
405-4	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. The DCP DEIR misleadingly excludes detailed consideration of local agency projects related to water conservation, water-use efficiency, alternative water supplies, recycled water, desalination, etc. In the 99 pages of Appendix 3C there is an insufficient level of effort put forth in quantifying the Portfolio of water supply options mentioned above. All reasonable alternatives must be given full and fair consideration so that the public and the state and federal decision-makers can meaningfully compare the options that are available. The Portfolio of local/regional water supply options meets the DCP purpose, and all four related criteria listed in Chapter 3, and as required by CEQA requires additional study and quantification.	Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the CEQA requirements for describing and evaluating a No Project Alternative in an EIR and the types of projects that are included in the No Project Alternative, including those projects mentioned by the comment (e.g., water conservation, water-use efficiency, alternative water supplies, recycled water, desalination). See also Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, which explains that the No Project Alternative analyses focus on identifying the additional water-supply related actions public water agencies may opt to follow if the Delta Conveyance Project does not occur. Please see response to comment 405-3 regarding the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
405-5	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. The structure of the alternatives analysis falsely frames that the scope of the alternatives should be limited to only alternatives of massive new delta new water conveyance facilities that manipulate the flow of the Delta, which would continue to exacerbate current and future significant impacts. In other words, a legitimate proposal that would substantially lessen the project's impacts by achieving the project objectives in another manner has been blatantly ignored. DWR's position defies logic and is not a sound basis for excluding an evaluation of the Portfolio alternative.	Please see response to comment 405-3 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR and response to comment 405-4 regarding the types of water supply/water demand management techniques evaluated under the No Project Alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
405-6	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. DWR, DCP and DCP proponents have a profound influence over local water use. For example, southern California water agencies are embarking on some of the world's largest water recycling projects, storm water capture, desalination, and more that for some unexplainable reason are omitted or not quantified in the No Project Alternative. The claim that water conservation and local water supply alternatives is beyond the control of the DCP and DWR is a false narrative. Even if DWR and the DCP lacked influence or control over local water conservation and alternative water supply efforts, that would not be an excuse for failing to evaluate the Portfolio alternative. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c) (alternatives analysis must include "reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency"); CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(f)(1) (no single factor, such as regulatory limitations or jurisdictional boundaries, establishes a fixed limit on the scope of the alternatives analysis, which must be sufficient to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making).	Please see response to comment 405-3 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Regarding the Portfolio Alternative, the EIR does consider this alternative in the alternatives screening analysis in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, but was screened out for analysis in the Draft EIR because it did not meet most of the basic project objectives. Please see response to comment 405-4 regarding the types of water supply/water demand management activities evaluated under the No Project Alternative. The EIR explains under the section titled No Project Alternative in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, that among other operational assumptions that the No Project evaluated the impacts of possible additional actions to address local water shortages that likely go beyond those actions that local agencies are planning with or without the Delta Conveyance Project. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative and Description of Analysis, for more information on CEQA requirements and the EIR approach to the No Project Alternative.
405-7	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. The DCP Draft EIR furthers fails to take into consideration DWR's own Mission "To sustainably manage the water resources of California, in cooperation with other agencies, to benefit the state's people and protect, restore, and enhance the natural and human environments" and Racial Equity Vision "All people in California are healthy, financially stable, and safe. This vision articulates an ideal state of being that we want all	DWR supports local efforts to implement conservation and recycling, and the suite of actions included in the Governor's Water Resilience Portfolio. DWR is considering the Delta Conveyance Project in addition to those actions because of the need to continue to protect the reliability of the State Water Project as an important part of the supply portfolio for many parts of California (refer to objectives of the project described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives). The objectives of the project are consistent with DWR's overall mission and racial equity vision quoted by the comment. Nothing in the EIR precludes DWR from fulfilling commitments to working with other agencies. This comment does not raise

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Californians to experience. It inspired the strategies contained in this Racial Equity Action Plan. Although DWR cannot achieve this vision alone, we are committed to doing our part to make it a reality" by purposely excluding facts that DWR does have a commitment to work with other agencies and does have significant influence over local water recycling, conservation, and the entire Portfolio.	a significant environmental issue related to the CEQA analysis provided in the EIR.
405-8	DCP DEIR Chapter 3 - Comments The Evaluation of The No Project Alternative Is Inadequate. Furthermore, compounding the inadequacy of the alternative analysis and No Project analysis is the incomprehensible decision of the DCP Draft EIR to rely on flow-related standards based on the historical State Water Board D-1641 and omits a feasible alternative that involves Forecast Informed Reservoir Operations (FIRO). Significant modeling efforts have been made in this arena and are intentionally omitted from the DCP Draft EIR. Success stories of FIRO include both Sonoma Water and Yuba County Water Agency that allowed flexibility in reservoir operations that are currently being regulated with decisions that are over 70 years old. Again, incorporating a FIRO option whether under No Project or an Alternative Project analysis is required for the EIR to be considered complete and in compliance with CEQA.	DWR complied with CEQA by including and analyzing, under baseline conditions, a reasonable range of alternatives in the EIR. The assertion that the alternatives analysis in the EIR is inadequate is not supported by the EIR. Please see response to comment 405-3 regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR and response to comment 405-4 regarding the types of water supply/water demand management techniques evaluated under the No Project Alternative. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding requirements for defining baseline under CEQA and plans, policies, and programs that are included in the baseline including D-1641 and existing Bay-Delta Water Quality Objectives identified in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. Incorporating Forecast-Informed Reservoir Operations (FIRO) as an alternative to the project or in the No Project Alternative is not feasible because coordinated reservoir operations and pre-release of stored water as informed by short-term runoff forecasts may affect reservoir operations at daily and hourly time scales and cannot be incorporated into the monthly planning model, CalSim 3 end-of-month, used for the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. During the flood season, CalSim 3 end-of-month simulated storage cannot exceed water control manual “guide curves” established by USACE for Section 7 reservoirs (U.S. Flood Control Act of 1944). The model is agnostic to daily or hourly operations that may occur

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		within the month. Typically, water control diagrams are based on basin wetness indices and/or the historical likelihood of runoff events of a given magnitude. Skill in weather and streamflow forecasting may lead to more flexible flood control rules and the potential to increase reservoir storage during the refill season. However, incorporating reservoir forecasting into a monthly planning model would require USACE to amend its regulatory requirements. In the absence of these regulatory changes, there is insufficient basis to incorporate FIRO into a monthly planning model that is used in support of an EIR, and attempts to do so would be speculative.
405-9	DCP DEIR Chapter 12 - Comments. Environmental Setting Comments. The first section, the Environmental Setting, does an adequate if incomplete job of providing an overview of the conditions fish and other aquatic species face in this heavily altered environment. For example, on p. 12-8, the DEIR states, "Flow management in the Delta altered the aquatic habitat by (1) changing aspects of the historical flow regime (timing, magnitude, duration) that supported life history traits of native species; (2) limiting access to or quality of habitat; (3) contributing to conditions better suited to invasive, nonnative species (reduced spring flows, increased summer inflows and exports, and low and less-variable interior Delta salinity [Moyle and Bennett 2008]…" However, nowhere within the entirety of Chapter 12 does the DEIR provide information on how the proposed project would improve the three elements of altered flows described above.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of CEQA and the disclosure of impacts, as opposed to benefits, and the requirements to establish a CEQA baseline under which to measure changes under different alternatives. The proposed project does not have improvement of “altered flows” (existing flow conditions) as a project purpose. Please see the discussion of project purpose in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description. The potential effects of the project alternatives are assessed in relation to the baseline and mitigation is proposed where necessary to reduce impacts to less than significant.
405-10	This chapter [Ch.12] is also replete with unsubstantiated, speculative statements. For example, on pp. 12-44-47, labeled "No Project Alternative," the DEIR touches upon the following elements:	The section titled Future Fish and Aquatic Resources Conditions in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, mentions temperature, as the commenter states, and notes example effects from other factors such as potential changes in sediment loading/turbidity, movement of the salinity field, and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	- Future Fish and Aquatic Resources Conditions - Predictable Actions by Others In the first of these two sections, the DEIR briefly discusses climate change but fails to provide any details for the potential effects of climate change beyond increasing temperatures.	potential effects from seismic events. The potential effects of climate change are described in various locations within the EIR. For example, Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, provides an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Chapter 30, Climate Change, evaluates potential impacts of the alternatives under climate change. Furthermore, there are multiple appendices that consider potential effects associated with climate change under different scenarios (i.e., under 2040 and under 2070). For example, see Appendix 4A, Consideration of 2070 Conditions; Appendix 5B, Surface Water 2040 Analysis; and Appendix 6A, Water Supply 2040 Analysis. Additionally, please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. With respect to Chapter 12, Appendix 12C, Fish and Aquatic Resources 2040 Analysis, compares the No Project Alternative under the 2040 scenario to the project alternatives under the 2040 scenario using modeling tools and methods appropriate for the evaluation of impacts on fish and aquatic resources; in Appendix 12C, modeling for the No Project Alternative under the 2040 scenario and project alternatives under the 2040 scenario incorporates assumptions regarding changes to hydrology and sea level rise as a result of climate change; this appendix shows that the relative difference between the project alternatives and No Project Alternative under the 2040 scenario is generally similar to difference between the project alternatives and existing conditions at 2020.
405-11	This chapter [Ch.12] is also replete with unsubstantiated, speculative statements. For example, on pp. 12-44-47, labeled "No Project Alternative," the DEIR touches upon the following elements: - Future Fish and Aquatic Resources Conditions -Predictable Actions by Others	Please see response to comment 405-4 regarding the description of the No Project Alternative and the types of water supply/water demand management techniques evaluated under the No Project Alternative. Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, provides descriptions and evidence of the existing and proposed desalination projects assumed to occur in the northern and southern coastal regions; as noted in that appendix, projects currently in development or in exploratory phases are outlined in the most

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	In the second section, the DEIR makes numerous speculative statements about actions various regions of the state may take in the absence of the proposed project. But nowhere does the DEIR provide evidence for these speculative statements. For example, on p. 12-46, the DEIR states, "Desalination projects would most likely be pursued in the northern and southern coastal regions." This whole section, pp. 12-44 thru 12-47, is pure speculation, and should be stricken from the DEIR. Alternatively, this section should be thoroughly revised so that every speculative statement is fully substantiated with peer-reviewed, scientific evidence.	current Urban or Agricultural Water Management Plan for each of the water agencies in the various regions. These plans formed the basis for the assumptions regarding projects most likely to be pursued.
405-12	However, there is one "Predictable Action by Others" which is not addressed and must be included in Chapter 12's analysis. On p. 12-40, in a section labeled "Applicable Laws, Regulations and Programs," the DEIR references "...the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Control Plan for San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary..." In December 2018, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWCRB) issued its proposal to increase flows into the Delta by requiring approximately 40% unimpaired flows from the San Joaquin River and its three main tributaries, the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers. The SWRCB is currently in process of implementing this updated water quality control plan, known as "Phase 1" of the update. Phase 2 will update the Sacramento River's water quality control plan. As noted above, Chapter 12 contains a section of speculative statements labeled "Predictable Actions by Others." Yet here we have a specific set of actions currently in the process of being taken by the main body of water regulation in California,	Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the State Water Resources Control Board updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, including "Phase 1" as mentioned by the comment. These updates are considered to the extent possible given the level of information on operational criteria/objectives identified in the updates. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, qualitatively references the State Water Resources Control Board updates to the Bay-Delta Plan both in the No Project Alternative analysis and in the cumulative analysis contained in the section titled Cumulative Analysis (see also the discussion of the Bay-Delta Plan updates in Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions). Appendix 4C, Alternate Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis, includes a quantitative sensitivity study focused on the operation of the proposed project to understand if potential environmental effects of the proposed project may vary with an Alternate Regulatory Scenario. In summary, the appendix concludes that no new impacts are identified under an Alternate Regulatory Scenario relative to those already disclosed in Chapters 7 – 32 of the EIR. The analysis presented in the appendix shows that impacts would generally be similar in nature and extent with proposed

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the SWRCB, but no discussion of the importance of these new regulations on the proposed project. It is entirely "predictable" that the SWRCB will take action in updating its water quality control plan for the Sacramento River. It is entirely "predictable" that this update will impact the operations of the proposed project by requiring some level of unimpaired flows in the Sacramento River. Therefore, the section labeled "Predictable Actions by Others" should be rewritten in conjunction with the SWRCB to include the actions the SWRCB is likely to take in updating the water quality control plan.	project under an Alternate Regulatory Scenario as compared to the proposed project under existing conditions and as described in Chapters 7 – 32 of the EIR.
405-13	Impacts Comments As noted above, Chapter 12 includes descriptions of nineteen specific impacts. It is notable that "Impact AQUA-2: Effects of Operations and Maintenance of Water Conveyance Facilities on Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon" is by far the longest, most detailed of the nineteen impacts. Those details cover such topics as near- and far-field effects, North and South Delta exports, water temperature and harmful algal blooms. But in spite of all of these details, there is no discussion of the impact of reduced flows throughout the estuary on winter-run Chinook salmon. Detailed review of the other eighteen impacts shows the same missing information: nowhere does the DEIR discuss the impact of reduced flows on any of the fish and aquatic resources. This complete lack of discussion contradicts Chapter 12's own statement, as quoted above (on p. 12-8, the DEIR states, "Flow management in the Delta altered the aquatic habitat by (1) changing aspects of the historical flow regime (timing, magnitude, duration) that supported life history traits of native species; (2) limiting access to or quality of habitat; (3) contributing to conditions better suited to invasive, nonnative species (reduced spring flows,	The comment suggests that the Draft EIR omits discussion of the impacts associated with flows in the analysis of fish and aquatic resources contained in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources; however, multiple analyses regarding flow are included. For example, Impacts AQUA-2 (winter-run Chinook salmon), AQUA-3 (spring-run Chinook salmon), and AQUA-4 (fall-run/late fall-run Chinook salmon) all include consideration of indirect mortality within the Delta using tools such as the Delta Passage Model, which reflects the effects of flow on juvenile through-Delta migration survival. A number of other impacts include quantitative or qualitative consideration of the effects of differences in Delta outflow on fish and aquatic resources, for example, Impact AQUA-5 (Central Valley steelhead; cross-referencing juvenile Chinook salmon analysis), Impact AQUA-6 (delta smelt; this discusses potential X2 effects on prey and juvenile survival), Impact AQUA-7 (longfin smelt; this applies a statistical relationship between Delta outflow and fall midwater trawl abundance index), Impacts AQUA-8 and AQUA-9 (green and white sturgeon; a Delta outflow-year class strength regression analysis is applied), and Impacts AQUA-14 and AQUA-15 (striped bass and American shad; these include application of published X2-abundance and survival relationships).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	increased summer inflows and exports, and low and less-variable interior Delta salinity [Moyle and Bennett 2008]…".")	
405-14	Furthermore, the other eighteen impacts [in Ch.12] do not provide anywhere near the same detailed analysis of the impacts as Impact AQUA-2. Why not? Again, nowhere in the DEIR is there any explanation for why the impact on winter-run Chinook receives the substantial bulk of the impact discussion. Many if not all of the other impacted species, whether steelhead, delta smelt, long-fin smelt, or even southern resident killer whales, will be negatively impacted by the proposed project's operations and maintenance, and in nearly all of the same ways that winter-run Chinook salmon will be impacted. Therefore, the DEIR's Chapter 12 should be thoroughly rewritten. Here I provide a list of the impact topics discussed in Impact AQUA-2: - Near-field effects of North and South Delta Exports -Far-field effects: -Hydrodynamic effects - Through-Delta Survival - Habitat Suitability -Habitat & Wetland Bench Inundation -Water Temperature -Cyanobacteria Harmful Algal Blooms - Metals -Adult Straying -Salmon Life-Cycle monitoring - Maintenance Effects - CEQA Conclusions -No Project Alternative	The level of detail provided for each species evaluated in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, is appropriate given the state of the knowledge for each species, potential for impacts and known population stressors, and status of species (e.g., listed species vs. non-listed species). The items in the list are addressed, to the extent biologically relevant, for every species evaluated. Thus, for example, listed species such as winter-run Chinook salmon and delta smelt include relatively more factors given increased knowledge and concern about particular stressors, as expressed in prior environmental and permitting documentation involving these species. Species may also have relatively less detail because it is appropriate to cross-reference more detailed analysis for other species, for example as is done in the case of other salmonids cross-referencing the analysis for winter-run Chinook salmon. Specific to that point, reference Impact AQUA-3. In the introductory paragraph is a reference to analyses associated with Impact AQUA-2 that are comparable. This logic is carried on throughout Chapter 12. Additionally, certain analytical tools, such as the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Life Cycle Model are specific to only the winter-run Chinook salmon.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	A thorough revision of Chapter 12 is required to provide similar impact analyses across all affected fish and aquatic resources for the simple reason that winter-run chinook salmon is not the only species which lives - or attempts to live - in this heavily altered environment. The proposed project will alter this environment even more. Every affected species deserves and requires a thorough analysis. The analysis of winter-run chinook salmon provides a reasonable model to begin that analysis.	
405-15	Important Omissions: The winter-run Chinook salmon analysis fails to address the historic, continuing and future impacts of reduced water flows throughout the Bay-Delta Estuary. Therefore, to the bulleted list provided above [see comment 14], the DEIR needs to add this impact element to its analysis of all impacted species, not only winter-run chinook: - Impact of historic, continuing and future water diversions on each species' ability to thrive.	Information related to past and current conditions is provided in the environmental setting in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. Please also see response to comment 405-12 regarding other plans, projects, policies, and programs and cumulative impacts analyzed in Chapter 12, which considers potential future reduced water flows. Please also see response to comment 405-10 with respect to future conditions and consideration of climate change.
405-16	A second major omission is regarding the Delta Reform Act of 2009 ("the Act"). The Act defines "coequal goals" as "the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." (Water Code 85054) Nowhere in Chapter 12 is the Act addressed. Fish and aquatic resources are certainly part of "natural resource values" and therefore are required by California law to be enhanced, not degraded. Chapter 12 of the DEIR must be completely rewritten. Every section, from the	Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding consistency with the Delta Reform Act, including the application of the co-equal goals. Delta Reform Act Considerations are contained in Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Environmental Setting and stressors all the way through to Impact AQUA-19, must be rewritten to include a full, detailed description of how each specific element will be enhanced by the proposed project. As currently written, the DEIR violates the Delta Reform Act of 2009; substantial revisions must be undertaken to correct this glaring omission.	
405-17	DCP DEIR Chapter 16 - Comments This section of the DEIR is narrowly focused on what people do when they recreate in the Delta. They adequately cover the geographical locations of marinas and parks and using survey information estimate what people are doing and how long they are doing it. Their main analysis focuses on the impacts to these recreational activities from the construction, operation and maintenance of the tunnel project. This narrow focus ignores a key issue: how does this project improve water quality in the Delta. On p. 16-33, the DEIR quotes the Delta Reform Act of 2009, which calls for the coequal goals for the Delta of "providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the delta ecosystem." Relative to recreation, protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem is paramount.	The study area and methods and rationale for the analysis are discussed in Chapter 16, Recreation. The criteria used for determining the significance of an effect on recreation resources are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist). Effects on water-dependent or water-enhanced recreation opportunities are evaluated for the potential of the project to: (1) increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; and (2) whether the project includes recreational facilities or requires (or indirectly cause) the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Similarly, criteria used for determining the significance of an effects on water quality are based on the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (Environmental Checklist). Effects would be considered significant if implementation of an alternative would result in a set of conditions, of which includes exceeding state or federal water quality objectives or criteria such that they result in adverse effects on beneficial uses such as recreation activities. Water Quality effects are provided in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The effects analysis in Chapter 9 determined the project would not cause increased exceedances of water quality objectives/criteria by frequency, magnitude, and geographic extent that would result in adverse effects on one or more beneficial uses. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the Delta Reform Act.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
405-18	One important step in protecting the Delta ecosystem is to ensure that adequate flows of fresh water flow through the Delta. The lack of adequate flows is apparent right now in harmful algal blooms that endanger children and pets and stagnant, weed-filled channels that provide habitat for non-native species. The Recreation section of the DEIR should be amended to address the impacts of inadequate flows and poor water quality on human recreation. The DEIR also needs to address how the tunnel project will protect, restore, and enhance the Delta ecosystem.	Please see response to comment 405-17 regarding project effects to water quality. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding requirements for defining baseline under CEQA and plans, policies, and programs that are included in the baseline, including State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641. Please see response to comment 405-9 regarding measuring change from baseline under alternatives. Impacts on recreationists from water quality and water flow and level considerations are discussed in Chapter 16, Recreation, Impact REC-1. Further discussion regarding effects related to the potential for diminished quality of recreation experiences can be found in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the Delta Reform Act and "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem."
405-19	On p. 16-22, the DEIR states "Desalination projects would most likely be pursued in the northern and southern coastal regions. The southern coastal regions would likely require larger and more desalination projects than the northern coastal region in order to replace the water yield that otherwise would have been received through the Delta Conveyance Project. These projects would be sited near the coast." The DEIR provides no evidence for this bold statement. The DEIR needs to be amended to explain the source of this statement and why DWR thinks it is true. Alternatively, this statement should be stricken from the DEIR as it is purely speculative with no scientific evidence to back it up.	Please see Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, in the section entitled, No Project Alternative Assumptions for Water Agency Action, for a description of the assumption and reasoning used in the No Project Alternative for location of potential desalination plants.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
405-20	On p. 16-34, the DEIR states, "The 2019 biological opinions issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and USFWS facilitate Delta habitat restoration." DWR needs to explain which biological opinions it is referencing here, since there are several out there, and at least some of them are the subject of current litigation and may not apply to this project.	The statement is referring to the 2019 biological opinions issued by NMFS and USFWS. These opinions and their modeled representation are described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, "Among the ongoing programs by governmental entities that are included in the No Project Alternative are actions required by the 2019 USFWS and NMFS Biological Opinions (BiOps) on Coordinated Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2020 Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for Long-Term Operations of the SWP. The following summarizes which actions are reflected in the No Project Alternative as well as Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, and Appendix 5A, Section A, Modeling Technical Appendix Overview.
405-21	Conclusion DWR's Draft EIR is so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment have been precluded. A revised Draft EIR containing the required full environmental disclosure and the required range of reasonable alternatives must be prepared and recirculated for public review and comment.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments stating opinions regarding general opposition of the project and recirculation. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Responses to specific comments regarding the range of alternatives evaluated and the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR are provided in responses to comments 405-2 through 405-20.
414-1	The principal purpose of this project, to ensure the continued conveyance of water to agriculture and domestic use south of the Delta, in an era of demonstrable global warming that has plunged California into persistent drought, would be fulfilled only if its completion guaranteed sufficient snow and rainfall to accomplish the goal. Unfortunately, it doesn't. Thus, the	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	participating rate payers would be paying billions of dollars for a mere expectancy.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to taxpayers.
414-2	The money to be expended on the project would be better spent on activities that actually produce more usable water, such as reclamation and helping agriculture transition to less water-intensive crops and more efficient irrigation systems.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project. Please also refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
414-3	Further, the Delta needs the infusion of more water, not the lower amount that this project would certainly provide despite assertions to the contrary.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, and the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative.
414-4	This latter-day peripheral canal project needs to be abandoned once and for all, therefore I respectfully submit that the "no project alternative" be adopted.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
422-1a	As a concerned resident of Solano County, I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel). I live in Rio Vista, shop locally, own a sailboat, berthed	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	in Isleton, CA, and drive frequently on Hwy 12, Hwy 160 and Interstate 5.	text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
422-1b	I am concerned that the Delta waterways, flora and fauna, roads and highways are too fragile to support 14 years of construction traffic, a 100-foot deep, 40-foot-wide tunnel and the increase of salinity caused by pumping our water to Southern California. The Delta cannot survive long-term tunnel construction and water loss to Big Ag and farmlands with poor soil on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Currently our 2-lane roads are frequently impacted by bridge/ferry closings, road accidents, road repair and weather.	The commenter addresses concerns related to terrestrial biological resources, transportation, water quality and/or loss. Please refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and adequacy of mitigation measures; Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of road rehabilitation; and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, for more information about the water quality impact analysis. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project. Please also refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
422-2	It [the DCP] is incompatible with The Delta Protection Act of 1992 that declared "the Delta … a natural resource of statewide, national, and international significance containing irreplaceable resources… the policy of the state (is) to recognize, preserve and protect those resources for the use of enjoyment of current and future generations". The DEIR is not in alignment with the qualities that make the delta unique and important to farmers, recreation, quality of life, and nutrient-rich habitat. In March 2019, the California Legislature declared the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, consisting of approximately 73,000 acres, a National Heritage Area.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Protection Act of 1992 is discussed in multiple chapters where applicable, such as the description of the Study Area and the list of existing plans, policies and programs related to the cumulative impacts analysis (See Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Chapter 14, Land Use, Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources). The EIR provides an analysis of the environmental resources raised by the comment, including agriculture (Chapter 15), recreation (Chapter 16), land

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		use (Chapter 14), fish and aquatic resources (Chapter 12), terrestrial biological resources (Chapter 13), and cultural resources (Chapter 19). Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
426-1	When I drive to Sacramento or Tahoe especially in the weekend rush, I usually drive through the Delta, it takes a bit longer than the no backups alternatives, (when has that ever happened?) but I can expect to arrive on time with the box of Barbecued Pork Baos from my usual stop in Hood. I usually allow time for a stop at one of the great local restaurants along the way. In any event I am not the only one the Antioch Bridge. All of us will be diverted to I-80 and I-5, both of which are already overloaded. Construction on the conveyance will make travel from the Bay Area to Sacramento and the North Sierra almost impossible even if the construction trucks use I-5 for part of the trip which will turn that freeway into a parking lot. You can forget 160 and 84.	Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding information on selected study areas and the analysis of potential transportation impacts. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects on local and regional roadways including Interstate 5; State Routes 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road; and Hood-Franklin Road, discussed in Chapter 20, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of road rehabilitation.
426-2	The destruction of the Delta lifestyle which is inevitable despite all the "Mitigation Projects" with whole islands buried in drilling mud is a major loss of a wonderful recreation area and the chance to relax and enjoy the quiet lifestyle. It will not be recreated after the project is completed. The natives will have dispersed to new areas of the state.	Please refer to Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities.
426-3	One of the major justifications for Central Valley Aqueduct was to supply farmers who export Northern California's rapidly diminishing supply of water in the form of Almonds and Rice to Monsoon areas of the Globe. Many of these farmers have been forced to tear out crops and some have already moved to places with more reliable water supplies. The conveyance will	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	have no water to sell, but no problem, the major customers will have moved.	Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
426-4	It should also be noted that a 22-year drought is not a transient phenomenon, but scientifically linked to ongoing Climate Change. It isn't going to end soon even if the overdue month-long atmospheric river drowns the Central Valley again. Most such catastrophic atmospheric rivers, which will be more intense due to Climate Change merely run off into the Pacific Ocean. Even the month-long event would run off through the delta turning it and everything on it into a major riverbed.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, which discusses climate change analysis in the EIR and water supply reliability and climate change. Please also refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding climate change assumptions related to hydrological modeling.
426-5	I am sure you are tired of all the comments on how worthless the $40 Billion spent on the Delta Conveyance Project is but take the same money so coveted by the construction industry and distribute it all over the state for projects for reclaiming flood water, desalination, grey water reclamation, putting solar water purification on the aqueduct and reservoirs, and hundreds of other water conservation projects, call it Alternative B, and make something useful out of the Delta Conveyance Project.	Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for details on project costs to taxpayers. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project. Please also refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
434-1	To whom it concerns: I would like to request that the appendix for mitigation actions (3F) be revised and updated with respect to the potential use of Bouldin Island. Bouldin Island is currently going through an adaptive land use public planning process for the entire island, called the Delta Island Adaptations [DIA] Project: https://deltaislandadaptations-ucdavis.hub.arcgis.com/ Your mitigation study preceded this land use planning effort and assumes a status quo of the current land uses and conditions around which to plan mitigation, which is no longer accurate. It would be helpful to all if you included language in the appendix that makes mention of the DIA project, which will likely affect where and how conveyance mitigation would best occur on Bouldin island, given the land use planning and climate change adaptation outcomes of the DIA process.	Regarding land uses of planned compensatory mitigation locations (i.e., Bouldin Island), there are no legal prohibitions to using the initial mitigation sites, including portions of the Delta Islands Adaptations project identified in the Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for Delta Conveyance Project compensatory mitigation. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for a discussion of potential land encumbrances.
436-1	It seems DWR and our Governor are so bent on pushing this project through that the health of the Delta is being ignored. There are so many voices that just are not getting the attention that they should. Bring some health back to the Delta first before trying to put in a tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comment that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted by DWR throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. Please also see Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding outreach activities conducted for environmental justice communities in the Delta and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for additional information on DWR's proactive approach to engage interested parties, agencies and individual interested in the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making, and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources.
436-2	Go back and visit Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. I don't think you'll find too many citizens objecting to that.	This comment does not concern the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
447-1	I write to you today not only as a concerned citizen but as the patriarch of three generations of my family living in Discovery Bay – once a safe place for my grandchildren to swim and sadly, no longer. Years of neglect and excessive pumping from the Delta have resulted in uncontrolled weeds and the poisonous Blue Green algae making it unsafe for man or beast to venture into our bays. That is today. Yet the State is planning even further damage to our ecology and environment with a tunnel project that will divert even more fresh water from the South Delta. The result is inevitable saltwater encroachment further East and even more polluted water in Discovery Bay as water flow are further reduced.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, for the project's impact on Recreation and Recreational Opportunities. Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, for more information regarding surface water quality and groundwater resources. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5: Effects on Electrical Conductivity Resulting from Facility Operations and Maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. The analysis within Chapter 9 concluded Impact WQ-5 to be less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
447-2	How can the State even contemplate spending $16 billion to build something that causes environmental harm to multiple communities and farms while not generating one single gallon of new water? Given the woeful history of over budget State projects (e.g. Bay Bridge, High Speed rail) shouldn't we also be skeptical of $16 billion for a 20 year project moving almost 300 million cubic feet of clay, peat and soil from deep underground. Perhaps $100 Billion might be closer.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, which focus on the SWP's ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize disruption of SWP operations from earthquakes in and around the Delta, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility. As described in Chapter 2, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. The project is not intended to create new water supplies. The above-stated main purpose leads to a number of related objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project, encompassing various aims such as improved operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta, among others. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to taxpayers.
447-3	The current conveyance system from the Delta to Southern California is flawed but it has worked for decades. Today, however, we are facing climate changes with no known end to the drought. The tunnel project and even the current supply system are totally dependent on the snowpack in the mountains and are, and will continue to be, the single heaviest user of electricity in the State. I have two points here. First is the questionable assumption that the future snowpack will provide adequate water flows to allow the anticipated level of pumping.	Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including energy consumption in Chapter 22, Energy. Please also see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
447-4	The current conveyance system from the Delta to Southern California is flawed but it has worked for decades. Today, however, we are facing climate changes with no known end to the drought. The tunnel project and even the current supply	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	system are totally dependent on the snowpack in the mountains and are, and will continue to be, the single heaviest user of electricity in the State. I have two points here. Secondly, in everything I have read, the State has totally failed to examine alternatives that would actually generate fresh water. Entire countries now depend on desalination and the power we use pumping Delta water over the Tehachapi Mountains could be better used powering desalination plants in Southern California. Even better, why are we not considering desalination powered by solar to meet State goals of clean power?	General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management (such as desalination) and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including energy consumption in Chapter 22, Energy.
447-5	To take this to the next level, it is my understanding that the existing SWP is the largest consumer of electricity in California and that the Edmonston Plant alone consumes some 40% of that power. If I read the draft EIR correctly, the tunnel will add another 1.3 Gigawatt annual need with no mitigation whatsoever and a looming crisis of power shortages in the State. Many of us will be retired or deceased by the time this tunnel is built and I have no doubt that the people finishing the project in 2045 or beyond will wonder what on earth we were thinking.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including energy consumption in Chapter 22, Energy. As analyzed in Chapter 22, the project alternatives would require the use of electricity during both construction and operation; however, none of the alternatives would result significant impacts on energy.
447-6	In a State that is a world leader in technology development, it appears our State government is ignoring the viable options that are tried and proved around the world. We, the taxpayers, have spent millions of dollars planning and studying a tunnel project while nothing has been done to build storage or to look	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for a discussion of project costs to taxpayers.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	at modern day alternatives. I urge all concerned to cancel the tunnel project and divert their resources to technology driven projects that actually produce new supplies of fresh water.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making, and adaptive management. Please also refer to Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions.
448-1	My name is Chelsea Boyle and I am a concerned resident of CA commenting on the delta tunnel project.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
448-2	I urge you to stop the delta tunnel. This project would result in substantial cumulatively significant impact on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape and Sacramento River TCL, toxic algae and fish runs.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Although the analyses in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, conclude that impacts on Tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding an in-depth analysis of the project alternatives and the potential impacts on fish species, which were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact would be less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Additionally, the EIR appropriately evaluates cumulative impacts on water quality, fish species, and Tribal cultural resources, in Chapter 9, Chapter 12, and Chapter 32, respectively, and proposes mitigation measures for potentially significant environmental impacts, where appropriate.
448-3	Tribes should not have to fight so hard to save their Tribal cultural resources, spiritual and ceremonial sites and locations of creation stories from desecration by state projects. Some Northern CA tribes deeply depend on survival of the salmon	DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta as a Tribal cultural landscape, as described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, Impact TCR-1. Please see the response to comment 448-2 regarding the Tribal cultural resources analysis and Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
448-4	Further, DEIR does not adequately assess salmon and other fish and all alternatives result in far worse ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife. It does not assess the environmental impact on water quality which is essential to fish survival.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for a full evaluation of potential impacts on water quality. As described in Chapter 9, all potential water quality impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. Please also refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and adequacy of mitigation measures.
449-1	We must stop diverting our rivers and let them flow naturally and stop messing with mother nature. Leave her alone. This is not okay. We the people are putting an end to this. No more diverting our precious waterways for profit. This is also not	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	helping with climate control. Listen to us and do something about it and make the best decision for the people, for the earth!!! Save our rivers and all the animal life that depend on it. It is stopping now. No more delta tunnel.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project. Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis.
453-1	In submitting my EIR comments, I am also expressing my strong opposition to what I view as a disastrous project that will cost billions of dollars, won't generate one new drop of water and will likely lead to the ecological collapse of the Delta and cause huge irreversible negative impacts to small farmers in the Delta, sacred indigenous cultural sites, beloved historic resources and endangered species. Californians have fought various versions of this project as far back as the voter defeated Peripheral Canal. Current DWR estimates claim the Delta Conveyance Project will cost $16 billion (I have also seen estimates of $20 billion) and could take up to thirteen years to construct. Due to inflation, cost overruns and the inevitable delays that occur with huge projects, all of these numbers are likely huge understatements of what the actual cost and time line will be.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition of the project. DWR has reviewed all general comments in opposition to the project and will consider these comments as part of the decision-making process. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on aquatic biological resources and terrestrial biological resources are not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The EIR has fully evaluated and disclosed potentially significant impacts on agricultural resources, cultural resources, and Tribal cultural resources, as identified in Chapters 15, Agricultural Resources, Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, respectively, and provided mitigation measures to reduce impacts on these resources where feasible. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the cost and funding for the Delta Conveyance Project.
453-2	Climate predictions show California continuing to suffer from increasing heat, long term drought and aridification interspersed with unpredictable mass rain/flooding events that	This comment describes information about projections of future climate and is generally consistent with the information in Chapter 30, Climate

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	could be as bad or worse than the rain/flooding event that California experienced in the 1860's.	Change, regarding projections of future climate that includes changes in temperature, precipitation and hydrology, and sea level rise. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all general comments in opposition to the project and will consider these comments as part of the decision-making process.
453-3	Increasing heat will worsen water evaporation, resulting in less Delta water reaching its Southern California destinations than is currently the case. The Delta is already in serious trouble given the amount of water that is currently sent south and the new Delta Conveyance intakes will increase the amount of water diverted from the Delta while increased heat and evaporation will result in less of the total water that is diverted arriving at its destination than is the case today.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project. One of the objectives of the project is "protect the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements." The Delta Conveyance Project is being implemented to help restore and protect the reliability of State Water Project (SWP) water deliveries and, potentially, Central Valley Project (CVP) water deliveries by addressing seismic risks, sea level rise, and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events Although Delta Conveyance Project does not address loss of water through evaporation neither does it preclude future actions taken by DWR or others which may address evaporation losses. The project would not modify existing water rights and does not propose to convey water supplies beyond those that are currently allowed by existing water rights or contracts. Please also see Common Response 1, regarding baseline conditions and the operation of the existing SWP and CVP. The effects of climate change on evaporation in the California Aqueduct is not an environmental impact of the proposed project, so no CEQA analysis is required.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
453-4	If the episodic massive rain events/floods that are predicted occur, it is unclear how much damage they will do to the Delta watershed and equally unclear what they will do the existing system of canals that carry water south or even to the new tunnel. That system could be destroyed by a massive flood.	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP deliveries. The proposed project is not a flood control project but has been designed to ensure that intake structures on the Sacramento River and modifying flood control levees would not reduce the protection afforded by the existing flood control system. The Delta Conveyance Project water conveyance facilities are designed to withstand different flood events (e.g., 200-year flood event) under different project climate change hydrology (e.g., sea level rise of 10.2 feet at Golden Gate Bridge). Please see Chapter 7, Flood Protection, for a description of the existing setting and areas subject to flooding, as well as Chapter 30, Climate Change, for a discussion of climate change and how it is projected to affect the study area.
453-5	For that matter, it [a new tunnel] could also be destroyed by a massive earthquake.	Potential impacts associated with the operation and construction of the project and earthquakes are evaluated in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity. This chapter concludes that construction and operation of all facilities would meet all required standards for earthquake safety. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake.
453-6	A system of water distribution that is dependent on a massive tunnel combined with the existing above ground canal system has no resilience in the event of a major catastrophe and the cost of the Delta Conveyance project will significantly limit the money that water districts participating in the Conveyance Project have to spend on building local resilience.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the performance of the project objectives related to seismic events. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits. Please also see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, which identifies one of the project objectives as being "To minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts from reduced quantity and quality of SWP water deliveries, and potentially CVP water deliveries, south of the Delta as a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		result of a major earthquake that could cause breaching of Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas where existing SWP and CVP pumping plants operate in the southern Delta." Public Water Agencies participating in the Conveyance project make independent decisions regarding their service area needs and budgets and the budget limit asserted by the comment is beyond the scope of the CEQA analysis for the Delta Conveyance Project.
453-7	The section of the EIR on alternatives includes a "No Project Alternative" and a discussion of the three tunnel alignments that were considered and why the chosen alignment was chosen. Nowhere does it consider how the $16 billion (or whatever the final estimate is) might instead be used to make southern and central California water districts more resilient while sparing the Delta itself from collapse or something very close to collapse. Such alternatives include waste-water/runoff recycling to make such water potable, reuse of grey water for irrigation, ground water recharge systems, repairing and replacing leaking municipal water pipes and water pipes located on private property, drip irrigation, drought tolerant landscapes, all of which would contribute to local resiliency.	The assertion that the EIR does not consider how the project will sustain south of Delta water providers is not supported by the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, please refer to the section titled No Project Alternative in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis. These reasonably foreseeable actions include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies. Furthermore, the EIR does not support the assertion that funding for the Delta Conveyance Project could instead be used for projects benefiting the southern and central California water districts. It is speculative to assume, if the Delta Conveyance Project was not approved, that the funding would be used to fund an increase in local water projects beyond those assumed in the No Project Alternative.
453-8	A major portion of this extremely expensive project will be paid for by increasing water rates in the water districts that will get water from the Delta Conveyance Project. People are already	The EIR includes an analysis of environmental justice issues in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice; however, this is not required under CEQA. The section titled Resource Topics without CEQA Impact Conclusions in Chapter

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	struggling to pay their water bills and many rate payers have faced shut-offs because of inability to pay. This is a huge environmental justice issue, the full extent of which will not be clear until the actual costs of the Delta Conveyance project, including cost overruns, inevitable delays and the inflation that will occur during course of a project that will take as many years to build as the tunnel will. (Perhaps the best analogy is the delays and cost overruns the high speed rail project is currently experiencing.)	29 discusses the environmental justice effects of changes in water supply to the participating export service area public water agencies that receive SWP water. It describes how current and future actions by participating public water agencies would ensure meeting the water supply needs of minority customers and low-income customers within their service areas. Overall, sustaining and improving water supply reliability and supplementing or reducing groundwater use as expected with implementation of the proposed project and its alternatives would provide broad direct and indirect benefits to minority and low-income communities in the SWP export service area. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to water users and customer rates.
453-9	Much of the water from the Delta Conveyance Project will go to large agricultural operations in the San Joaquin Valley, while many small farmers in the Delta will be sacrificed to eminent domain. Many of the large farming operations grow highly water dependent crops: e.g. almonds. pistachios, a large percentage of which are shipped overseas, and alfalfa, used to feed animals in factory farms which themselves contribute significantly to the climate crisis. These crops will likely not be sustainable given increasing heat and drought. Given California's changing climate, there needs to be a realistic analysis of what crops are and are not sustainable, The state should not be destroying sustainable small farming operations in the Delta in order to provide water to large, wealthy growers whose crops are not sustainable. California is going to have to adjust what it grows to the significantly altered climate it is currently facing.	Please see response to comment 453-3 regarding the SWP and the delivery of water in the State of California. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies and Programs, regarding the beneficial use of water in the State of California. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding impacts on all agricultural resources and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding climate change effects. Neither chapter supports the conclusion that the project would destroy sustainable farming operations in the Delta. As described in Appendix 15B, Agricultural and Land Stewardship Considerations, extensive planning efforts helped to greatly reduce the total extent of agricultural land in the Delta that would need to be permanently or temporarily converted during construction. Current and future crops choices by agricultural operators within the SWP service area are largely driven by market forces which can be highly dynamic; crop choices are effectively private business decisions which are not under DWR's authority and hence outside the scope of this EIR analysis.
453-10	Currently fracking is consuming and permanently poisoning immense amounts of water in Kern County and surrounding areas and contributing to California's water crisis. It makes no	Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies and Programs, regarding the beneficial use of water in the State of California. As discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, the California Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	sense to build an incredibly expensive, destructive tunnel on the one hand, while allowing massive amounts of our previous water to be poisoned on the other. Any realistic plan to address California's water crisis needs to address this horrible waste of water before inflicting a multi-billion dollar, Delta destroying tunnel on us. How is this issue going to be addressed or will it just continue to be ignored? Currently, thanks to a combination of heat/evaporation and the amount of water diverted from the Delta, water quality is becoming an increasing problem. Stockton, much of which is an environmental justice community, has been struggling with toxic algal blooms for several years now. This year San Francisco Bay had serious problems with toxic algal blooms. As heat and water evaporation worsen, this problem will worsen. Further reduction in water flows through the Delta will make this problem even worse and is totally unacceptable. Given the toxicity of the algal blooms, this is a growing public health issue. How will it be handled?	Resilience Portfolio released on July 28, 2020, identifies a suite of complementary actions to ensure safe and resilient water supplies, flood protection and healthy waterways for the state's communities, economy, and environment. One of the projects identified in the portfolio is new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta to safeguard the SWP, which is now proposed as the Delta Conveyance Project. This portfolio is a plan to address California's water resource management issues. Chapter 9, Water Quality, evaluates the impact of the alternatives on cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (CHABs) in Impact WQ-14. The impact analysis addressed numerous locations including the Stockton Waterfront and San Francisco Bay, and concluded the frequency and magnitude of CHABs for project alternatives are not expected to increase substantially, if at all, in the study area waterbodies. Chapter 26, Public Health, Impact PH-5 evaluates the potential impacts on public health due to an increase in Microcystis bloom formation (CHABs) and concludes impacts would be less than significant because the factors affecting the development of CHABs in the Delta would not be changed in such a degree that the frequency or magnitude of CHABs in these areas of the Delta would be affected relative to existing conditions. The portion of the comment regarding the use of water for fracking is beyond the scope of the project and the Delta Conveyance Project EIR.
453-11	Currently there isn't even agreement on the amount of water that needs to travel through the Delta to the ocean in order for there to be any reasonable chance of the Delta's survival as a functioning ecosystem - an amount that will need to increase as increasing heat and resultant evaporation take an ever increasing toll on our rivers and streams. There needs to be clear, public, transparent scientific analysis of how much water actually needs to pass through the Delta to prevent ecological collapse. Such analysis must be overseen by the State Water	CEQA does not require projects to undertake ecosystem restoration or to preemptively address ecological decline. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the State Water Resource Control Board activities related to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and the Voluntary Agreements. As described in Common Response 8, the State Water Board is an independent agency with independent responsibilities and authorities, one of which includes establishing and implementing water quality objectives through existing water quality control plans. The comment mentions the voluntary

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Quality Control Board. Currently, so called voluntary agreements are being used to determine water flows. Voluntary agreements are political agreements, lack scientific basis and are unacceptable.	agreements which are not part of the Delta Conveyance Project, nor part of the EIR, and therefore this part of the comment does not raise issues pertinent to the Delta Conveyance EIR. Please refer to Appendix 4C, Alternate Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis, which provides information regarding a possible future Alternate Regulatory Scenario describing different regulatory requirements for water quality and flow in the Delta from those assumed in the assessment provided in Chapters 5–32 of the EIR. Appendix 4C considers whether potential future changes to existing regulatory requirements could cause changes to potential environmental effects of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project disclosed in the EIR. DWR acknowledges that the existing regulatory requirements are subject to change. Should regulatory requirements change, DWR will modify operations in accordance with those requirements. Modification of State Water Project operations resulting from the implementation of future changes to regulatory requirements would require separate evaluation and approval.
453-12	The Delta is facing a massive extinction crisis of native species of fish, including salmon. This is due to both inadequate amounts of water traveling through the Delta water system and the increasing heat of the water that is literally cooking endangered fish alive. California cannot afford a multi-billion-dollar tunnel that triggers mass extinction events.	The analyses in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, draw upon both quantitative and qualitative evaluations of the impacts on aquatic species, as provided by experts in the field. These findings do not align with the commenter's suggestion concerning mass extinction events. Where potentially significant impacts are identified, mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant.
453-13	It should also be noted that salmon are a key part of the cultures of the indigenous tribes that will be impacted by the Conveyance Project and their interests must be considered.	DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding DWR's consultation and engagement with Tribes on the project, the definition of Tribal cultural resources, and those resources identified as Tribal cultural resources. Please see Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding DWR's consideration of individual Tribal cultural resources, as well as the documentation in the record

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding DWR's evaluation of Tribal cultural resources. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, including those identified in the table titled Tribal Views on Delta TCL Character-Defining Features. For example, terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species and their habitats, including that of salmon, are identified both as part of the Delta's ecosystem and as character-defining features that represent heritage and cultural significance to Tribes pertaining to sustenance, traditional knowledge, ceremony, spiritual practices, and stewardship. As such, the impact analysis in Chapter 32 considers the various individual resources identified by Tribes and the values these resources contribute to the Tribal Cultural Landscape.
453-14	As the Sacramento Bee points out in a detailed article published November 6, 2022, the entire Delta water system has been subject to ongoing, serious water theft. Massive amounts of water are simply disappearing. The Bee cites as examples the "Shasta River Rebellion" where farmers ignored drought restrictions and simply took as much water as they wanted and a federally funded project on the San Joaquin River where water intended to reach endangered salmon is apparently being siphoned off in great quantities and never reaches the endangered fish. According to the Bee part of the problem is the lack of functioning water gauges that would allow the State Water Resources Control Board to measure water flows and determine areas where water is simply disappearing and part of it is due to farms failing to report their water uses as required by law and the Control Board's lack of an adequate computer system to keep track of any of this. Even if the State Water Resources Control Board develops a clear, scientific standard for how much water must pass through the Delta to the ocean in able to keep it health, how will it be able to measure, let alone enforce, anything close to	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. The State Water Resources Control Board is a separate and independent state agency from the Department of Water Resources. It has an existing system to manage water rights and report annual water diversions. In addition, there are various methodologies the State Water Board uses to evaluate and quantify unavailable water.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	this amount of water is actually passing through when it lacks the necessary measurement tools? This issue must be addressed.	
453-15	While I understand that the proposed Sites Reservoir is separate from the Delta Conveyance project, there seems to be an assumption that it will be built and will provide a source of water that the Conveyance Project can siphon off and send through the tunnel. If built, Sites will drown yet more of what's left of California's wild lands, including habitat for endangered species.	While both the Sites Reservoir Project and Delta Conveyance Project are water-related projects currently under environmental review, the projects serve different purposes (storage versus diversion), can be implemented independently, and neither is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the other. The proposed Sites Reservoir project, which is subject to its own EIR, has not been approved by the Sites Reservoir Authority. For the purposes of the Delta Conveyance Project EIR, the Sites Reservoir Project is included on the cumulative project list and potential impacts associated with implementing both the Delta Conveyance Project and the Sites Reservoir Project are qualitatively evaluated in the cumulative analysis discussions provided in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR where applicable. The hydrologic modeling (documented in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix) does not assume Sites Reservoir would provide source water that the Delta Conveyance Project would divert.
453-16	There is growing evidence that reservoirs are sources of significant amounts of methane gas - gas that is created by the death and decay of the landscapes they drown. Methane is the most potent greenhouse gas there is and climate scientists are in agreement that we should be doing everything possible to reduce current methane gas emissions and avoid creating any more of them. According to the Paris Agreement, 2030 is the year by which carbon emissions must be reduced by 45 percent to avoid "irreversible consequences of climate change". It is irresponsible for the state of California to approve any project that will increase methane emissions during this critical time period. How is the Tunnel Project going to deal with this issue? The Conveyance Project is projected to take at least thirteen years to build and experience tells us that complicated,	The proposed project would not include a new reservoir, and the alternatives that include a small forebay in the south Delta would clear vegetation prior to construction and operations; therefore, methane would not be produced by decaying vegetation. Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, evaluates GHG emissions (including methane) and sequestration resulting from habitat restoration and land use change, including the conversion of existing agricultural lands, related to construction and operation of the alternatives and construction and operation of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan. Specifically, Impact AQ-10 describes the impact analysis. GHG emissions (including methane) from all other emission sources (e.g., off-road equipment exhaust, electricity consumption) are fully quantified for all alternatives in Chapter 23 in Impact AQ-9. The quantification

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	massive projects like the Conveyance Project always take more time than they are estimated to take. Tunnel construction and the new and/or widened roads that must be built to get to construction sites will result in massive carbon emissions from construction equipment and from vehicles driven to and from construction sites by workers and suppliers of materials. Given that we are just beginning the transition to electric trucks and construction vehicles, most of the vehicles used will be diesel. There will also be significant emissions from materials like cement and blacktop used in building the tunnel and roads to construction sites.. Many of these emissions will occur in the time between now and 2030. How are these emissions be accounted for? They fly in the face of the need to make major reductions in emissions before 2030. What will this do to the air that nearby residents, farmers and farm workers must breath for years. Are these people simply considered collateral damage? What about endangered species exposed to this? What about other wildlife?	includes data and assumptions regarding all construction and O&M activities, including roadwork and construction employee vehicle miles driven and equipment and vehicle fuel types. The assumptions can be found in Chapter 23, as well as supporting appendices (e.g., Appendix 23B, Air Quality and GHG Analysis Activity Data). CEQA does not require evaluating embodied emissions from materials like cement and blacktop. Please refer to Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding further information on embodied emissions. As discussed in Chapter 23, DWR has selected a net-zero threshold for construction generated GHG emissions. A net zero threshold represents a conservative assessment of construction emissions considering that they will be generated before the state's commitment to carbon neutrality (2035 for state agencies and 2045 statewide, pursuant to AB 1279). Regardless, DWR has committed to a net zero construction threshold to avoid underrepresenting potential impacts. DWR has also committed to aggressive onsite measures that would substantially reduce GHG emissions. The commitments are summarized in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices, and were identified by DWR based on a comprehensive review of all feasible onsite control strategies, considering project-specific equipment and reasonably foreseeable technologies. Mitigation Measure AQ-9 is proposed where GHG emissions exceed the net emissions criteria of zero. This measure will mitigate emissions from construction to net zero through the development and implementation of a GHG mitigation program. Reducing construction emissions to net zero ensures the project would not contribute to elevated GHG concentrations and associated climate change risks during construction. A health risk assessment was conducted for all alternatives and analyzes potential cancer and non-cancer health hazards associated with receptor exposure to diesel particulate matter. The results are presented in Impact

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		AQ-6. Impact AQ-5 quantifies criteria pollutant concentrations for all alternatives and analyzes whether those concentrations would exceed the health-protective ambient air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected violation. Effects on wildlife species from construction activities are described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Air quality mitigation measures and environmental commitments that reduce emissions generated by construction of the project will minimize exposure of wildlife to project generated air pollution.
453-17	In 2020 a state team of independent engineers called tunnel construction impractical given the inaccessibility of shaft sites and other construction sites due to location and lack of access roads. Was their report simply ignored?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Nevertheless, the comment does not cite or include the 2020 report prepared by the independent engineers and as a result DWR was unable to determine whether this report was included in Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority's (DCA) feasibility analysis and considered during design. DCA has designed the project to include designated parking areas for construction workers at different construction locations where feasible or the development and use of park-and-ride facilities outside of the immediate construction areas when the location does not provide adequate area to include designated parking. In addition, the project does include roadway improvements and specific haul routes to and from project feature construction sites. Details associated with parking areas, park-and-ride facilities, haul routes, and roadway improvements are described in Chapter 3, Description of Project and Alternatives, and Chapter 20, Transportation. Chapter 20 analyzes potential impacts associated with transportation that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, and evaluates mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts.
453-18	Construction of the tunnel will require massive excavation of soil that must be moved somewhere. The need to dump massive volumes of soil somewhere will lead to destruction of	The comment assertions regarding reusable tunnel material (RTM) stockpiles creating flooding risks or landslides are not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. The management of permanent and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	a huge amount of what are now natural lands. What is the ultimate plan for all this soil? What will happen to it if California has one of the massive floods that climate scientists have told us are likely to happen sooner or later? What will be the impact of massive floods and likely massive landslides be on all that piled up soil? Where will it go? How many people and places will it cover, kill and destroy?	temporary reusable tunnel material (RTM) is described in Chapter 3, in the section titled Reusable Tunnel Material. This section provides an overview of how the RTM would be generated, tested, and stored within the construction sites. Under some alternatives, a portion of the RTM would be used for construction of embankments or tunnel shaft pads. All remaining RTM would remain at construction sites. DWR would be committed to developing site-specific plans for the beneficial reuse of RTM. Additionally, the maximum long-term height of the RTM piles would be 15 feet. Chapter 7, Flood Protection, Impact FP-2 identifies that impacts related to flooding at the construction site would be less than significant. Also, as described in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, the project would comply with applicable design standards and building codes to avoid slope instability and other ground failures, during both construction and operation and maintenance.
453-19	The tunnel intakes are apparently slated to be near the historic Delta town of Hood. Much of Hood is an historic resource. The land around Hood, which will be destroyed, is the land the famous Sacramento artist Wayne Tiebault painted. Much of Hood is apparently slated for tear down. What's left of it will likely be made unlivable. It's now beautiful surroundings that Tiebault painted will be turned into an industrial hell scape. It seems likely that the destruction of much of Hood and the years upon years of construction will lead to its total abandonment. There is no way to mitigate the loss of an historic resource like this or the lives of everyone who lives there, works there and all those who care about it.	Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane. As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
453-20	The destruction of Hood and much of the rest of the Delta is an environmental justice issue as well as an historic preservation issue. This massive, unmitigatable disaster is a reason in and of itself not to proceed with the Conveyance Project.	The comment assertions regarding unmitigated impacts on historical resources and agricultural resources are not consistent with the analyses contained in the Draft EIR. Please see response to comment 453-19 regarding consideration of historical resources and Hood. For all significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR, DWR proposed mitigation measures where feasible to reduce the potential level of significance and then

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	How many small farmers in the Delta will be completely wiped out? How much of the Delta farming economy will be lost? This too is a huge, unmitigatable environmental justice.[sic] issue. It is unacceptable to destroy large numbers of people's lives in this way.	determined if the mitigation measure would reduce the level of impact to less than significant. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of CEQA impact determinations and mitigation measures applicable to agricultural resources. As shown in this table, the analysis in the Draft EIR provides for the following mitigation measures: Mitigation Measures AG-1, AG-3, and GW-1. Please also refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for a discussion of the approach used to evaluate environmental justice effects and a disclosure of effects on environmental justice communities in the study area. The mitigation measures identified above are incorporated, where appropriate, into the analysis contained in Chapter 29. Where mitigation measures are found to not reduce significant physical impacts on agricultural and cultural resources to less-than-significant levels, and the remaining impacts would be disproportionate for minority or low-income populations, Chapter 29 acknowledges that there would be an adverse effect on environmental justice. Chapter 29, in the section titled Resource Topics without CEQA Impact Conclusions, also notes that the project's Community Benefits Program would help protect and support the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta. Please refer to Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, for additional details.
453-21	The Sacramento and San Joaquin watershed was all once indigenous land that was stolen. It is full of sacred sites and probably also burial grounds. At one of the EIR hearings that I viewed online, I heard a tribal preservation officer describe construction of the Delta Conveyance Project as "Cultural Genocide" Historically, California is the site of the largest genocide of indigenous people that occurred in our country. There have never been reparations. There has never been justice. Destroying sacred indigenous lands and waters and	DWR recognizes and affirms Executive Order N-15-19, which apologized on behalf of the citizens of the State of California to all California Native Americans for the many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect California inflicted on Tribes. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources was consistent with current State policies regarding Indigenous people in California. Please also see Common Response 16 regarding the context for integrating input from consulting Tribes and the importance of Delta resources. Please see Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	destroying the species on which they have traditionally depended is cultural genocide. To use the climate crisis and the horrible drought as an excuse to build this terribly destructive project that won't fix the drought and won't create even one extra drop of water is profoundly unethical. I am not indigenous, but I stand with my indigenous neighbors in believing that this ill conceived, destructive, astronomically expensive project absolutely must not go forward. It is yet another example of massive settler-colonial land destruction.	Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding funding and implementation of the project.
454-1	I have been boating in the Delta since the 70s and have lived in Discovery Bay since 2007. I have been involved in the various canal and tunnel projects since 2009 and am co-founder of the Save the California Delta Alliance.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
454-2	This "new" EIR has the same serious, unsurmountable issues as the BDCP and Cal WaterFix, issues that are why it was not able to be deemed "Consistent" with the Delta Plan as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. It doesn't preserve legacy communities and doesn't reduce reliance on the Delta…just the opposite.	Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan. Potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 in the EIR. Additionally, the Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
454-3	1) The current Northern intake locations are unacceptable and will destroy the legacy town of Hood. The Delta Plan included preserving the historical legacy towns. The location of the intakes which would decimate the town of Hood was one of	Intake locations were previously intensively analyzed for the BDCP/California WaterFix Project and re-evaluated for the analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project. For the proposed project, DWR also assessed alternative intake locations upstream and downstream, and found that

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the main reasons why the DSC Staff recommended that the WaterFix project was not consistent with the Delta Plan and why WaterFix was about to be rejected by a Judge. This "new" EIR does not change the location. I brought this up again in a June 22, 2020 zoom meeting with DCA's Kathryn Mallon, Phil Ryan, and Nazli Parvizi. Kathryn's reply, the same she has given to the SEC when concerns about Hood were raised, was that this is the only possible location and that the DCA was directed by DWR to not discuss other locations. Having an existing water right is not the legal criteria for evaluating intake locations. Other intake locations and configurations must be reasonably evaluated.	these alternate locations did not meet the project objectives and/or did not have the potential to lessen potential significant environmental effects, which are the screening criteria for whether alternatives should move forward for further evaluation in the EIR. Screening criteria for assessing intake site suitability included proximity to existing development (including the town of Hood), number of structures and residences within the permanent footprint, and potential impacts from construction traffic and new roads and road improvements. Please refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum in the Engineering Project Report for detailed information on site selection criteria (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The comment assertion that the Delta Conveyance Project would decimate the town of Hood is not supported by the analysis in the EIR. While significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated for some resources such as in Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, and Chapter 20, Transportation, other resources evaluated found no impacts or less than significant impacts for the town of Hood and vicinity. Examples include Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; Chapter 14, Land Use; Chapter 16, Recreation; Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, and Chapter 26, Public Health. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood in compliance with CEQA. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
454-4	(2) No Valid Alternatives Studied. The same complaint as I've commented on for the BDCP and WaterFix still exists in this "new" EIR – citizens who live in the Delta area need DWR to study and propose real alternatives. With the money spent on this old technology tunnel, better alternatives that have better cost/benefits need to be evaluated. In this EIR, the DWR even admits that the "No Project" alternative is not accurate. Without a tunnel project, alternatives recommended by Garamendi and Newsom would be considered. More modern projects than a tunnel, projects that actually produce water instead of just moving it, like desalination, recycling, conservation.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR; Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project; Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making, and adaptive management; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for a discussion of project costs to taxpayers.
454-5	(3) Extraordinary Energy Requirements. The pushback on desalination is often an arm wave about the amount of electricity desalination requires…but pumping water over the Tehachapi to L.A. is the largest energy consumer in the state and this project will add another 993 GWh of energy used, more per year than twenty-four California counties. Three times more than Colusa County. The PG&E grid is already	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives such as desalination.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	maxed out in Northern California. We don't need more of a strain from a project that provides no benefit for Northern California.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including energy consumption in Chapter 22, Energy. As analyzed in Chapter 22, the project alternatives would require the use of electricity during both construction and operation; however, none of the alternatives would result significant impacts on energy.
454-6	Bottom Line: We need more water flowing through the Delta. Everyone knows the past decades of over-pumping has put the estuary in crisis. It's intuitively obvious that taking the fresher water out and around the Delta will significantly exacerbate the issues. We already have so many weeds it's impossible to anchor out at Mildred Island without clogging intake hoses.	Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, and Chapter 9, Water Quality, for details on the water supply and water quality reliability changes resulting from the project alternatives. Overall, increases in reliability of the total existing water portfolio are expected with implementation of the proposed project and its alternatives by sustaining and improving water supply reliability. Please also refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, which discusses the reasonable representation of project operations in the hydrologic model (CalSim 3), and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the water quality analysis.
454-7	Each year we have more toxic blue-green algae, harmful to humans and pets, in our bays in Discovery Bay. We need our levee walls strengthened and more delta flow to stop the intrusion of salt water into our Delta farmlands. Every farm in	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	east Contra County is watered from Delta water and it's getting saltier.	Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, including the analysis of harmful algal blooms. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity.
457-1	Daniel Armstrong-Resident of the north delta-supporter of a no tunnel alternative The people and ecosystems of California do not need a Delta tunnel. The single delta tunnel, otherwise known as Delta Conveyance, is a green washed infrastructure project that will be the nail in the coffin for threatened anadromous fish species, wildlife and delta communities.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for discussion of the project's impact analysis on communities.
457-2	The state of California has a history of being racist, classist and anti environment. Continuing that legacy, this project will negatively impact historically disenfranchised delta communities in a direct way and will degrade the quality of life for humans and nature alike.	Please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics; Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, to review how the EIR has incorporated impact analysis and mitigation measures pertaining to community resources; and Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding impacts and mitigation measures affecting minority and low-income communities.
457-3	People in urban spaces such as Stockton and along the south delta will experience an increase in HABs (harmful algal blooms) and degraded water quality, while those of us in the north delta will see a reduction of Sacramento River outflow, rising salinity and the decimation of delta heritage communities and these unique and pristine connected ecosystems.	The comment assertions of the experiences of the south and north delta from the proposed project is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, including the analysis of harmful algal blooms and Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance (electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative.
457-4	Communities such as the towns of Hood, Courtland, Locke, Walnut Grove, Clarksburg, Isleton and Rio Vista will all experience the negative impacts on quality of rural existence. People do not need or desire tons of diesel exhaust, endless lines of truck traffic, massive tons of tunnel muck, nor the destruction of natural spaces along the proposed tunnel pumping station sites.	A health risk assessment was conducted for all alternatives and analyzes potential cancer and non-cancer health hazards associated with receptor exposure to diesel particulate matter. The results are presented in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-6. The analysis demonstrates that cancer and non-cancer risks from construction of the project would be below health protective thresholds at all receptors within the communities identified by the commenter. For Alternatives 2a and 4a, Impact AQ-6 identifies that DWR will provide financial assistance for air filters to residences impacted by construction of Intake A, which is the only location identified in the EIR where predicted health risks would exceed a local air district threshold (see Mitigation Measure AQ-6). Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of road rehabilitation. Additionally, Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, contains information relating to the plans for Reusable Tunnel Material resulting from construction. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening an existing bridge and roadway, as well as for tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane. As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
457-5	In regard to how nature will suffer, we already have seen how water agencies have handled the Sacramento River during this drought year. The Sacramento River temperature management plan and the earlier temporary urgency change petitions all contributed to death of returning fall run adult chinook salmon, who swam into a Sacramento River only to die of gill rot, bacterial infections and low dissolved oxygen due to a 78 plus degree river. These fish were boiling to death and floating down the river during the late summer through mid fall. This is a harbinger of things to come if a delta tunnel project comes to be. This is an insult to these majestic animals and to all the people connected to them.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
457-6	By removing an additional 6,000 CFS through a tunnel, we will be wiping out the flows of the American and Feather rivers. Salt intrusion, rising water temps and less outflow will lead to a massively degraded and decimated California delta and ultimately the ecosystems and communities that connect to it through the bay and pacific.	The comment assertions that the project will "be wiping out the flows of the American and Feather rivers" and "will lead to a massively degraded and decimated California delta" is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative. Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity.
457-7	Leave the California delta to be, it is not for us to exploit or profit from. Profit minded individuals have already caused nature and the people connected to it enough historical and current suffering.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
458-1	My comments on the DEIR are attached. DWR should abandon the project. The time for large 1950's-style massive public works projects has long since passed. There are cost-effective, beneficial alternatives to the project that DWR should pursue.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for information regarding project costs to taxpayers.
458-2	I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel). I'm a retired state scientist whose career has been deeply intwined with environmental planning and Environmental Documents prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
458-3	I know greenwashing and environmental baloney when I see it. The DEIR certainly meets both those characteristics. The Delta Tunnel project is another iteration of the decades-long pipe dream (pardon the expression) of water grabbers who want to profit off Sacramento River water without regard for the damage it would do to Northern California's environment and economy. I was among the 63% of voters who defeated the Peripheral Canal in 1982. And I have followed, with dismay, the ceaseless, subsequent efforts to rebuke the voice of the voters with many iterations of the same basic plan. DWR has been complicit in doing that across several state Administrations, with the latest such boondoggle being the Delta Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives.
458-4	I believe the DEIR is inadequate and has failed miserably to inform the public of the actual extent on the environmental impacts of the project. It functions, and reads, as a justification document (inappropriate, per CEQA guidelines and case law) for the project, doing the bidding of the primary beneficiaries of the project – Corporate Ag Welfare Queens, Big Oil frackers and sleazy water purveyors.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
458-5	While there is no doubt combating the current water crisis is a tough challenge for the state, the Delta Tunnel would lay waste to the Delta and spread harm across a large part of California. Still, the project's environmental, social and economic impacts are problematic, significant, and excessively unaffordable. By belittling concerns about the project, the DEIR is unacceptable.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.
458-6	Here is a short list of the myriad faults of the DEIR's deceptive analysis of the project's impacts: It misleads as to project purpose. The Delta Tunnel project is just a different version of previous underground Peripheral Canals that would deprive the Delta -- the West Coast's largest estuarine wetland -- of necessary fresh water flows. It would permanently alter the hydrology and water quality of the Delta. The DEIR says Delta water exports would increase by 25% if the Delta Tunnel is built, with Sacramento River flows at Hood decreasing by 7% and Delta outflow being reduced by 4%.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project; Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding concerns about saltwater intrusion into the Delta; and Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, for information regarding the hydrologic modeling used in the analysis. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative.
458-7	It claims severe risk from earthquakes as the reason why fresh water from the Sacramento River must be piped underground. Water supply managers know about those risks and already have sufficient infrastructure to handle it. What the Delta actually needs to safeguard against earthquakes and climate change are levee improvements.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. As discussed in the section titled Comment-Suggested Infrastructure and Water Management Alternatives of Common Response 3, upgrading existing Delta levees to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise were fully evaluated and determined to not meet most or all of the Delta Conveyance Project objectives for water supply, climate change, or seismic resiliency.
458-8	It promises better conditions for aquatic species, reiterating an old lie. Aquatic species in the Delta and the Bay-Delta system have not fared well under the mismanagement of Delta water quality. Our commercial fishing industry, our recreational fishing industry and even indicator species like the Delta Smelt have been taking a beating from Big Water's massive fresh water transfers. The Delta Tunnel locks in detrimental	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which identifies significant impacts on fish and aquatic species from construction and operation of water conveyance features and the mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	circumstances for aquatic species and does nothing about the significant fish kills at Clifton Court.	
458-9	It minimizes impacts of the project. Though the project would build a 45-mile long, 39-foot outer diameter tunnel around the Delta, the DEIR claims that all biological impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels. The claim has no merit. Impacts from over a decade of construction would adversely affect thousands of acres of farmland, grasslands, wetlands and riparian habitat, disturbing and displacing wildlife. Worse, the farmlands that would be despoiled have been sustainably farmed for years and years, some for over 150 years.	Please refer to the table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Executive Summary for a comprehensive list of potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please also refer to Chapter 14, Land Use, and Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for the analyses of the project impacts on land and agriculture. As described in Chapter 14, the impacts analyzed would result in no impacts, or less-than-significant impacts. As described in Chapter 15, conversion of agricultural land would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.
458-10	It shows a great number of significant negative impacts on Delta communities that, in total, make the Delta a Sacrifice Area. * Almost 4,000 acres of prime farmland would be harmed by conversion from agricultural uses, by water with more salinity, or by crop reduction * There are more than 70 significant impacts requiring mitigation * There are more than 17 significant impacts regarding noise, air quality, aesthetics and agriculture * The project will cost taxpayers and ratepayers $16 billion or more * Disruptive construction will occur for 13 years or more across 6 counties.	Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of Road Rehabilitation. Truck trips for construction of the project alternatives are included in the roadway segment and intersection analysis contained in Appendix 20A, Delta Conveyance 2020 Traffic Analysis and Appendix 20C, Delta Conveyance 2040 Traffic Analysis. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 14, Land Use, Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for details on project costs, including taxpayer costs.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	* There will be nearly 4.5 million truck trips on Delta roads that were never intended for that level of use.	
458-11	It foreshadows continued negative impacts on vulnerable communities. The project impacts are inherently environmentally unjust. The state has historically just talked a good game about underserved communities and local tribes. The DEIR does not show a pathway out of those hollow promises.	Please see Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for the EIR's impact analysis and mitigation measures related to environmental justice populations. Please refer Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources and how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources was consistent with current State policies regarding Indigenous people in California.
458-12	The project's "Community Benefits Program" does not, and cannot, address the very real impacts to residents during and after construction. This is unacceptable given the extensive and lasting impacts the project would have in the region. For example, criteria and toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, across the region as a result of project construction, endangering the health of Delta residents.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding community engagement proposed by DWR to address effects within local communities during implementation of the Community Benefits Program. Commitments made through the Community Benefits Program would be separate from, and in addition to, mitigation measures identified in the EIR and would seek to address local Delta community effects that are beyond CEQA's analysis of potential significant impacts on the physical environment, such as air quality impacts. Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, discloses significant and unavoidable air quality impacts from construction of the proposed project and its alternatives. Improved air quality is a potential community benefit from potential actions implemented as a result of the Community Benefits Program. Please refer to Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program for details on these benefits. Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for details on the water supply changes resulting from the project alternatives. Overall, the proposed project and its alternatives would sustain and improve water supply reliability.
458-13	It makes unsupported claims about the Delta Tunnel's functionality during "big storms". Though it states that 236,000 acre-feet of "big storm" water could have been captured for re-use if the Delta Tunnel had been in operation recently, it provides no details about how that could have been done	Please see Chapter 6, Water Supply, for details on the water supply changes resulting from the project alternatives. Overall, the proposed project and its alternatives would sustain and improve water supply reliability.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	while also respecting existing regulatory constraints. In truth, the Delta Tunnel would divert water every day, taking up to 6,000cfs. Diversions of that scale will create permanent drought conditions in the Delta.	
458-14	Diverting 1/3 to 1/2 the average flow of the river will increase salinity as well as the incidence of harmful algal blooms. Yet the DEIR somehow concludes those impacts will be less than significant. It offers no mitigation measures for salinity or harmful algal blooms.	Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding concerns about increased salinity and harmful algal blooms (CHABs) into the Delta. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality including the analysis of electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and CHABs. Overall, increases in reliability of the total existing water portfolio is expected with implementation of the proposed project and its alternatives by sustaining and improving water supply reliability and supplementing or reducing groundwater use. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, specifically under Impact WQ-14, operation of the project under the project alternatives would not affect Delta water temperatures, nutrients, or water clarity at levels that would substantially affect, or affect at all, cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (CHABs) frequency or magnitude in the Delta.
458-15	It presents project alternatives that essentially just rearrange how to foist the same destruction on the Delta. Neither the project nor the DEIR's alternatives produce new water. There are other methods to meet the DWR's water supply reliability goals, yet they are not discussed. The DEIR ignores those other, more environmentally friendly and practical ways to make California's water infrastructure more resilient without increasing reliance on Delta exports. By ignoring them, the DEIR conflicts with the 2009 Delta Reform Act.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the identification of alternatives and screening process
458-16	In summary, the Delta Tunnel project will be an environmental and socioeconomic disaster. Many of the environmental impacts, as well as the exorbitant cost, could be avoided by pursuing less grandiose, more sustainable, water projects. It is time for DWR to abandon the Delta Tunnel boondoggle and opt for more stormwater capture, groundwater recharge, recycling and reuse, and water conservation that would not create as many significant environmental and other impacts on the California Delta.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for details on project costs, including taxpayer costs. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, and Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, to review how the EIR has incorporated effects and impact analysis and mitigation measures pertaining to community resources.
458-17	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project. I would appreciate being added to the notice list.	The contact information provided by the commenter has been added to project email list as requested.
468-1	on 12.15.2022. Given Terminous Marina map of Outrageous Delta "Dust Bowl", in 2015 the request, by retired Woodbridge Irrigation Director, WID (AC) was for Growers to attend meetings or we'd become a "Dust Bowl". I went to water meetings in Stockton, Sacramento, Los Angeles and Clarksburg. (Clarksburg workshop, 7, 2015, reported 80% non-compliance in DELTA LEVEE MAINTENANCE.) The WID Manager description proved foresight in questions: [Comments 2-15]	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-2	I'd gone to WID [Woodbridge Irrigation director] to learn about the AQUIFER; is it blocked by two feet of granite? Likewise, can a private company from out of state, profit in natural gas, but not locals with senior property rights?	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-3	This BOONDOGGLE is 20 year construction, 400 Miles to SOCAL, for no water?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project.
468-4	Is it for privy profits in WATER BONDS, towards SoCal, at the loss of Food Crops in Delta to Lodi Lake with Mokelumne River.?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding the project's impacts on agriculture and the feasibility or effectiveness of agricultural resources environmental commitments and mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
468-5	DROUGHT RECYCLES grow more serious. Are Grower WELLS to go dry? With fertile, Delta peat dirt soil, Lodi grew watermelon, but now some vineyards, which use less irrigation, are being pulled? Various other crops like nut, olive and fruit trees are planted, besides housing projections for concrete jungle.	Please see the response to comment 468-4 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project, regarding the project's impacts on agriculture, and regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Chapter 11, Soils, which evaluates potentially significant environmental impacts on soils in the study area and proposed mitigation measures. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project. Please refer to Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, which describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
468-6	CONCRETE COSTS MORE than Salt Energy in Desalination? (SoCal Metro knows.)	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives such as desalination.
468-7	DESALINATION was invented at UCB, with J. Leibovitz, 1977, and since used in 100 nations)? California coast has 9000 miles of Pacific Ocean.	Please see comment response 468-6 regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives such as desalination. This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-8	WATER EXPORTS since Pardee Dam, 1929, have already drained Mokelumne River, towards Port of Oakland and East Bay MUD. Is mention of this in voluminous studies?	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-9	We hear talk of DRAINAGE, and STORAGE, but who has power of control over the spigots?	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-10	REFORESTATION? In Delta East, we have increasing drought recycles. That is with lack of rain, which could include the need for California reforestation for humidity, snow and rain, amidst careless fires.	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
468-11	WEST, DELTA RIVER AQUADUCT: Seriously, any tunnel or more water aqueducts -- need to be West of the Delta River. Yes, the duck hunters might have a fighting chance, amidst the big boat canal to Sacramento.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
468-12	CRANES: Why disturb the rare Cranes reserve, west of Lodi? Why ignore damage to river communities? The rivers are an appealing attraction for community lives and marine life.	As described in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure BIO-33 is sufficient to avoid and minimize potentially significant impacts on sandhill cranes. Chapter 13 concludes that potential impacts on sandhill cranes would be less than significant with mitigation. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
468-13	COAST: Again, SoCal and more desert like areas along the coast, can obviously benefit from 9000 miles of Pacific Ocean.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
468-14	Can NAVY SHIPS, San Diego to Long Beach, be restored towards more cost-effective Desalination?	Please see response to comment 468-13 regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives such as desalination.
468-15	MAPS of River towns? Where are they, say by press releases to newspapers in towns and metro areas. Most maps just show water and tunnel or aqueduct lines for more water exports.	Please refer to the mapbooks provided as part of Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, which provide details regarding the location of project features and local communities near the project features. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of maps, figures, and mapbooks in the EIR.
468-16	Born and raised in Lodi, we helped plant the Zin vineyard for rootstock to fight virus. Then we'd go waterskiing or watercraft on Mokelumne River. Having ridden the bus with Lodi, LUSD students from Terminous, we know where the Marina is. Also, as Commodore, Dad led a Poker Ski run of five Marina stops with the Delta River areas. A state board member was surprised to learn that Delta areas and towns enjoy community recreation. When asked, a state board member said thatchy [sic] only visited the Delta River "a couple of hours one night", questions were allowed in discussion.	The comment describes personal biographical information and does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The project's impact on recreational resources was determined to be less than significant, as analyzed in Chapter 16, Recreation. Furthermore, a list of annual community-hosted events in the Delta that draw heavy boat traffic to local communities is provided in the table titled Annual Community-Based Delta Recreation Events.
468-17	Most do not seem to know the significance or river communities impacted, of what and where we are talking, with the Terminous Marina and park and Mokelumne River to Lodi Lake. Like Native American values for the earth, river communities need to be fostered, not face water exports where other people moved to desert areas in SoCal. Yet we are all blessed with the California Coast on the grand Pacific Ocean.	As described in the EIR, three distinct but complementary processes would be implemented to address effects within local communities, including the river communities mentioned by the commenter: the Community Benefits Program (Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework); regulatory mitigation as a part of the CEQA process Chapters 7-32 of the EIR; and a project ombudsman (Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Ombudsman). Please refer to Chapters 7 - 32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
468-18	Please reply, affirmatively to saving our fresh food crops, with exports to USA and international, and our river communities from drought recycles	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
468-19	Thank you for allowing me to express my observations of a lifetime, born and raised in Lodi, CA.	This comment does not address the proposed project or the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
469-1	Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of my comments and concerns regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report of the DWR's recent proposed project, "The Delta Conveyance Project" EXECUTIVE SUMMARY My comments are based upon internet research, and, while firmly opposed to this Project, I am basing my commentary on facts I have gleaned from my research, which is sourced to enable verification of the facts I convey in this document. Beginning with a brief history, I will then cover soil sample critiques, I will next review Large Tunnel Construction and concerns of environmental and flawed planning techniques, factors not considered in the Tunnel construction as they pertain to environmental destruction. After presenting obvious outcomes of the operation of the project after completion, I will finally comment on the past record of the DWR's actions, inactions and what I perceive as violation of Public Trust.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. The EIR contains information regarding public trust resources in Chapter 33, Other CEQA-Required Analyses, specifically in the section titled Public Trust Considerations. Please also see Common Response 17, Public Trust, regarding public trust concerns.
469-2	HISTORICAL UNDISPUTED FACTS This project, as most are aware, is not a new concept. The SWP was envisioned in the mid 1950's and championed by then	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Governor Pat Brown, and put to planning in the early 1960's. After a narrowly passed vote on the Project, construction began immediately. The SWP in its entirety was never finished due to environmental restrictions that arose in the late 1960's through the 1980's. A large portion of the SWP was to be a "Peripheral Canal", designed to take water from North of the Delta and convey it to the Byron Pumping Facility. The construction of the "Peripheral Canal" was halted and a vote to decide to build or not build it was held in 1983. The outcome of this state-wide vote was "NO". Construction was never resumed. Undaunted by the outcome of the vote, and flying in the face of the will of the People of the Great State of California, the DWR began dreaming up a replacement for their "Peripheral Canal". The "Twin Tunnels", or as the son of Governor Pat Brown, Governor Jerry Brown named it, "The California WaterFix" was the result of the DWR's dream. Despite Jerry Brown's best efforts over 2 recent terms as Governor, the "WaterFix" was never approved. When the current Governor came to power, he cut the project to a single Tunnel, and it now has a name of "The Delta Conveyance Project. While the Peripheral Canal was an abomination, both financially and environmentally speaking, it would have been a far better choice than what is currently proposed. I certainly hope I do not need to explain this point further. A canal does the same job as a pipeline. A Pipeline is a Tunnel, only above ground. They all perform the same function, a function that was put to vote in 1983, when The People voted against the project.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the identification of alternatives and screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
469-3	CURRENT PROJECT COMMENTS In the brochure "Draft EIR Explained" posted on the DWR website, under "The Project" the DWR toutes the Project as "a proposal by DWR to restore and protect the reliability of the State Water Project water deliveries by modernizing SWP infrastructure in the Delta. These facility updates allow DWR to address sea level rise and climate change, minimize water supply disruption due to seismic risk and improve aquatic conditions in the Delta due to more flexible SWP water operations” It is unclear whether the proposal intends to "restore the reliability of the water deliveries," or to "restore the State Water Project water deliveries." Either way, it is unclear what has degraded to the point of needing restoration. The DWR is perhaps wishing to restore the amounts of water originally envisioned in the 1960’s, which was promised to the DWR’s Water Contractors that originally signed on to pay for the SWP once water was provided to them. Aside from that, there are no facilities I have been made aware of that have degraded to the point that water deliveries have been curtailed due to this degradation.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project’s purpose and objectives, including DWR’s continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also addresses the adequacy of the purpose and objectives statements for the purposes of CEQA. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. As described in Chapter 2, the project’s purpose and project objectives are to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta consistent with the California Water Resilience Portfolio, in a cost-effective manner. The objectives focus on the SWP’s ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize disruption of SWP operations from earthquakes in and around the Delta, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the identification of alternatives and screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
469-4	The DWR is restricted from pumping at times due to the needs of fish and other Delta life that requires certain amounts of water to continue their existence, and juvenile fish at times are unable to fight the current the DWR's massive pumping creates, necessitating times of pumping inactivity. The EIR should be clear as to what the DWR actually wants. There is no "restoration." The DWR wishes to run their pumps during the sensitive times juvenile fish require natural flowing waters. This should be accurately reflected.	Please see comment response 469-3 regarding the project's purpose and objectives to restore and protect reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding impact and mitigation measures.
469-5	It is common knowledge that the DWR has promised more water deliveries than they can provide. In fact, more water is promised than exists, or ever has existed. The "Delta Conveyance Project" is obviously an attempt at fulfilling more	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	of the over promised water. Sadly, the DWR is not currently restricted from yet more promises of water, a fact I will go in to at the end of this document.	sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California.
469-6	Continuing, the "protection" of the water deliveries is cited, and further explained as protecting water quantity and quality…””…as a result of a major earthquake that could cause breaching of the Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas where existing SWP and CVP pumping plants operate…”. The Delta Protection Commission’s 2012 Economic Sustainability Report states that no Delta Levee has ever failed due to earthquake or other seismic event. An internet search will show many, many news articles warning of possible failures, but to date, no levee has failed due to earthquake. The Report does identify levees that are in need of reinforcement, but again, none of the levees have ever failed due to earthquake. This also should be included in the final EIR. It is very important, in my opinion, that information given out by a State Agency is accurate and not misleading. The information in this brochure is misleading.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, the adequacy of the purpose and objectives and the performance of objectives for the purposes of the CEQA analysis. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs and financing. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding DWR’s levee management efforts in the Delta. Please also see Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
469-7	Although I wish I could, I have not read the entire draft EIR. I doubt there will be many Californians that are able to budget time to review the entirety of the document. That said, I have noticed an area of great concern that has been glossed over, LTS’d actually. That area is Groundwater.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The EIR states the impact to Groundwater is Less Than Substantial. This is simply not true. The potential of the Tunnel, as well as the TBM (Tunnel Boring Machine) to affect Groundwater is indeed substantial.	Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are also evaluated in Chapter 8, Groundwater, of the EIR. As described in Chapter 8, Groundwater, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.
469-8	The EIR downplays the existence of natural gases in the Project area as well. It is not necessary to provide links to internet sites on this subject. I encourage anyone reading this to get into their car and drive up Highway 160, making note of the large, large quantity of natural gas wells. Many are in use, more are capped. Using common sense only, this would indicate there are many small pockets of gases in the area. The TBM will encounter several pockets of gases, and potentially link pockets, or expose pockets to the open air, or worse. This is COMMON SENSE.	Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Field Investigations, regarding field investigations that would be conducted to identify buried natural gas and oil wells prior to and during construction of the proposed project.
469-9	Another issue not identified in the EIR is effluent. Since this project will be removing most of the fresh water that currently enters the North Delta, which flushes out much of the Delta on its way through the sloughs. When that flushing water is no longer present, it has come to my attention that the non sea water portion of the water in the delta will be comprised of sea water, agricultural wastewater and treated effluent from Sacramento, Elk Grove, Galt and Lodi, Fairfield, Woodland, Davis and more. Research has been difficult on the actual discharges from each of these sources, but the discharges are not always treated as they should be. These discharges contribute heavily to the destruction of marine habitat and the current flushing action is quite possibly all there is standing between the few remaining fish and their total extinction. This is a very real threat, and one that again, has not been addressed.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The comment lists a series of potential impacts that are addressed in the EIR. For most resources, the EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of impacts and their impact conclusions before and after the application of mitigation measures. Where the EIR analysis concludes that impacts from the project could be significant, DWR has proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts. Please also see Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 9, 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, for more information regarding surface water quality and groundwater resources.
469-10	The DWR does not have any idea how much Groundwater is in the Project area, nor does any other State agency because it has not been mapped or quantified. The EIR's statement of LTS is not correct, there is groundwater present, and it will be encountered. This too is COMMON SENSE. The effect of the Tunnel on the path of the Groundwater as it drains toward the Ocean or toward a local depression will be a factor to the MANY farms and residences in the area that rely on groundwater. There will be subsidence over the top of the Tunnel. It will not be large, but it will effect the soils above the Tunnel, which in turn will affect both the surface drainage as well as east-west or west-east groundwater migration in soils between the tunnel and surface. This subsidence issue is common knowledge.	Chapter 11, Soils, Impact SOILS-3, provides an assessment of the potential for subsidence in the study area resulting from constructing and operating the project. The analysis determined that hazards attributable to subsidence are considered less-than-significant impacts of the project. Chapter 8, Groundwater, Impact GW-6, addressed subsidence as a result of dewatering activities and concluded, similar to the analysis in Chapter 11, that such activities would not result in significant impacts. Additional details regarding the geotechnical and soil considerations can be found in the Engineering Project Reports associated with the project (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Diaphragm walls or slurry walls would be installed prior to construction of the vertical tunnel shafts. Then, the bottom of the tunnel shaft would be installed to seal the tunnel shaft from the surrounding groundwater aquifer. Dewatering at the tunnel shaft would only occur once at the end of the shaft construction and would be limited to the groundwater within the shaft. Excessive pumping that could result in subsidence will not occur. The shaft would remain impermeable to groundwater intrusion throughout tunnel construction and operations. As described in the Engineering Project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Reports, the slurry walls at the intakes, which will be constructed to state standards, should substantially limit reduction of external groundwater levels during internal construction dewatering activities and limit mounding of water external to the walls during operations when intake sedimentation basin levels are higher than the surrounding groundwater levels. Existing geotechnical information and data were reviewed during preparation of this EIR to perform preliminary evaluations of seismic, liquefaction, ground improvement, and dewatering considerations for the planning phase and EIR preparation. Geotechnical, soils, and additional field work investigation would be completed during the design phase of the adopted project prior to completion of the geotechnical and seismic design.
469-11	The Tunnel has been touted as a better option than reliance on Delta Levees in the event of a large earthquake. Tunnels are earthquake resistant, when bored through rock. The Delta Conveyance will not be bored through rock, however, and it will be traversing at least two major fault lines. In a paper published 5/1/2022, with input from folks from Shandong University of Science and Technology (China), Nagasaki University(Japan), Southeast University (China) and Imperial College London (UK),the following: "Although there have been a lot of studies assessing how we can prevent tunnel seismic disasters, several post- earthquake damage investigations show that there is a need for further research, especially research in complex geological conditions." It is local knowledge that the ground movement due to seismic activity happens frequently in the Delta area. Large scale earthquakes are infrequent, but small earth movements are	Please refer to Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, regarding the potential impacts of the project alternatives evaluated in the Delta Conveyance EIR. This chapter concludes that construction and operation of all facilities would meet all required standards for earthquake safety. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake. The project has been designed and engineered to withstand seismic activity. CEQA does not require an evaluation of the potential impacts on the project related to severe weather or other natural disasters. Rather, the EIR evaluates the potential for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project to impact existing environmental resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	quite common. The proposed project will not be double-lined, and is destined to crack and leak. While small leaks will be expected, there appears to be no reference to them in the EIR. It should be noted that pooling around these expected small leaks directly interferes with the overall stability of a tunnel, and a subsequent large earthquake can easily result in liquification exacerbated by this pooling. Indeed on July 15, 2021, during construction of the Shijingshan Tunnel in Zuhai Guangdong, China a water inrush incident occurred at the construction site resulting in 14 casualties. There were special geologic conditions present, high conductivity at the part that connects the underground water system and the overlying water body. This is a very possible scenario here, since the DWR has NO IDEA OF THE QUANTITY AND LOCATION of underground aquifers in the Project area. Published 2/2022, TBM Tunneling Problems through Subterranean Rivers, An Evaluation of Nowsud Tunnel in Iran, the iar [sic] consulting engineer noted: "Fault induced subterranean rivers create a major challenge of tunnel construction" he goes on to cite regional drawdown, structural stability of segmental rings issues and large water inflow. "Tunneling through faulted/highly fractured zones brings the geotechnical problems...collapses, traveling, slabbing, softening and slaking, swelling, squeezing and flowing ground…" These are all issues encountered during initial construction and must be prepared for considering the location of local fault lines.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	COMMON SENSE again rears its ugly head, when the question is posed: which would be faster and easier to repair, a surface levee breach, or a deeply buried tunnel leak? In the case of the levee breach, local farmers, as they have done in the past, could be called to action with their farm tractors, as well as local companies with large dirt moving equipment. In the breached tunnel scenario, there would be very few qualified to affect repairs, causing long term water delivery outages. In the event of a large earthquake, where a levee breach or a tunnel breach occurred, there would most likely be damage to other infrastructure as well. This also was not brought up in the EIR. The last few points may not be environmental in origin, but the damage to the surrounding area, whether due to Groundwater/gas pocket interference or should a water inrush incident happen, will include marine and land based animal life.	
469-12	Other environmental concerns stem from the downplayed RTM drying plan, the pollution coming from the years of truck traffic, either from the diesel fumes or the electrical generation needed to power electric semi's, the traffic they will create, and the RTM itself, as it dries and blows in the Delta winds.	Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of road rehabilitation. Analysis conducted for the EIR demonstrates that diesel emissions from haul trucks operating on delta roadways would not result in a significant health risk impact (refer to Appendix 23C, Health Risk Assessment and Ambient Air Quality Analysis Methodology, and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-6).For additional discussion of construction equipment and delivery trucks and their impact on air quality and greenhouse gases, please refer to Chapter 23. Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Alternatives, and Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, for details and analysis on the handling, drying, and storage of reusable tunnel material (RTM).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
469-13	Additionally, the Tunnel will require pumps. Large, electric pumps. Currently, the DWR is using power from a Lodi natural gas plant to pump water to SoCal. The DWR is one of the largest consumers of electricity in California now, and with the transition to electric vehicles mandated by Governor Newsome, when this Project is slated to come on line, the availability of electricity will be far less than current conditions. It should be factored as such in this report.	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project, and Chapter 22, Energy, for the EIR's discussion on the energy demands for the proposed project, impacts and mitigation approaches, and cumulative analysis of energy usage.
469-14	The Project will destroy Hood. The Delta residents will all be effected by noise, traffic and the influx of people. This area is unique, like a step back in time, yet located 30 minutes from major cities. The loss of the area will be tragic. It is a shame that the Delta is nearly gone, is there no way to leave just a little bit for the next generation?	The comment assertion that project features will "destroy Hood" is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding potential effects on community character. Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a further discussion of road rehabilitation. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please also refer to Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, for potential impacts and mitigation measures. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as for tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
469-15	There are many, many more concerns with this horrible Project. I am happy I was not able to review all pages of this EIR, as I am sure you, as the reader of these comments are also. As I review this Draft EIR, in the back of my head I ask myself, do I trust the DWR? The resounding "NO" screamed from the back of my mind is deafening. A main reason the DWR exists is to manage the SWP. In this job, it seems, the DWR is owned by the "Water Contractors," what those Contractors want, the DWR pursues. In the case of the 2017 Oroville spillway, which was never completed, The Independent Institute reported that the reason the spillway was never finished was that the Metropolitan Water District of LA and the other Water Contractors did not want to pay for it. This is outrageous.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, and Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	In 1994 the Monterey Amendments between the DWR and their Water Contractors was another example of this agency's incompetent management of State assets. Trading the Kern Water Bank for the retirement of 45,000 acres of junior water right lands is criminal. The smell of collusion and corruption cannot be ignored. The DWR is attempting still to honor their "Amendments" with this Project, as ludicrous as it is, because they pledged to complete the SWP in Monterey. The expense alone, which COMMON SENSE again shows the $16 Billion estimate is low, it's more likely to be double that by the project completion. The excuse of protection from earthquake vulnerabilities, as I have shown is simply a lie. Operation flexibility is just another way of saying "skirting the environmental restrictions placed by the Judicial system"" This project is oversized, under justified, obscenely expensive, environmentally disastrous and will result in the complete collapse of the marine ecosystems from Freeport to the Golden Gate. I'm not a scientist, but I have COMMON SENSE.	including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
469-16	The Water Contractors pledge to repay the Project cost, when water is delivered. So, the State Taxpayers will pay for this project, and then pay themselves back with their increased water bill, starting in about 10 years. And there will, of course, be interest.	Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations regarding the costs of the project, costs to taxpayers, and the community benefits framework and implementation.
469-17	If a project is needed here, it is not this tunnel. The Conveyance needs to be a canal. Prior to consideration of that canal, however, the DWR must inventory its resources: Groundwater aquifers must be measured, and water amounts quantified. Well water must be metered, water must be metered when it leaves the Byron Pumping Plant, and at all diversions. Water transfers must be documented. Water loss due to evaporation needs to be accurately measured, which it	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding prior Delta conveyance planning efforts and a detailed discussion of the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	has never been, along the SW [Southwest], and monitored closely.	programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies. Please also see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding how the reasonably foreseeable actions considered part of the No Project Alternative are not an alternative because they fail to meet the project's purpose and objectives.
469-18	The theft of water is a very real possibility, as documented in Mark Arax' book. The sale of water must accurately be recorded and prices set reflecting nothing short of costs for the water plus operations and maintenance. The end of subsidized water for mega AG [Agriculture] (Stuart Resnick and the like) must happen immediately.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
469-19	In 1944 there were more salmon than had ever been recorded in the Delta. Construction of the SWP began in 1961, water was delivered to SoCal in 1973, and the Coastal Branch was completed in 1997. In the span of 21 years, the DWR's mismanagement of the SWP caused, in 1993 the Delta smelt to	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	be listed as endangered and in 1994 the Winter Run on Chinook Salmon was also listed as endangered. When will this agency be held accountable for its actions, its many mistakes and its violations of the Public Trust?	The EIR contains information regarding public trust resources in Chapter 33, Other CEQA-Required Analyses, specifically the section titled Public Trust Considerations. Please also see Common Response 17, Public Trust, regarding public trust concerns.
469-20	If you have any questions, I can be reached at[N/A], or by email at [N/A]. Please redact this personal contact info if this document is published.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
470-1	I am writing to protest the proposed building of the tunnel between Hood and Byron. This project will ruin the environment of the Delta, cause pollution and will be a huge cost. The Delta is our home and the building of the tunnel will cause damage to our home values, damage to our wildlife, to our fish and our plant life. This is where we live, where I have raised my kids and now look forward to enjoying sharing the Delta with my grandkids. Would you be okay with someone destroying your backyard and neighborhood?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding potential effects on community character and project costs, including taxpayer costs. The EIR evaluates impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resources raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
470-2	Why aren't reservoirs being built to help solve some of the water issues?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives. Please see Chapter 2, Project Purpose and Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.
470-3	Please DO NOT build the tunnel.	The comment asserts general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
471-1	Big money isn't going to turn my home of 40 years here in the Delta into a toilet bowl. That's exactly what will happen if our fresh water flow is reduced any further. We value our quality of life here and the Sacramento River and its related ecosystems are paramount to that quality.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase deliveries during excess

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	STOP THE TUNNELS SAVE THE DELTA!	flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
475-1	All project alternatives in the Draft EIR propose 3 water supply conveyance alignments (pipes) combined with proposed construction of new North Delta diversion and conveyance facilities capable of carrying 3000 to7500 cubic feet of water per second. Intake A would be south of and on the other side of the Sacramento River from Clarksburg. Intake B would be just north of Hood, and Intake C would be between Hood and Courtland. The California Aqueduct already exists which is more than 701 miles long and carries water to the South. It delivers water to 27 million people and irrigation for 750,000 acres of farmland. The Delta Mendota Canal is117 miles long and delivers water from the Sacramento River to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Delta Mendota Canal/California Intertie Project was completed in 2012 at a cost of $34 million to deliver water to Southern California.	The information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
475-2	Sea levels are already rising and California has been having increasingly low water years. It is not advisable to build more outtake pipes from the Sacramento River as this will cause saltwater to intrude into the Delta. This will destroy valuable farmland, destroy freshwater fisheries, and introduce saltwater into the water supply for millions of people in the North and South State. New water conveyance facilities would affect the salinity of the water and soil causing seedlings to die, reduce plant growth, and reduce yields	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding salinity and water quality in the Delta.
475-3	Construction of the Project will cause the conversion of a minimum of 2400 acres of Important Farmland, Farmland	Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding project impacts on agricultural lands and proposed mitigation. Please see Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding the methodology of analysis and the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	subject to Williamson Act Contract, and Farmland under contract in a Farmland Security Zone.	effectiveness of mitigation measures to reduce impacts on agricultural land.
475-4	Construction of this Project will cause injury and death to plants and wildlife from paving, mowing, vegetation removal, herbicide and pesticide application, vehicular movement, heavy equipment operation, noise, lighting, and overall human presence.	The EIR evaluates impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, particularly Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration. Please also refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on wildlife and plants in the study area.
475-5	Animals present in the Project Area include invertebrates, frogs, toads, salamanders, river otter, mink, beaver, turtles, squirrels, badger, raccoons, riparian brush rabbits, weasels, foxes, bobcats, coyotes, mountain lions, black-tailed deer, mule deer, San Joaquin Kit Foxes, burrowing owls, Sandhill cranes and other birds, bats, and flying insects. Fish habitat for Pacific Salmon, ground fish, and coastal pelagic fishes will be affected by the Project. There are plants in the Project Area which are very rare and close to extinction, including the Diamond-petaled California Poppy and the Caper-fruited Tropidocarpum which will be destroyed by the Conveyance Project.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of terrestrial biological and aquatic resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Please refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding proposed compensatory mitigation. Please refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the methodology of analyses and mitigation.
475-6	Construction of the Conveyance Facilities will degrade scenic vistas and destroy the visual character of the area. Light and glare will ruin the area, and trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings will be damaged.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the resources mentioned in the comment. Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, analyzes scenic views and vistas, visual character, light and glare, and proposed mitigation to reduce impacts. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, provides analysis of impacts of the project on historical and cultural resources and proposed mitigation to reduce impacts.
475-7	Construction of the Conveyances will affect at least 27 to 30 archaeological resources.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the resources mentioned in the comment. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, provides analysis of impacts of the project on archaeological and cultural resources and proposed mitigation to reduce impacts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
475-8	The Project will cause adverse change to the significance of known Tribal cultural resources.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the resources mentioned in the comment. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, provides an analysis of impacts of the project on Tribal cultural resources and proposed mitigation to reduce impacts. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding the approach to the analysis and the significant and unavoidable impacts on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape.
475-9	The Project Area is known to contain vertebrate fossils including bony fish, cartilaginous fish, and marine reptiles. Marine mammals related to elephants and sea-cows, reptiles, birds, three-toed horses, dwarf pronghorns, horses, rodents, deer, camels, saber-toothed cats, ground sloths, coyotes, turtles, mammoths, tortoises, toads, rabbits, dire wolves, and bison are all recorded fossil finds in the Project Area which will be impacted by the Project.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the resources mentioned in the comment. Chapter 28, Paleontological Resources, provides analysis of impacts of the project on fossils resources and proposed mitigation to reduce impacts.
475-10	The Delta Conveyance Project is a bad idea and should not be approved.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
477-1	I oppose this project. It ships our northern water south. We will be needing it more each year.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding adapting to a hotter, drier future. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
480-1	I write to you as a concerned member of the local community.	This information is general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
480-2	I have reviewed the Draft EIR document and wish to give community commentary on Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis. In review of Chapter 34, I can assure you the community simply does not desire the proposed peace offerings. I present this counter argument based on the community's repeated votes to stop the exact propositions outlined in Chapter 34. Propositions such as building a community center, adding bus routes, revitalizing rural main streets, increasing tourism by encouraging vacation rental by owner, and altering housing / building permits is precisely what the community has voted against for decades. These project entities would destroy the quaint simplicity of local towns that have intentionally remained RURAL for 4+ generations. Industrializing the area by introducing more people and establishing more construction goes against the core values of the Delta community. Anglers, recreational boaters, wine enthusiasts, and avid bird watchers travel from all over the state of CA to the Sacramento Delta to escape exactly what Chapter 34 proposes: industrialization, traffic, and mainstream tourism. Again, I emphasize the community has voted time and time again to limit the building in this area and restrict housing permits. The Delta Conveyance Project blatantly disregards the community's vote.	As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, no decisions will be made regarding community benefits funding or specific actions until after CEQA approval and after continued engagement with the community. As described in Appendix 3G, the list of potential actions was developed with direct input from community members and is intended to represent a broad range of interests for DWR to consider in the CEQA analysis. After CEQA approval, which would include approval of the Community Benefits Program, additional community input will be used to develop the specific parameters for implementation of the program. Whether community members oppose or support the project, they are welcome and encouraged to participate in the future development of the Community Benefits Program. Furthermore, as described in Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, because many details are not known at this time, the actions and activities analyzed in this chapter may require subsequent project-level environmental analysis, any applicable permitting, and approval before implementation. If applicable, additional environmental review would evaluate potential impacts on recreation, traffic, socioeconomics, and conflicts with local land use policies.
480-3	Courtland, CA has been my home for 9 years. I have chosen to live here with my husband and raise our children here. My husband is a 4th generation farmer in Courtland and I personally have utilized the Delta waterways for recreation my whole life. It is of great concern to see this unique region threatened.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
480-4	Of greater concern, Section 34.3.5.3 highlights imminent risk to the Delta's agricultural community. The Sacramento Delta region is one of the largest agricultural and crop producing regions in the state of CA. This project threatens the sustainability of local family owned farms that have been established for 150 years. Converting agricultural farmland for the purpose of tourism would negatively impact the entire state's food supply as well as surrounding states who obtain produce from this region. "If increased tourism results in the need for new facilities or housing, this increase could result in changes to land use in the region. Because much of the open space in the Delta is currently used for agriculture, construction of tourism facilities and new housing could result in conversion of agricultural land uses. Where facilities could be constructed within existing communities, it is unlikely that they would be inconsistent with current land uses and plans. Where available and feasible, lower-quality farmland or farmland with lower habitat values could be chosen to reduce or avoid impacts to Important Farmland. However, even with mitigation, impacts may be substantial." Page 34-18, Chapter 34, Section 34.3.5.3 - Land Use.	Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, concludes that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on agricultural land in the Delta as mentioned in the comment. Chapter 15 also includes Mitigation Measure AG-1 and Mitigation Measure AG-3 to reduce the impacts. Please see response to comment 480-5 regarding other project impacts and mitigation. As described in Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, because many details are not known at this time, the actions and activities analyzed in this chapter may require subsequent project-level environmental analysis, any applicable permitting, and approval before implementation. If applicable, additional environmental review would evaluate potential impacts on agricultural resources, population and housing, public services and utilities, and socioeconomics. As stated in Chapter 34, potential impacts on agricultural land from implementation of community benefit program actions could be avoided or minimized through siting actions on lower quality farmland where feasible. Chapter 34 discloses potential impacts that could be anticipated based on available information but does not include CEQA significance impact determinations because, at this stage, it is unknown which specific activities would be approved, and their design, location, or scale are unknown.
480-5	Sections 34.3.1.1-34.3.1.11 are equally as alarming. In short, the project would destroy the surrounding communities of Hood, Courtland, Walnut Grove, and Clarksburg. The aforementioned sections provide a disturbing outline of what would be to come. Noise, harmful pollution, increased traffic, road closures, aesthetic alteration of the Delta and, of most concern, unwarranted disturbance and death to the already at risk aquatic and wildlife species in the Delta. Even more concerning is the below disclosure statement in section 34.1	The EIR identifies that the project could result in potentially significant and unavoidable impacts on several resources including noise, visual and aesthetic resources, agriculture, air quality, and traffic. The EIR also identifies multiple mitigation measures that could reduce impacts. In some cases, successful implementation of mitigation measures, and therefore reduction of impacts, will depend on collaboration with local landowners. For example, Mitigation Measure AQ-6 could reduce potential air quality impacts related to diesel particulate matter on residents if local residential occupants agreed to use DWR provided air filters. DWR is committed to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	alerting the public that the full scope of damages to the region is simply unpredictable. Moving forward with this project means moving forward with irreversible and unavoidable damage. "While CEQA requires analyzing reasonable, foreseeable future components of a project, it only requires analyzing them at a level of detail that is commensurate with the detail available for the project. Because the actions that could be funded or integrated into the project as part of this program have not yet been specifically identified, this analysis discloses potential impacts that could be anticipated based on available information but does not include CEQA significance impact determinations because, at this stage, it is unknown which specific activities would be approved, and their design, location, or scale are unknown." Page 34-2, Chapter 34, Section 34.1 - Introduction.	working with local landowners and interested parties to reduce impacts through mitigation measures to the extent feasible. In addition to regulatory mitigation, DWR is committed to the development and implementation of the Community Benefits Program to address community concerns beyond the regulatory requirements. As described in Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, this analysis discloses potential impacts and types of mitigation that could be implemented but does not include CEQA significance impact determinations or specific mitigation measures because, at this stage, it is unknown which specific activities would be approved, and their design, location, or scale are unknown. Specific Delta Conveyance Project impact determinations and mitigation measures are included in the resource impact discussions provided in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, no decisions will be made regarding community benefits funding or specific actions until after CEQA approval of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project and after continued engagement with the community. If applicable, additional environmental review would evaluate potential impacts of Community Benefits Program actions such as noise, air quality, traffic, aesthetics, and aquatic and terrestrial biological resources.
480-6	The Sacramento Delta is one of the last rural areas in the valley. The Delta community and residents of Sacramento have repeatedly declined previous propositions similar to the Delta Conveyance Project and outspokenly do not support the current project. I encourage you to respectfully listen to your community. No means no.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
480-7	Thank you for your time and consideration of this commentary.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
483-1	Attached are my comments on the subject project.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
483-2	This transmits comments in regards to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. As a Miwkoʔ (Plains Miwok) traditional cultural practitioner with career experience in conservation, restoration, and environmental regulation, these comments are submitted in reverence to the responsibility we (Miwkoʔ) uphold to be good stewards of lands and waters.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
483-3	The proposed project fails to meet the needs of the ecology, culture, and metaphysical properties of traditional Indigenous homelands and features, which this project falls within.	DWR analyzed impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, respectively. These chapters include a discussion of impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources from the proposed project and its alternatives and identify mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible.
483-4	As expressed in previous comments on the BDCP, Water Fix, and other similar projects in the region the DEIR provides little evidence that any of the proposed alternatives will provide a long-term solution to address water consumption and environmental needs, nor does the document adequately address Indigenous ecocultural and cultural impacts for the project. The proposed project continues to rob future generations the right to inherit a world in as good or better condition than nature intended. The document fails to recognize the holistic view of the Delta beginning at the sources, which feed into it. The Delta is part of a landscape from summit to sea, and the problems within the Delta are not exclusive to its legal boundary (see Hankins 2018).	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, which includes a description of why demand management actions, including addressing water consumption, are infeasible in achieving the majority of the basic objectives of the project. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the implementation of regional water-use conservation and efficiency strategies. The EIR adequately evaluates potential impacts as required by CEQA. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, evaluates potential impacts on resources identified as Tribal cultural resources, including the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, and identifies mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape (Delta TCL), including those identified in the table titled Tribal Views on Delta TCL Character-Defining Features. For

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		example, terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats are identified both as part of the Delta's ecosystem and as character-defining features that represent heritage and cultural significance to Tribes pertaining to sustenance, traditional knowledge, ceremony, spiritual practices, and stewardship. The analysis in Chapter 32 takes a holistic view of those resources that could contribute to Tribal cultural resources, including terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats, and includes information from various chapters to support the impact analysis and conclusion that the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the Delta TCL. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding the Delta TCL boundary and the approach used in the EIR to analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.
483-5	Whereas the state is pursuing tribal engagement on many fronts relative to 30x30, Truth and Healing, and other initiatives, the exclusion of all interested traditional cultural practitioners with ancestral ties to the region from the process is a major oversight and counter to the mentioned initiatives. Despite other policies which are more inclusive HR 93-638, B-10-11, and other federal or state policies recognizing tribal self-determination and sovereignty. DWR opted to consult with AB	The comment's assertion that DWR's Tribal engagement was insufficient is not supported by the project's robust record of consultation in accordance with state policies, CEQA, and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. DWR conducted government-to-government consultation guided by Executive Orders (B-10-11, N-10-19, N-15-19) and through the processes of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good faith effort to foster meaningful

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	52 tribes and versus a broader inclusion of practitioners inclusive of individuals listed in the Sacred Lands File with intimate knowledge of cultural and ecological factors for consideration. If tribal entities are to engage in any meaningful way inclusive of the intent recognized by 30x30 and Truth and Healing in particular, then tribal engagement must extend beyond simple requirements for consultation. In the scoping comments, the California Indian Water Commission recommended traditional cultural practitioners from the Delta and elsewhere should be engaged to develop a project and analysis that avoids and minimizes impacts to cultural and ecological systems directly, indirectly, and cumulatively. The limited approach to AB 52 consultation is problematic given the limitations of knowledge and input such narrow consultation may provide, and further omits the analysis only traditional cultural practitioners could provide. Furthermore, where AB 52 Tribes were willing to support engagement of traditional cultural practitioners - like me, DWR sought to infringe on the sovereign rights of both the Tribe and cultural practitioner. Specifically, in a November 2022 email from DWR tribal liaison states "comments received from [practitioner] will be subject to confidentiality concerns on behalf of [Tribe] formally. How is that supporting the intent of traditional, state, and federal law and broader policies to address things inclusive of the environmental crises we face?	consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. In addition to formal consultation with Tribal governments (Executive Order B-10-11, N-15-19, CNRA/DWR Tribal consultation policies, AB 52, and Public Resources Code 21080.3.1), DWR provided opportunities through formal consultation and public outreach for Tribal input. DWR recognizes the importance of Tribal practitioners and TEK subject matter experts (who may or may not be affiliated with a California Native American Tribe or who may be a citizen of a non-California Native American Tribe or a non-Tribal subject matter expert) with delegated authority to represent a Tribe. Please refer to Chapter 32 and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding the outreach activities conducted to engage California Native American Tribes and Tribal communities throughout the EIR process. Please also see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the project's outreach program and Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. DWR is committed to the principles and legal requirements for maintaining confidentiality of protected Tribal information. Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c)(1) states that any information, including, but not limited to, the location, description, and use of Tribal cultural resources that is submitted by a California Native American Tribe during the environmental process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public without prior consent of the Tribe that provided the information.
483-6	Given the shortcomings of engagement [with Native American tribes], the analyses have failed to adequately address the ecocultural impacts of the proposed project and alternatives. To understand the ecocultural context of the planning area,	Please see Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, particularly the discussion of the meaningful Tribal consultation that informed DWR's identification and evaluation of Tribal Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	DWR should have become familiar with points of analysis noted in Hankins (2018 and 2019), which discuss many problems related to water management impacts from an ecocultural perspective. Hankins (2019) includes a list of some ecocultural species from vernal pools in the project area, many of which are not considered in the project impacts, but may be impacted by the project nonetheless. Inclusive in this analysis are the many sensitive species noted in our creation stories that are affiliated with sacred sites across the proposed project area. The species and sites themselves may be adversely impacted by any of the proposed alternatives, yet these impacts have not been analyzed. The existence of the State Water Project within the Delta infringes upon significant ecocultural sites, and the proposed alternatives fail to address those existing and future impacts, nor address the appropriate opportunities to rehabilitate or mitigate impacts to these sites. All proposed alternatives will impact traditional cultural properties within the Miwkoʔ traditional cultural landscape. Given the restricted nature of this knowledge I will not disclose it here.	Tribes, which describe DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Chapter 32 analyzes impacts on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape and individual Tribal cultural resources resulting from implementation of the project and its alternatives. DWR understands and recognizes that some plant and animal species are key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta as a Tribal cultural Llandscape. Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1, considers multiple variables (described as character-defining features) as part of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape (Delta TCL), including those identified in the table titled Tribal Views on Delta TCL Character-Defining Features. Terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats are identified both as part of the Delta's ecosystem and as character-defining features that represent heritage and cultural significance to Tribes pertaining to sustenance, traditional knowledge, ceremony, spiritual practices, and stewardship. As such, the impact analysis in Chapter 32 considers the various resources identified by Tribes, including plant and animal species, and the values these resources contribute to the Tribal cultural landscape. DWR did not have access to Hankins 2019 to assess the species list mentioned in the comment; however, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, evaluates potential impacts from construction, operations, and maintenance of the project on sensitive natural communities, plants, and wildlife, including vernal pool natural communities. These natural communities may support plants and animals that are important to Tribes. As described in Chapter 13, where potential effects on sensitive natural communities, plants, and wildlife were identified, mitigation measures were provided to reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Although mitigation measures have been identified to reduce and minimize impacts on Tribal cultural resources, terrestrial biological resources, fish and aquatic resources, and cultural resources, the EIR concludes the project has the potential to materially impair affiliated Tribes' physical, spiritual, and ceremonial experience of character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape and therefore result in a significant and unavoidable impact on a Tribal cultural resource. DWR is committed to continuing consultation and engagement with Tribes as part of the project's mitigation measures, and DWR will continue to consult with affiliated Tribes regarding the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize and mitigate the project's potentially significant impacts.
483-7	The analysis [of the DCP] should not be focused on water delivery, rather how can delivery be done in a way that is ecoculturally resilient and sustainable. California's water is highly variable given long-term knowledge and data regarding climate conditions. DWR needs to reframe the antiquated approaches of extractive water use to develop a water future for the state that is in balance with the environment. The proposed actions do not do this, rather perpetuate the status quo of exporting water from a highly fragile system.	The Delta Conveyance Project, if approved, would be a resilient and sustainable part of the SWP, as described in multiple parts of the EIR (please also see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding climate resilience). Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Common Response 1 also discusses the scope of the project objectives and the discretion CEQA affords lead agencies in defining the project purpose and objectives.
483-8	The project should seek to comprehensively recover species and ecosystems prior to any diversion. There is sufficient data to demonstrate the flow requirements necessary for fisheries	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	survival and recovery, but that is not necessarily sufficient to achieve ecosystem function. A functioning ecosystem is critical to the quality of water, economy, and other attributes of the region. Key opportunities exist for land retirement, restoration of historic wetlands and reservoirs for natural storage, infiltration, and ecological benefits, which all work to reduce water demands unsustainable water uses and achieve species recovery. The analysis suggests the impacts for most species are not adverse. For T&E [threatened and endangered] species, how is the project making a significant contribution to their recovery and more importantly the ecosystems?	Issues, regarding the adequacy of the purpose and objectives statements for the purposes of CEQA as well as the use of the appropriate CEQA baseline. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, assess effects on special-status species, including threatened and endangered species, with mitigation proposed as necessary to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. Specifically, please refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for more information regarding the mitigation sites and approaches identified to address potentially significant impacts on special status aquatic and terrestrial species.
483-9	Where is the analysis of impacts to these [threatened and endangered] species as Tribal Trust resources? There is need for analysis of a broader suite of species considering Indigenous knowledge. This is not something agency staff or their consultants can do on their own.	The EIR is a document prepared under the state's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). "Tribal Trust" refers to the physical properties, funds, or reserved rights of federally recognized Indian Tribes and Indian individuals held in trust by the federal government; in other words, it is between a federally recognized Indian Tribe and the federal government (not the state government). Terrestrial species and fish and aquatic species habitats that are part of the Delta's ecosystem and Tribal heritage are examined in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. The effects of the project alternatives on terrestrial species and fish and aquatic species habitats (some of which are character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape) and the mitigation proposed for reducing such impacts to a less-than-significant level are addressed in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. As analyzed in Chapter 32, even with consideration of the mitigation proposed, the project alternatives have the potential to materially impair an affiliated Tribe's ability to physically, spiritually, or ceremonially experience these character-defining terrestrial species habitats. Chapter 12 concludes that the nominal effects of the project alternatives on character-defining fish and aquatic species habitats identified would be less than significant from a biological resources

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		perspective, and the project would not materially impair an affiliated Tribe's ability to physically, spiritually, or ceremonially experience these character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. As described for response to comment 483-6, refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, for a discussion of the meaningful Tribal consultation that informed DWR's identification and evaluation of Tribal cultural resources, and Chapter 32, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, which describes DWR's good-faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources.
483-10	Impacts from the proposed project to water as a Tribal Trust resource, and Tribal water rights. Prior legal precedence demonstrates preeminent rights to surface and ground water (see Winters v. United States and Agua Caliente v. Coachella Valley Water District & Desert Water Agency). Given the lack of discussion of such issues, it is apparent a lack of understanding of what those rights entail, and how the project infringes upon those rights.	The comment raises an issue related to Tribal rights to water resources on reservations or use of water resources on former reservation lands. However, the proposed project and its alternatives would not impact water as a Tribal trust resource or Tribal water right. The environmental justice study area of the project alternatives does not include Tribal reservation lands. Further, as identified in Chapter 6, Water Supply, of the EIR, in the section titled Water Supply, the project alternatives do not include any actions that would modify water deliveries to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights holders, including in-Delta water rights holders. As described in response to comment 483-9, the EIR is a document prepared under the state's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). "Tribal Trust" refers to the physical properties, funds, or reserved rights of federally recognized Indian Tribes and Indian individuals held in trust by the federal government; in other words, it is between a federally recognized Indian Tribe and the federal government (not the state government).
483-11	The economic analysis fails to recognize Indigenous socioeconomic impacts. Specific impacts include the loss of fish and other animals as part of our traditional economy, the breakdown of kinship to these species due to project impacts, and other factors.	The EIR recognizes that Tribal people continue to look to the Delta for livelihood, ecological knowledge, ceremony and spirituality, and heritage, which the EIR defines as the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, a Tribal cultural resource that is central to the identity of consulting Tribes. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, defines and identifies significant impacts on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape and although mitigation measures are identified to reduce and minimize these impacts, the EIR concludes that the impacts on character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape would be significant and unavoidable. Please see the Chapter 32 section titled Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape for a detailed description of the Tribal Cultural Landscape analyzed in the EIR and the analysis included under Impact TCR-1 for the impact analysis of the project and its alternatives on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potentially significant impacts on fish and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project would not result in a loss of fish and other animals that are part of traditional Indigenous economies, as such, there would be no adverse economic effects.
483-12	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis:	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the establishment of the environmental baseline and its use as a basis for impact analysis per CEQA requirements. The description of the baseline conditions for evaluating potential impacts on Tribal cultural resources is described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. For example, the section titled Cultural and Historic Context of the Landscape, describes information relevant to assessing the change between baseline conditions and alternative conditions. In defining the resource, DWR analyzed information in the record about the past and the present, as well as reasonably foreseeable conditions.
483-13	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts)	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. DWR recognizes, and the EIR acknowledges, the Delta's importance to Tribes. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape, describes the Delta Tribal Cultural

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Impacts to sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and traditional cultural landscapes (all of which occur within the footprint of the project, and in order to understand would require government to government consultation with us). Not all of these features may be on file with the Native American Heritage Commission.	Landscape, which was evaluated as a cultural (sometimes called ethnographic) landscape, which relies on the continued recognition of culturally important processes in addition to historical trends. In addition, Chapter 32, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also see Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
483-14	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Diversions impacts to Indigenous water rights and self-determination (e.g., Winters Doctrine and prior appropriations).	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please also refer to response to comment 483-10 for a discussion of Tribal water rights. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding Delta Conveyance Project's operations, which does not include changes to State Water Project (SWP) or Central Valley Project (CVP) operations upstream of the proposed north Delta intakes. As identified in Chapter 6, Water Supply, the project alternatives do not include any actions that would modify water deliveries to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights holders, including in-Delta water rights holders.
483-15	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis:	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources was consistent with current State policies regarding Indigenous people in California.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	- Implications to self-determination and sovereignty pursuant to policies including HR 93-638, B-10-11 and N-15-19.	
483-16	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Analysis of solastalgia and intergenerational trauma to Tribal individuals/communities[.]	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please also refer to response to comment 483-15 regarding how DWR's efforts to identify and analyze impacts on Tribal cultural resources was consistent with current State policies regarding Indigenous people in California. The EIR adequately evaluates potential impacts as required by CEQA, including the Tribal cultural resources analysis.
483-17	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Long-term survival and recovery to abundance of ecocultural species.	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please refer to response to comment 483-6 regarding DWR's consideration of the impacts on terrestrial and aquatic plant and animal species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta as a Tribal cultural landscape. To help ensure that the project's ecological restoration activities also support Tribal objectives related to survival and sustainability of species with Tribal cultural value, Mitigation Measure TCR-1c commits to the incorporation of Tribal knowledge, including Tribal Ecological Knowledge, during preparation and implementation of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources (Appendix 3F) and other measures for mitigating impacts on terrestrial biological resources. DWR is committed to continuing consultation and engagement with Tribes regarding the implementation of the mitigation measures to minimize and mitigate the project's potentially significant impacts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Additionally, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, evaluates potential impacts from construction, operations, and maintenance of the project on sensitive natural communities, plants, and wildlife. These natural communities may support plants and animals that are important to Tribes. As described in Chapter 13, where potential effects to sensitive natural communities, plants, and wildlife were identified, mitigation measures were provided to reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.
483-18	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Water sustainability and resilience given climatic variability.	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, which discusses the range of climate change analyses provided in the EIR and how DWR has exceeded the CEQA requirements by including a dedicated chapter on climate change (Chapter 30, Climate Change), which discusses how trends in observed and projected climate change clearly indicate the need for the project and how it can enable adaptation to potential climate change impacts in the study area. This Common Response also provides discussions of how the project would enable adaptation to future changes in temperature and precipitation patterns and ensure water supply reliability in the face of increasing hydrological extremes.
483-19	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - Traditional Indigenous lifeways and economy.	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. CEQA does not require analysis of project impacts on traditional indigenous lifeways or economies. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good faith and robust effort to foster meaningful consultation with Tribes about Tribal cultural resources, including identification, impacts analysis, and mitigation. DWR provided information about the project to each of the consulting Tribes and invited each Tribe to provide DWR with information

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		about resources of concern, including their location and significance, what impacts might occur from project activities, and ways that impacts could be avoided or mitigated. Any information consulting Tribes chose to share with DWR regarding traditional lifeways or economics factored into DWR's finding that the Delta TCL meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resource, and thus qualifies as a Tribal cultural resource under CEQA. Please also see Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, section titled Environmental Justice Community Outreach, which discusses the survey conducted to gather the perspectives of members of low-income, minority, indigenous, historically burdened, and otherwise underrepresented or disadvantaged communities (including limited English speakers) who live or work in the Delta.
483-20	In summary, tribal planning and impact analysis is comprehensive. It is inclusive of past, present, and future generations. Thus, the project analysis should have considered the landscape prior to European invasion to 200 years from present. Specific analysis (inclusive of past projects prior to existence of consultation policies and environmental impacts) should have focused on the following areas, which are absent or insufficient in the existing analysis: - The impacts to species needs to be comprehensive of the food web from source to sink (i.e., mountains to sea), as all of these species are likely to be impacted.	This comment includes introductory language regarding baseline conditions that is addressed in the response to comment 483-12. Please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, which discusses topics related to the information used to describe the environmental setting, the approach to the impact analysis, and the proposed mitigation measures for biological species affected by the project. As stated in response to comment 483-6, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, addresses potential effects on sensitive natural communities, plants, and wildlife and identifies mitigation measures to reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.
483-21	While I appreciate inclusion of a broader suite of project alternatives, none proposed are compatible with the ecocultural needs of this region. As such, I support the no action alternative.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
483-22	References: Hankins, D.L. 2018. Ecocultural Equality in the Miwko? Waali?. San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science. 16(3): 1-11 Hankins, D.L. 2019. Ecocultural Species of Vernal Pool Ecosystems: Case Study from the Miwko? Waali?. In. Gottschock et al. Vernal Pool Landscapes, CSU Chico Herbarium	The commenter provided these references in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. To the extent feasible, DWR attempted to review the cited material; however, these references were not readily accessible.
486-1	Please, please don't take the precious San Francisco Bay water!!!	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
487-1	I am trying to help stop this ridiculous project to take fresh water out of the Sacramento River before it can flow through Delta. There are multiple issues at hand that have been identified and known throughout the years regarding this project which is harmful to our communities and the eco	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	systems in the delta region. Listed below are a few that resonate with me.	objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring).
487-2	(1) The location of the intakes on the Sacramento River is at Hood, CA, a small legacy community the Delta Plan says to protect. This project will destroy Hood and surrounding bird refuge.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
487-3	(2) As before, taking the freshest water out north on the Sacramento River and around the estuary will worsen water quality within our fragile Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding analysis of environmental impacts on surface water quality from the project alternatives. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on water quality would be less than significant before the application of mitigation.
487-4	(3) They'll still be leaving muck on our islands and farmland. They spell it "RTM" (reusable tunnel material) but it isn't reusable per their own experts and it is muck.	Please see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material. As described in Chapter 3, DWR would develop site-specific plans for the beneficial reuse of tunnel material to the greatest extent feasible. RTM would be placed in temporary stockpile areas and tested regularly for the presence of hazardous material concentrations above regulatory thresholds.
487-5	(4) This expensive project creates no new water, like alternatives would. (Desalination, recycling, etc.) The EIR doesn't study any real alternatives. Just tunnel or no tunnel.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
487-6a	(5) The energy costs to pump all this water around the delta is extremely high. We don't need any more strain on PG&E. We don't want our rates to go up.	Please see Chapter 22, Energy, regarding comments related to energy impacts and mitigation approaches. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on energy identified in the comment would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments related to project costs, including taxpayer costs.
487-6b	Northern California will get the construction impacts, energy drain, and lose fresh water. More toxic blue-green algae. There's no positive value for Northern California.	The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. In particular, Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		project related to water quality and cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. Please also see Chapter 22, Energy, for an analysis of the project's impacts on energy use, which would be less than significant.
487-6c	Instead we need the State to invest in our levees, make improvements to the narrow highway 4 bridges (not add construction truck traffic), and let more water flow through the Delta to keep the salt water out, not less	Please see response to comment 487-5 regarding the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
487-7	Please consider the impacts and understand that I am saying NO to DWR, the tunnel, and the zoom-only community meetings. I can't be bribed and am watching our politicians very closely and will not vote for any that support this project which is so detrimental to the communities in Northern California.	Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding public hearings and other public outreach activities. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment.
488-1	Please consider the impacts and understand that I am saying NO to DWR, the tunnel and the zoom-only community meetings. I cannot be bribed and am watching politicians very closely and will not vote for any that support this project which is so detrimental to the communities in Northern California.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding public hearings and other public outreach activities. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
490-1	The idea that a Tunnel taking water away from the Delta just does not make sense. This project has the ability to destroy the largest Delta in the United States west of the Mississippi River. It is a Sanctuary for birds and fish. We already must build a rock wall to keep Salinity out of the upper areas of the delta now, what do you think is going to happen when that Hydraulic	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Pressure is reduced! Even worse it does not provide a single extra gallon of water to the State.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including birds and their habitats in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in Chapter 13, significant impacts on bird refuges would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Please also refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding salinity and water quality in the Delta.
490-2	The only long-term solution is additional storage. I believe that Los Vaqueros Reservoir between Brentwood and Livermore is a perfect example of how we should handle and store water. It was placed in an area where there was no streams or rivers to block, an excellent environmental solution. There are hills all up and down the state that would be good areas to do this. Please reconsider this plan...Thanks.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding suggested infrastructure and water management alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
492-1	Southern California will NEVER have enough water! Millions of swimming pools down there are filled with our precious N CA Water! Millions of acres of Pasture Land have been converted to Almond Orchards. CA exports 80% of the WORLDS ALMONDS! It takes a HUGE amount of our CA WATER to grow that many ALMONDS! Valley views of our mountains have been turned into a TUNNEL OF ALMOND TREES exposing the	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	people who live next to the orchards to dangerous pesticides that cause cancer! We conserve water up here at 5,000 feet elevation so people downslope can fill their swimming pools. There are just too many people in CA that waste water.	compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
492-2	CA is overpopulated. Wildlife habitat is endangered by the expanding demand for more housing.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
492-3	Sierra Valley was completely dry the summer of 2021. There was not one drop of surface water in the Sierra Valley channels. We put out water for our wildlife. On the ranch lands the pivot sprinklers are now metered and monitored to prevent over drafting our groundwater. HWY 70 has sunk in two places across Sierra Valley due to low groundwater levels.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, which describes potential changes to surface water resources that could result from implementation of the project. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
492-4	The native fish in N CA streams and the Delta can't survive low, warm water years. The work to restore fish habitat in Butte and Big Chico Creek resulted in Salmon returning to spawn. The fish have to survive migrating upriver through the Delta to reach their many spawning grounds at the top of the watersheds during low water level years.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
492-5	Low water flows increase the concentration of poisons such as Carbofuran used by illegal cannabis growers that poison wildlife. People we work with on trail crew that clean up illegal grows on National Forest Land tell us the poison is sprayed on the plants. Also illegal cannabis uses large amounts of water taken from our N CA watersheds without any oversight.	Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-11 for an analysis of potential impacts from operations and maintenance of the project on pesticides, which were determined to be less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, describes the crop types and distribution of crops in the study area for the project. Cannabis cultivation, including illegal cannabis cultivation, is not prevalent in the study area.
492-6	Northern California can't afford to export more Delta Water to Southern California. The health of our native species in the Delta should have priority. Exporting water to Southern California will make the current low water levels in the Delta even worse. There is no telling how many years our snowpack will be deficient.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.
493-1	I am impressed with the multiple media resources that you have made available for public exposure. And impressed with the detailed breakdown and analysis provided in your Draft EIR documents. This publicity focuses on minimizing environmental impact and mitigating construction and/or cultural or historic issues. I watched a couple of the video previews and I printed the 28 page summary so I could make notes and write my questions and reactions. Then I canvased friends and neighbors for their thoughts or reactions on the project. Most of them knew nothing except for headlines about the "twin tunnels " being reduced to one. And most were against the idea. "It's just Southern California corporate farming operations and exclusive residential developments taking our water!" I live and work around Butte County in Northern California so those reactions did not surprise me. So my first reaction is that there needs to be more public media presence in Northern California; focused messages that emphasize how it is excess water that is shared with Southern California only after maintaining Nature's web of life, the balance of farmlands and	This information describes the background of the individual commenter in addition to the individual commenter's experience with public outreach activities. While it is not a comment on the contents of the EIR, DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding public meetings and other public outreach activities. Please also refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. Lastly, please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	salt marsh of the Delta, and our Northern California water needs are met. My second reaction is that public meetings to collect local comment be conducted with an empathetic supervision. I sat in on one such meeting in Sacramento about four years ago where people drove down from the Redding area, and no one felt their opinions mattered! On the other hand, I attended another meeting after the Oroville spillway incident where the highest level of DWR administration respectfully listened to locals complaining! I worked at the Lake Oroville Visitor Center for 15 years (for California State Parks) and fielded questions, compliments, and criticism about the State Water Project. My response started with "You are right!" and I acknowledged their opinions and feelings. I'd like to see more publicity about how our state agencies are protecting our state's natural resources. I volunteered with the CDFW for 10 years before landing a position with CDPR. Wade Crowfoot is the first Secretary that I feel has promoted that role to the public.	
494-1	Build Desalination in L.A. The Delta is in peril exporting water for L.A. is insane. Pumping the water over the Tehachapi mountains is crazy. Stop taking water from the Delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also see Common Response 4, No

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
496-1	The EIR's scope is too narrow and optimistically focuses on the logistics of maintaining the status quo of our cities', towns', industries', and farms' current development trajectories. By creating a massive new infrastructure investment, the State of CA government would enable the status quo to proceed; in fact, this new infrastructure would incentivize these unwise and climate reality-blind trajectories to happen. The status quo for these development trajectories is neither sustainable nor advisable in terms of land stewardship. It is neither sustainable nor advisable for a truly thriving California. Rather than focusing on a technical fix with how to maintain our current water delivery system as drought conditions worsen, the people of the state of California must reckon with making an adaptive change. We need to not only move away from the current growth trajectories and plans, we need to undo some of the harms of poor past decisions. For example, I grew up in the Los Angeles area. When I attended college there, my geology professor taught us that our region could naturally sustain just under 500,000 people, with its historic fresh water capacity. Ever since, I have taken a more mature and land stewardship-oriented view of my beloved home state.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
496-2	To the DWR and the Office of the Governor: ignoring the true, adaptive challenges of today and those on the horizon is not an effective way to protect, steward, and honor your lands, water, and fellow Californians. Please let go of this project so that you	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding scope of analysis and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	can turn your capable minds and formidable resources to strategize a more meaningful plan for our climate and for climate justice in our state.	Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
499-1	This "new" EIR has the same serious, unsurmountable issues as the BDCP and Cal WaterFix, issues that are why it was not able to be deemed “Consistent” with the Delta Plan as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. This has been brought up innumerable times in hearings and comments over the past ten years.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act.
499-2	Real alternatives still haven’t been studied in this latest version of the EIR. Global warming is still being ignored. Look at the unsustainable levels of the lakes that feed the Sacramento River, and then look at the Colorado River Basin and the levels of Lake Powell and Lake Mead, and a person with a lower skill set like me easily realizes that the big picture of the American Southwest is being glossed over in favor of a terribly expensive band aid approach with a tunnel that ultimately won’t provide any more water. We need to look at other desert countries like Israel and the Persian Gulf states for guidance, because California is becoming a desert, as evidenced by the escalating die-outs of our forests. Instead of an expensive tunnel that will further destroy our fragile Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta, why didn’t the EIR consider desalination, water reuse, and pinpoint (drip) irrigation. California is blessed with expansive deserts with ample sunshine – perfectly equipped for massive solar arrays to capture the additional energy required for desalination. I’ve read about the suggestion to cover the	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. Please also refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please see Chapter 22, Energy, for analysis of the project’s impacts on energy use, which are less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	California Aqueduct with solar to reduce the 10% of water lost to evaporation. Pumping the water from the Delta to Southern California is already the largest consumer of electricity in California.	
499-3	In summary, I consider the EIR to not be focused on the real water issues facing our State, and as a result, to be wholly inadequate.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
509-1	As a career environmental scientist as well as a resident of Discovery Bay, I am very concerned regarding the environmental impacts of this Delta Conveyance Project.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Additionally, please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
509-2	The following items highlight my concerns: Impact to irrigation water quality for water pulled from the delta and utilized for agricultural purposes	The analysis contained in the EIR discusses impacts related to specific water quality concerns. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding impacts related to water quality.
509-3	The following items highlight my concerns: Further degradation of the water quality for migratory bird populations	Please refer to response to comment 509-2 regarding the analysis of water quality. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for the analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation for the environmental resources raised in the comment.
509-4	The following items highlight my concerns: Consultation with EPA on Federal Designated Critical Habitat (sensitive/critical habitats include): California red-legged frog California tiger salamander Delta smelt Longhorn fairy shrimp	Please refer to Chapters 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding critical habitat for various species as mentioned by the commenter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Vernal pool fairy shrimp Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat-Riverine Chinook Salmon Critical Habitat-Estuarine Green Sturgeon Critical Habitat	
509-5	The following items highlight my concerns: Army Corps of Engineers consultation (Region 3) feedback?	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and NEPA Process.
509-6	The following items highlight my concerns: California Department of Fish & Wildlife transparent feedback on project?	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding CEQA lead and responsible agencies' use of best available science. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.
509-7	The following items highlight my concerns: Time duration of this project likely to be >10 years to fully implement	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for further details related to the duration of project implementation, including construction and operation of the proposed alternatives.
509-8	The following items highlight my concerns: Pursue and implement water resource alternatives that can be accomplished in a much rapid pace Lack of viable alternatives that have been actively identified and transparently pursued -Desalination plants closer to the source of the water needed -Robust water conservation efforts -Transparency around the utilization of flow meters across California and efforts to ration water, as needed. -Higher focus on drought related effects on Colorado River and managing that resource more effectively	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	-Risk management for those areas that have been historically desert climate and the lack of limitations placed on these areas which may not be the best recipient of water. -Evaluating evaporation losses and potential for finding leaks with the current system of aqueducts & conveyance canals -Larger utilization of cisterns for homeowners & businesses to curb some of the demand on limited water resources -Evaluation of existing dams and potential areas that could benefit from dam construction -Larger effort to utilize recycled water so water is not just discharged back to surface water	
509-9	The following items highlight my concerns: Impacts to the ecosystem of the delta (fish populations, salinity changes)	Please refer to Common Responses 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding concerns with impacts on the ecosystem of the Delta. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the analysis of salinity changes and fish populations.
509-10	The following items highlight my concerns: Escalate the rate of saltwater intrusion that is being delicately balanced/managed near Bethel Island	Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, for modeled results. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding discussions on modeling and results related to saltwater intrusion.
509-11	The following items highlight my concerns: Incidental take permitting which may be needed to protect wildlife that could be impacted by the construction project	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding permits. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for information related to applicable permitting for the project.
509-12	The following items highlight my concerns: Stream alteration permits	Please refer to response to comment 509-11 regarding the applicable permitting for the project.
509-13	The following items highlight my concerns: Potential for environmental justice issues that could arise by impacting the town of Hood and surrounding bird refuge	The analysis contained in the EIR addresses issues of environmental justice. Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding impacts related to areas in the Delta, such as the town of Hood. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding bird refuge.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
509-14	The following items highlight my concerns: Limited reuse of mucky materials that may be costly to dispose of or manage appropriately	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding any modifications to construction descriptions between the public and final draft EIR. Also, Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, contains additional information relating to the plans for material spoils from proposed construction.
509-15	The following items highlight my concerns: Additional sedimentation within the delta waterways that will impact the recreational and ecological quality of the delta	Impacts associated with sedimentation are addressed in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, of the EIR and found to be less than significant. Therefore, sedimentation of the project is not anticipated to impact the recreational and ecological quality of the Delta. Further, environmental commitments and BMPs of the proposed project include implementing erosion and sediment control plans (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices).
509-16	The following items highlight my concerns: Additional taxing on an energy grid that is already on the brink of available capacity which this project would surely increase the electrical demand of the large capacity pumps that will be required.	The analysis contained in the EIR discusses the necessary energy consumption for the proposed alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 22, Energy, for a summary comparison of the proposed alternatives and discussions related to their anticipated energy consumption.
509-17	The following items highlight my concerns: Additional greenhouse gases that will be produced not only by the construction equipment and delivery trucks but the long term energy needs will be far into the future	Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-9 quantifies and assesses greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would be generated by construction and operation of the project. As disclosed in Impact AQ-9, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation of GHG emissions. Please refer to Chapter 22, Energy, for an analysis of long-term energy needs associated with the project.
509-18	If you should have any questions or would like me to clarify any of my comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.	This information describes general conclusionary text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
510-1	Lodi is near I-5, but why is it NOT ON THE Map(s) of Delta Conveyance (tunnel) Project? That is for awful SoCal tunnel at Terminous Marina, part of Lodi, LUHS district. Why the cover up (no map info) of	Maps, figures, and graphics contained in chapters and appendices are designed to provide the level of detail appropriate to depict potential effects and orient readers to locational information. Accordingly, not all maps have the same scale; rather, the scale was selected based on the nature of the effects for a given resource area. Labeling in many map

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Mokelumne River communities, Lodi Lake, Clements Rodeos, etc.?	figures has been minimized to be consistent with discussions in the narrative in order to maintain clarity and ease of use in the maps.
510-2	I used to drive to CAL, next to Port of Oakland, passing along Delta River, Hwy 165…, It is scenic panoramic Mt. Diablo, over the Awesome Antioch Bridge to the Port of Stockton. (That is 2nd most panoramic in the world with Mt. Kilimanjaro, Africa). We'd see big Boat Dredging of Delta River with US Army Corp maps and Rio Vista private company.	This information provides context of what the individual commenter used to see while driving on Highway 165. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
510-3	DEEP PURE DREDGING BOATS -- avoided flooding. Yet in Sacbee (2015), a former US Senator (CA) from Massachusetts family in stock market, transferred USACE funding to Washington State.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
510-4	Who all are privy to water bonds for concrete funnel tunnels — when concrete costs more than cost effective, salt energy in Desalination? (Desal was invented at UCB, 1977, by J. Leibovitz, and since used in 100 nations.) Again there is the California coast with Pacific Ocean…..	Please refer to response to comment 510-3 regarding comments that do not raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIR.
510-5	At UCB, does Earth Science consider natural wells, instead of tearing up river communities, producing FRESH FOOD CROPS with Delta Lodi and Mokelumne River? That is #1 agricultural industry in San Joaquin County! 50% of California food crops serve USA and international.	Please refer to response to comment 510-3 regarding comments that do not raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIR.
510-6	Please apply our concerns to the benefit of all in the near future versus Delta drought recycles. This is largely from water exports and need to divert funds to reforestation practices. That is to restore humidity, rivers communities, etc.	Please refer to response to comment 510-3 regarding comments that do not raise significant environmental issues related to the Draft EIR.
512-1	I'm an independent journalist who's covered fish, environmental justice and water issues for 40 years. Different versions of this same gigantic and wasteful public works	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	project -- the Peripheral Canal, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, the California Water Fix and now the single Delta Conveyance -- have cast a dark, toxic shadow over California water policy since it was first decisively rejected by California voters in November 1982 as the Peripheral Canal.	of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
512-2	Tunnel proponents claim the tunnel will protect the reliability of water transport infrastructure, address the impacts of sea level rise, and "improve" the Delta's aquatic conditions. However, the project will do none of these things,	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
512-3	instead hastening the extinction of Sacramento River winter and spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, Delta and longfin smelt and green sturgeon. It's feared these fish species will die off as the multi-billion tunnel keeps indebting Californians for generations to come.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to water users and taxpayers, as well as rate increases for water agency customers using project water. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the project-related impacts on Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, delta and longfin smelt, and green sturgeon. Furthermore, a detailed discussion of project costs and financing is available in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives; Chapter 6, Water Supply; and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.
512-4	According to a recent blog post by Doug Obegi of NRDC, "Yet inexplicably, DWR's DEIR refuses to consider any operational alternatives. Even worse, DWR's proposed operations of the Delta tunnel are significantly less protective of the environment than the operations that the National Marine Fisheries Service and other agencies required for the proposed twin tunnel project only a few years ago (California WaterFix), as we explained in this letter to DWR last year. As a result, all of the alternatives in the DEIR substantially increase water exports from the Delta on average by approximately 500,000 acre feet per year, including significant increases in water	Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding a discussion of the operations evaluated in the EIR and the adequacy of the range of alternatives, including the operational scenario, in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	diversions in dry and critically dry years (200-300,000 acre feet per year) "	
512-5	"Because the project fails to include environmental protective operational criteria, the DEIR's modeling (see pages ES-71 to ES-74) concludes that the Delta tunnel (and all alternatives) will reduce the survival of winter-run and spring-run salmon migrating through the Delta, reduce the abundance of Longfin Smelt, increase the number of Delta Smelt that are entrained and killed, and worsen ecological conditions in the estuary (including reducing Delta outflow in dry and critically dry years - see Table 5A-B3.3.4.4-D.). The status quo in the Bay-Delta is awful for our native fish and wildlife, but the DEIR demonstrates that the Delta tunnel project -- at least with the proposed operations-- would make things in the Delta even worse," noted Obegi.	Please refer to response to comment 512-3 regarding aquatic species such as Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, delta and longfin smelt, and green sturgeon.
512-6	All of the available science reveals that the Delta and longfin smelt, Sacramento winter run and spring run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, green sturgeon and a host of other fish species need more water flowing down the Sacramento to the Delta to survive and thrive -- not less, as the DEIR proposes under the Delta Conveyance Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science as it relates to the analysis of Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, delta and longfin smelt, and green sturgeon.
512-7	The entire Delta Conveyance project is based on the irrational and unscientific premise that diverting more Sacramento River before it reaches the Delta will somehow "restore" the Delta ecosystem while providing water supply reliability.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a description of the purpose and project objectives, analysis of the project as a whole, and use of best available science. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, regarding the purpose of the project, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
512-8	I don't know of any water diversion project in world or U.S. history where taking more water out of a river or estuary has restored that river or estuary. The Delta Tunnel project, if ever constructed, would be no different.	Please refer to response to comment 512-7 regarding the purpose and project objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project.
519-1	My name is [commentor name], I am from the villages of Weychpues, Pektuhl and Erhlerger. I currently live in the village of Weychpues. I have raised my family in my village since moving home from graduating from the University of California Davis.	This information describes the background of the individual. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
519-2	I am very familiar with this area and this project [The DCP] back when it was projected for two tunnels. This scaling down of the bigger twin tunnels project should demonstrate the lack of viability of this current project. The short comings of the last project should also be included in this Environmental Impact Review.	Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding past planning efforts and the Governor's directive to evaluate a single tunnel project, as well as regarding the current planning effort which has included numerous design refinements to reduce impacts. Please see the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please also refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the project description, and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
519-3	The Delta Tunnel Conveyance project's EIR presents a plethora of adverse effects to the fisheries of Northern California as well as the natural and cultural resources in the Bay Delta, Sacramento, Klamath-Trinity Rivers Watersheds. With extinction looming for many fisheries species in these watersheds this project still presents adverse effects to the	The comment assertion is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please refer to the Summary of Impacts section of the Executive Summary to see that impacts related to fish and aquatic resources would be considered less than significant with proposed mitigation measures. For further information related to analyzed impacts on fish and aquatic

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	survival of fisheries and the economies that fuel the State of California, the West Coast of US, Mexico, and Canada.	resources, and proposed mitigation measures, please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources.
519-4	This project [The DCP] does not adequately mitigate the negative impacts from the drought over the last decade as well as relevant climate change research.	Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a description of the climate change analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.
519-5	Based on this EIR, this project [The DCP] will also have detrimental ramifications for better clean water projects that promote local community resilience. However based on this EIR this project promotes unstable and obsolete infrastructure that will need more upkeep and maintenance funding and other mitigation (i.e. training/ safety measures) than presented in the documents. This EIR needs to include the historical and current negative impacts from new construction or the modernization of large scale water projects like this one.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project does not preclude the development of improved regional water supplies, conservation, water use efficiency, increases in water recycling, advanced water technologies, local and regional water supply projects, or improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts. Please refer to Common Response 1 regarding the appropriate use of the baseline for the purposes of the CEQA analysis. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for a discussion regarding the analysis of project effects which addresses temporary and permanent effects from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately discloses the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
519-6	It is not clear the project [The DCP] is still even viable with the current financial projections presented.	Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for a description regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
519-7	The construction of this project [The DCP] will also bring many adverse effects to air quality, more large vehicle traffic (bigger strain on local transportations systems) that will have long lasting negative impacts on health and infrastructure.	Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding the effects of the project on air quality in the study area. In addition, please see Common Response 14, Transportation, regarding road rehabilitation. Please also refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, for further discussion.
519-8	As a Yurok Tribal Citizen and businessperson who relies on the watersheds of Northern California I do not support the adverse effects of this [The DCP] or other concurrent projects and recommend the project team elect the no build option moving forward.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding CEQA requirements and the scope of alternatives. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments in support of the No Project Alternative.
537-1	I write to you as a concerned member of the local community. I have reviewed the Draft EIR document and wish to give community commentary on Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis.¬ Courtland, CA has been my home for 9 years. I have chosen to live here with my husband and raise our children here. My husband is a 4th generation farmer in Courtland and I personally have utilized the Delta waterways for recreation my whole life. It is of great concern to see this unique region threatened.¬	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
537-2	In review of Chapter 34, I can assure you the community simply does not desire the proposed peace offerings. I present this counter argument based on the community's repeated votes to stop the exact propositions outlined in Chapter 34. Propositions such as building a community center, adding bus routes, revitalizing rural main streets, increasing tourism by encouraging vacation rental by owner, and altering housing / building permits is precisely what the community has voted against for decades. These project entities would destroy the quaint simplicity of local towns that have intentionally	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	remained RURAL for 4+ generations. Industrializing the area by introducing more people and establishing more construction goes against the core values of the Delta community. Anglers, recreational boaters, wine enthusiasts, and avid bird watchers travel from all over the state of CA to the Sacramento Delta to escape exactly what Chapter 34 proposes: industrialization, traffic, and mainstream tourism. Again, I emphasize the community has voted time and time again to limit the building in this area and restrict housing permits. The Delta Conveyance Project blatantly disregards the community's vote.	and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. As described in Appendix 3G, the goal of the Community Benefits Program is to define a set of commitments made as a part of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project and created in coordination with the local community to create lasting, tangible, and valuable economic and social benefits to the residents, businesses, and organizations experiencing localized Delta Conveyance Project construction effects that go beyond those that can be addressed through traditional environmental mitigation. The Community Benefits Framework recognizes that the local communities are best equipped to tailor benefits to their particular needs, therefore the development and implementation of the community benefits program would be guided by strong collaboration with the Delta communities and Tribal interests. With regard to the portion of the comment asserting that the project would be "industrializing the area by introducing more people," it is described in Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, that the project would restore amounts of water that public water agencies previously received that have been reduced due to regulatory requirements or operational agreements. As a result, there would be a modest change in water supply under the project and would not be a substantial factor in fostering growth within the study area.
537-3	Of greater concern, Section 34.3.5.3 highlights imminent risk to the Delta's agricultural community. The Sacramento Delta region is one of the largest agricultural and crop producing regions in the state of CA. This project threatens the sustainability of local family owned farms that have been established for 150 years. Converting agricultural farmland for the purpose of tourism would negatively impact the entire state's food supply as well as surrounding states who obtain produce from this region. ¬	Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding project impacts on agricultural lands. Please see Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding construction traffic and effects on agricultural practices. Please also see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, ECON-6, regarding changes in agricultural economics in the Delta and project area.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
537-4	"If increased tourism results in the need for new facilities or housing, this increase could result in changes to land use in the region. Because much of the open space in the Delta is currently used for agriculture, construction of tourism facilities and new housing could result in conversion of agricultural land uses. Where facilities could be constructed within existing communities, it is unlikely that they would be inconsistent with current land uses and plans. Where available and feasible, lower-quality farmland or farmland with lower habitat values could be chosen to reduce or avoid impacts to Important Farmland. However, even with mitigation, impacts may be substantial." Page 34-18, Chapter 34, Section 34.3.5.3 - Land Use. ¬	This comment quotes text from the EIR. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
537-5	Sections 34.3.1.1-34.3.1.11 are equally as alarming. In short, the project would destroy the surrounding communities of Hood, Courtland, Walnut Grove, and Clarksburg. The aforementioned sections provide a disturbing outline of what would be to come. Noise, harmful pollution, increased traffic, road closures, aesthetic alteration of the Delta and, of most concern, unwarranted disturbance and death to the already at risk aquatic and wildlife species in the Delta.	The comment assertion that the project would destroy local communities is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the community benefits and implementation and the socioeconomic analysis approach used in the EIR. Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, ECON-3 also contains information regarding impacts as a result of the project. Please also see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding information on selected study areas and the analysis of potential transportation impacts. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects to local and regional roadways including Interstate 5; State Routes 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road; and Hood-Franklin Road, as discussed in Chapter 20, in the section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Please see Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, for an analysis of potential impacts associated with noise and vibration as a result of the project. Please see Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, regarding the effects on air quality in the region and proposed mitigation. Please see Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for additional information on the methodology and approach used for the analyses of impacts on wildlife species. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively. Overall, the potential impacts on fish and wildlife were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
537-6	Even more concerning is the below disclosure statement in section 34.1 alerting the public that the full scope of damages to the region is simply unpredictable. Moving forward with this project means moving forward with irreversible and unavoidable damage."While CEQA requires analyzing reasonable, foreseeable future components of a project, it only requires analyzing them at a level of detail that is commensurate with the detail available for the project. Because the actions that could be funded or integrated into the project as part of this program have not yet been specifically identified, this analysis discloses potential impacts that could be anticipated based on available information but does not include CEQA significance impact determinations because, at this stage, it is unknown which specific activities would be approved, and their design, location, or scale are unknown." Page 34-2, Chapter 34, Section 34.1 - Introduction.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see the discussion about CEQA and the scope of the alternatives in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, regarding the requirements of CEQA and particularly the Chapter 4 section titled Analysis Level of Detail. As described in Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, as specific community benefit actions are funded or integrated with the construction of the project, they will undergo project-level CEQA review and required regulatory processes prior to implementation. During the project-level CEQA environmental review process, mitigation measures would be identified to reduce or avoid significant impacts on environmental resources that are consistent with the Delta Plan mitigation measures.
537-7	The Sacramento Delta is one of the last rural areas in the valley. The Delta community and residents of Sacramento have repeatedly declined previous propositions similar to the Delta	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Conveyance Project and outspokenly do not support the current project. I encourage you to respectfully listen to your community. No means no.Thank you for your time and consideration of this commentary.	
541-1	The DEIR is inadequate for a number of reasons: inaccurate "growing" population attribution, failure to comply with Delta Reform Act (Delta Act, Reform Act, Act), inadequate consideration of alternatives to accomplish water supply goals, and failed cost discussion.	The assertion that the EIR does not adequately analyze growth and adequately consider alternatives is not consistent with the EIR. Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, addresses potential impacts associated with the potential for the project to result in direct or indirect growth inducement. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits. While CEQA does not require a cost analysis, Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, addresses potential socioeconomic effects associated with the project. Additional discussion regarding project costs and funding is provided in Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations.
541-2	In the 2009 Delta Reform Act, the Legislature, with input from all segments of California population, enunciated the state's policy "to reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs through a statewide strategy of investing in improved regional supplies, conservation, and	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the discretion CEQA

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	water use efficiency." [Footnote 1: Cal. Water Code section 85021.] Then, in 2013, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)—reflecting the Delta Reform Act and the best science—spoke of the unparalleled opportunity for California to move aggressively towards a sustainable water future. The SWRCB envisioned accomplishing that future by means of local, resilient water through water recycling, water conservation, and the use of stormwater, noting those "sources of supply are drought-proof, reliable, and minimize our carbon footprint and can be sustained over the long-term." [Footnote 2: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2013/rs2013_0003_a.pdf]. Yet, 13 years after the Legislature enacted the Delta Reform Act and almost a decade after the SWRCB's plea, the public is being asked to comment on a tunnel project [Footnote 3: As an iteration of previous governors' tunnel plans, the Delta tunnel proposed will not have the benefit of legislative review. As the DEIR describes it: "one of the projects identified in the portfolio is new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta to safeguard the SWP, which is now proposed as the Delta Conveyance Project." Delta Tunnel DEIR, Ch. 1, p. 1.3. The current tunnel project was proposed in the California Water Resilience Portfolio (2020). The 2022 Portfolio update promotes the "Delta conveyance project … and a tunnel under the Delta to safeguard SWP deliveries… " The Portfolios are only administrative documents.] that does not reduce reliance on the Delta, is not local, does not recycle, will not conserve water and will not minimize our carbon footprint either currently or over the long term. In fact, the tunnel and its DEIR	affords lead agencies in defining the project purpose and objectives and the scope of the purpose and objectives statements for the purposes of CEQA. The EIR fully evaluates potentially significant environmental impacts from construction and operation of the alternatives on multiple resources in Chapters 7 through 32. As summarized in the Executive Summary, most of the potentially significant environmental impacts on resources within the Delta such as fisheries, wildlife, and vegetation can be reduced to less-than-significant levels after the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship between the Delta Conveyance Project and the Delta Reform Act. The EIR acknowledges and incorporates local or regional actions undertaken by public water agencies such as water recycling, water conservations, and the use of stormwater where appropriate (e.g., No Project Alternative description and analysis). The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	reflect a look backward for 20th century solutions to the state's water problems. Delta Reform Act The Delta tunnel's failure to reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs (as required by the Delta Reform Act) is clear from the DEIR itself: Tables ES-4 [Footnote 4: Delta Tunnel DEIR, p. ES-51.] and 6-0 [Footnote 5: Id. At p. 6-3.] demonstrate that the proposed alternatives all increase SWP and CVP deliveries by many thousands of acre-feet (af). (Notably, those tables do not even include deliveries to exchange contractors or to senior water right holders in the Feather River Service Area.) With DWR's 10% predicted reduction in water supply by 2040 [Footnote 6: https://resources.ca.gov/-/media/CNRA-Website/Files/Initiatives/Water-Resilience/CA-Water-Supply-Strategy.pdf] an increase in export deliveries seems certain to further harm species and the environment.	
541-3	Some figures supplied in the DEIR appear inconsistent, as seen in the Water Supply Existing Conditions, where total annual SWP deliveries long-term average are identified at 2,429,000 af/y in Table ES-4, but in Table 31-2, south of Delta only, are listed at 3,509,000 af/y. If existing conditions cannot be identified accurately, extrapolations through simulations provide little confidence in calculations obtained through their use.	The numbers in the Executive Summary table identified by the comment are correct. The numbers in the Chapter 31, Growth Inducing, table titled CalSim Modeling Results for Average Annual CVP and SWP Water Supply for Alternatives (thousand acre-feet per year) have been revised to reflect the numbers of the cited source of this table, which is "Chapter 6, *Water Supply*, Table 6-5." In other words, the revised numbers in the Chapter 31 table were already represented in the Chapter 6 table. The revisions to the Chapter 31 table titled CalSim Modeling Results for Average Annual CVP and SWP Water Supply for Alternatives (thousand acre-feet per year) did not result in a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact or require additional mitigation measures to which DWR was unwilling to commit.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
541-4	Further, many pages of the DEIR cite the CVP, including the DEIR's projected increases in CVP deliveries post-tunnel construction. These CVP references should have inspired a more intensive review of the CVP role in the proposed Delta tunnel operation, as well as federal environmental review -- neither of which has been undertaken to date.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Response to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding federal environmental involvement through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers involvement in the project and NEPA process. As described in Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, in the section titled U.S. Bureau of Reclamation or Central Valley Project Contractor(s), Reclamation or a CVP contractor (or contractors) have not expressed interest in participating in the Delta Conveyance Project as project proponents. The analysis of potential impacts disclosed in the Draft EIR for Alternatives 2A, 4A, or 5 would not be anticipated to change in any appreciable way. Therefore, changes in water deliveries under Alternative 5 (if Reclamation or CVP contractors were to express interest in participation) would not be expected to result in new or more severe impacts than those disclosed in this EIR for Alternatives 2a and 4a. Chapter 5, Surface Water, discusses existing regulations, operational rules, and water supply allocation procedures governing the SWP and CVP system.
541-5	Were the CVP to be a beneficiary of the Delta tunnel, more exports would likely be demanded. The impacts of those likely demands need to be analyzed, but weren't.	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for more details on the conveyance capacities of the alternatives considered. Alternatives 2a and 4a with capacities of 7,500 cfs would allow for conveyance of up to 1,500 cfs to the CVP and were fully described and analyzed in the EIR.
541-6	Alternatives inadequately considered The DEIR claims the Delta Act acknowledges the need for "new Delta conveyance facilities." Yet, the DEIR fails to consider the Act's Cal. Water Code § 85031(b) that contains a caveat regarding such facilities concerning areas that have used, diverted and conveyed water from the Sacramento River hydrologic region for use outside the Sacramento River hydrologic region or the Delta. Section § 85031(b) indicates that such areas "shall not be deemed ... capable of being conveniently supplied with water therefrom by virtue or on	The information cited in the comment, including the water code sections, is not directly related to defining the project objectives for the purposes of CEQA or alternatives screening. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the project's purpose and objectives. As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, DWR has a continuing

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	account of the diversion and conveyance of that water through facilities that may be constructed for that purpose after January 1, 2010." Continuing diversions are not to be automatically approved by means of new construction. The Delta Reform Act thus seems to warn of potential unsuitability of any particular construction as a source for continued diversion of Sacramento River water through the Delta. In light of this section of code, the creation of the project objective "to restore and protect reliable SWP supplies from the Delta" is misplaced. The DEIR excuses its failure to assess the capacity of participating water agencies to replace tunnel-supplied water through water reliability projects [Footnote 7: No Project Alternative Assumption for Water Agency Actions, Appx03C Defining Existing Conditions No Project Alternative Cumulative Impact Conditions ADA, DEIR, § 3C.3.2.5 pp. 3C-10 to 3C-12.] -- such as conservation, recycling, groundwater recovery, groundwater management -- by citing the DWR-created project goal, and claiming that CEQA then precludes consideration of participating water agencies' potential actions. This renders the goal (seeking "reliable SWP supplies from the Delta") of the tunnel project suspect. The Delta Reform Act's policy goals stated in Cal. Water Code § 85020 clearly link ecosystem protection and restoration with any improvement in water conveyance. [Footnote 8: Cal. Water Code § 85020.] DEIR and project proponents claim to be observing the Delta Reform Act, yet defining the project goal as doing the project improperly forecloses options that could meet the goals defined as paramount in state law and by state agencies.	commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project, if approved, in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship between the Delta Conveyance Project and the Delta Reform Act and Delta Plan. As described in multiple parts of the EIR, DWR is required to obtain a Change in Point of Diversion from the State Water Resources Control Board and to comply with other applicable permitting processes, prior to construction and operation of the proposed project or a project alternative (i.e., diverting water).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
541-7	Not only does the Delta Tunnel DEIR demonstrate failure to reduce reliance on the Delta, but it does not analyze and include the reasonable range of Delta conveyance alternatives mentioned by legislators in the Delta Reform Act [Footnote 9: Id. § 85320.] and the salutary effect those alternatives could have on water supply needs in California. California discharges ~3.5 million acre-feet (maf) of wastewater to our state's waters every year, much of which can be reused. Alternatives such as wastewater recycling, stormwater capture and reuse and conservation have been instituted in parts of California. Los Angeles, for instance, plans to decrease its amounts of imported water dramatically -- sourcing 70% of its water locally by 2035 through wastewater reuse and stormwater capture [Footnote 10: https://plan.lamayor.org/targets/targets_plan.html]. However, the DEIR fails to address the capacity to use these alternatives to supply water for the state in place of the proposed tunnel, instead restricting alternatives to consideration of narrow variations of the single tunnel option. Reliable, drought-proof, climate -resilient local water sources that also have been judged to be less costly [Footnote 11: https://pacinst.org/publication/california-urban-water-supply-potential-2022/] should be analyzed and pursued.	The EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding how alternatives were screened and selected for analysis in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. The purposes and project objectives of the project are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures, such as those suggested in the comment, that may be taken by DWR or other entities. The project would be operated consistent with the Delta Reform Act and other applicable legislation and agreements. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to the Delta Reform Act and to EIR Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, regarding the project's consistency with the Delta Reform Act.
541-8	Reportedly, proposed projects were chosen to ensure protection of the state's most vulnerable and important source of water. [Footnote 12: Appx01 Scoping Summary Report ADA.]	As stated in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the fundamental purpose of the project is to protect the reliability of the SWP consistent with the requirements of state and federal laws. As described in Chapter 3,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	However, the Bay-Delta and state watersheds will demonstrably not be protected by any of the alternatives selected. [Footnote 13: See, e.g., the DEIR comments submitted by Friends of the River and NRDC, incorporated as if set forth herein.]	Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, including State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits. Please refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms, to locate the letter numbers of comments provided by other entities that are of interest. Responses to all comment letters are provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Response to Comments Tables.
541-9	Additionally, the alternatives that the DEIR does contain fail to provide for increased flows through the Delta, which the SWRCB has indicated are needed to protect public trust resources. [Footnote 14: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/docs/final_rpt080310.pdf] If the tunnel project were to proceed using any of the identified alternatives, species and the environment would suffer. The DEIR identifies such environmental harm and species' survival reductions in its modeling on pages ES-71 to ES-74. These resulting harms would violate the Delta Reform Act's intention "to restore Delta flows and channels to support a healthy estuary and other ecosystems" [Footnote 15: Cal. Water Code section 85302€(4)] and its recognition that "the permanent protection of the Delta's natural and scenic resources is the paramount concern to present and future residents of the	Please refer to response to comment 541-2 regarding the scope of CEQA objectives and the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project. Please see Common Response 17, Public Trust, regarding the EIR's evaluation of public trust resources. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR, including a discussion regarding operational scenarios and the operation criteria evaluated in the EIR. The Executive Summary referenced by the comment provides a summary of the multiple lines of evidence (e.g., modeling results, literature) used in the impact analysis in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. As stated prior to the beginning of the summary table, impacts are either less than significant and not requiring mitigation measures, or less than significant after the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship of the Delta

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	state and nation." [Footnote 16: Id. Section 85022©(2).] Operational scenarios need to be considered that would provide greater protection for the Delta ecosystem.	Conveyance Project with the Delta Reform Act, as well as the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project to the State Water Board's water quality control planning process and the establishment of flow-based water quality objectives.
541-10	Delta outflows should be mandated (without reducing reservoir storage in a way that would adversely affect flows and water temperature). The potential environmental impacts of outflow criteria should be evaluated and disclosed in the tunnel DEIR, but have not been adequately addressed. With the tunnel's 6,000 cfs projected diversion from the Sacramento River, water quality and quantity in the Bay-Delta will deteriorate even beyond current critical conditions, resulting in collapse of the ecosystem.	The Delta Conveyance Project is not proposing changes to operations or amount of storage provided by upstream facilities. The Delta Conveyance Project also does not preclude future changes to the state's water supply either through modifications of the operation of existing facilities or increasing water storage. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the tables titled Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria, Delta Diversion Bypass Flow and Pulse Protection Requirements, and North Delta Diversion Bypass Flow Criteria (subtable), describes the circumstances under which the project can divert water from the Sacramento River. In addition, the Chapter 3 figure titled Seasonal Diversions graphically depicts how the project would operate. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections of existing standards and as prescribed by the federal and state environmental permitting process. Chapter 9, Water Quality, provides the results of the construction- and operational-related impacts of the Delta Conveyance Project on water quality. Construction activities may result in water quality impacts; however, DWR would implement construction-related environmental commitments and best management practice for water quality protection, and project operations would not result in significant impacts on water quality.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
541-11	Population is declining; DEIR flawed by incorrect reliance on "growing" population Additionally, since the state has been losing population, [Footnote 17: The U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts note a decline of 300,387 California residents between April 2020 and July 2021., accessed at https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/CA. "California appears to be on the verge of a new demographic era, one in which population declines characterize the state... " https://calmatters.org/commentary/2022/04/california-population-decline/] citing increases in demand due to a growing population appears speculative at best; the DEIR incorrectly cites "a growing California population" [Footnote 18: DEIR, Ch. 1, p. 1-11; Ch. 31, Fig. 31-4; Ch. 31, Fig. 31-4, p. 31-8.] as a reason for an increased need for more water. It is clear that population growth does not mean increased water demand. For instance, L.A.'s population grew by one million while water demand stayed at about the same level for the 45 years preceding 2016. [Footnote 19: https://www.newsdeeply.com/water/articles/2016/11/08/how-water-use-has-declined-with-populationgrowth] The DEIR does acknowledge that MWD population has increased by 30 percent while water demands have decreased by roughly 20 percent [Footnote 20: DEIR, Ch. 39, Figures 31-1 through 31-4.] but has not corrected its statement about "growing" population and its implied increased requirement. This misstatement about "growing" California populations should be corrected. The actual impact on water supply needs should be analyzed appropriately.	Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, in the section titled Project Purpose and Objectives, states the fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of the SWP water deliveries. California's population did decrease between 2020 and 2021 which has been attributed to a decrease in migration to the state combined with outmigration attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic. California is now experiencing a positive population growth rate as measured from July 2021 (Public Policy Institute of California 2023). Please see Chapter 31, Growth Inducement, for information regarding the direct and indirect growth inducement potential from implementation of the Delta Conveyance Project as well as increased water supply reliability for the participating SWP contractors.
541-12	Cost: failed DEIR analysis, low-income, vulnerable population affected	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. The comment provides no substantial support for the claims of millions of dollars allegedly having been misused to pay planning

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The rising cost of the Delta Tunnel project, now pegged at $16 billion,[Footnote 21: https://www.mercurynews.com/2022/07/27/california-water-new-16-billion-delta-tunnel-plan-released-bynewsom-administration/] represents a major failure and weakness in view of the stated purpose of the project: "to restore and protect the reliability of State Water Project (SWP) water deliveries and, potentially, Central Valley Project (CVP) water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner."[Footnote 22: Id. p. ES-1.] [Italics added] The minimal cost analysis done [Footnote 23: See, e.g., ES.3.2, p. ES-13, lines 1-3.] is insignificant and pales in comparison to the cost of the entire project. Since about 90% of dollars to fund water utilities in California come from ratepayers, [Footnote 24: Interview with Dr. Jeffrey Mount (emeritus professor and founding director of the Center for Water Sciences at UCD) and senior fellow at PPIC Water Policy Center, https://www.capradio.org/articles/2022/12/02/californianeeds-to-prepare-to-live-with-less-water-new-report-suggests/] the cost effectiveness of a chosen project matters. It is particularly important for the one-third of California people who are low-income [Footnote 25: Id.] and already have difficulty paying their water bills. Furthermore, debt service "which will increase over time" represents an increasingly heavy burden for people who have to pay for expensive projects like this that don't pencil out in terms of water that will be provided. There is no finished economic analysis; millions of dollars have already allegedly been misused to pay planning costs, and the planning costs alone are hugely over budget.	costs, and the planning costs being over budget. The project costs are available for members of the public to review on the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) website through the board materials produced for each board meeting. The board meetings are regularly scheduled and are public. As currently documented, the costs of the project are on budget. The statement regarding cost overruns is speculation on the part of the commenter. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for further information on the ratepayers involvement and payment of the project. As well as a discussion of why a cost-benefit or financing analysis is not needed for the purposes of CEQA environmental review and why the scope of the CEQA analysis is sufficient for decision-making purposes.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Vulnerable populations in the state would thus be on the hook for ballooning tunnel expenses, making the likelihood of cost overruns that would boost the already-high $16 billion estimate especially problematic. (Costs of tunneling, in the United States can reach $1 billion or more per mile [Footnote 26: https://tunnelingonline.com/why-tunnels-in-the-us-cost-much-more-than-anywhere-else-in-the-world/]). The risk of such an increase appears great for a large tunneling project such as this (40 miles of tunnel), given the "iron law of megaprojects": "over budget, over time, over and over again." [Footnote 27: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2278226] The failure of the DEIR to provide the promised cost analysis and financial analysis until after project selection is critical, given foreseeable impacts. It is not consistent with best practices to delay cost analysis for such a project. The DEIR's failure to include cost-benefit figures, represents a vacuum in its analysis and shows disregard for fiscal responsibility.	
541-13	Operational discretion. Operational discretion through faulty water year projections and TUCPs (Temporary Urgency Change Petitions), or through other relaxed regulatory requirements, have often allowed premature delivery of large amounts of water when the future supply is still unknown. These large amounts of exports water leave less water for Delta salinity protection, less for pollution dilution and species protection later in the year, and promote harmful algal blooms (HABs) - critical in the Delta during dry years. Since flows have been identified as crucial for species survival, [Footnote 28: http://wdl.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/docs/historic/Bulleti	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for information regarding Temporary Urgency Change Petitions.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	ns/Bulletin_76/Bulletin_76__1960.pdf; https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/docs/sed/sac_delta_framework_070618%20.pdf; https://bayecotarium.org/wp-content/uploads/freshwater_report.pdf] the failure of the DEIR to include mandatory protections for such flows is a glaring deficiency. Mandatory flow regimes sufficient for the protection of the Delta estuary should be enunciated.	
541-14	Carbon The carbon footprint of the project with a + 40 miles-long tunnel (tunnel length applicable to all alternatives) has been deemed in the DEIR to be generally less than significant, pursuant to mitigation measures to be developed—which is speculative at best, especially since a particular alternative has yet to be chosen. It is also not clear that electric-powered equipment, for instance, will be available or if available, whether it might be cost prohibitive. There should be conditions placed that would not allow the project to proceed unless there is assurance that appropriate mitigation measures will be satisfied.	The comment provides no evidence for their assertion that the EIR mitigation for GHG emissions is speculative. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, identifies the proposed project as Alternative 5. As described in that chapter, identification of the proposed project does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the proposed project will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA. Mitigation Measure AQ-9 will mitigate emissions from construction to net zero through the development and implementation of a GHG mitigation program. The measure identifies the performance criteria of net zero emissions, outlines specific and enforceable standards to meet the performance criteria, and includes requirements for annual reporting and tracking to ensure the performance criteria is achieved in practice, regardless of which alternative is ultimately approved by DWR. Appendix 23B, Air Quality and GHG Analysis Activity Data, presents the air quality modeling for the EIR, including electric-powered equipment. In developing the equipment inventory, DWR performed a detailed review of currently verified equipment and consulted with industry experts regarding the availability of electric engines in California.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Refer to Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for additional discussion on the feasibility of electric and zero-emissions equipment and vehicles during construction. See also Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding development and implementation of the project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
541-15	A more thorough investigation and analysis of the greenhouse gas (GHG) potential of this enormous undertaking should be provided to the public. GHG also appears more significant than discussed because the tunnel manufacture and construction will require massive amounts of cement, involving the creation of millions of pounds of carbon dioxide. "Cement production is currently the largest single industrial emitter of CO2." [Footnote 29: https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1821673116]	The EIR provides a comprehensive analysis of GHG emissions generated by construction and operation of the proposed project and project alternatives and meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure of potential GHG impacts of the project in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and associated appendices. Chapter 23 quantifies and discloses GHGs from cement and aggregate manufacturing for project construction. Please refer to Common Response 15, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for additional discussion on the consideration of embodied emissions from cement.
541-16	In sum, the DEIR's review and the project are premature. Impacts to watersheds and communities, and to inhabitants of those communities have not been adequately considered. The project should be re-evaluated and re-examined under CEQA and NEPA.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of analysis in the EIR, the selection of the study area(s) evaluated in the EIR and the timing of the CEQA document and NEPA document relative to other activities (e.g., planning and engineering). The EIR demonstrates that DWR has made an objective, good-faith attempt at full disclosure. The Delta Conveyance EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. As a result, the EIR adequately complies with CEQA and the assertion that recirculation of the CEQA document is required is unfounded. Changes to surface water and water supply are evaluated in Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply. The impact analysis evaluates water-dependent resources throughout the entire EIR based changes described in Chapters 5 and 6, including Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Resources, and Chapter 9, Water Quality. In addition, Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, and Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, evaluate different aspects of Delta communities.
546-1	This new version of the flawed WaterFix and BDCP projects shows very little improvement despite more than two years work in isolation by the project proponents.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). The EIR also analyzes Alternative 5, on the Bethany Reservoir alignment, which eliminates the need for a forebay and significantly reduces the total acres affected by the project.
546-2	It is unfortunate that your Delta Roundtable had to be postponed because of the drought emergency and the COVID pandemic. It is even more tragic that the Roundtable was not resumed and that DWR never reached out to the Delta stakeholders and others who had raised serious technical concerns about the project. Why wasn't an administrative draft made available to Delta stakeholders well in advance of the public release?	DWR conducted an extensive outreach program to inform interested parties about the preparation and release of the Draft EIR. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for more information about efforts to inform the public about the development of the document and the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. CEQA does not require that an Administrative Draft EIR be released for public review. However, DWR held a series of public webinars in summer 2021 to share information about specific topics being analyzed, including Fish and Aquatic Resources, Environmental Justice, and Climate Change. Additionally, to assist with review of the Draft EIR, DWR prepared informational materials that were posted to the EIR webpage about the content of the EIR and how to review the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-3	This latest Draft EIR is fatally flawed and inadequate for CEQA review and should be withdrawn. A new EIR and new joint storage-conveyance alternatives should be developed.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA approach and comments regarding recirculation. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
546-4	I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project that was released for public review on July 27, 2022. Sadly, for both the Delta fisheries and ecosystem and for the people of California, this "new" Draft EIR represents a tragic waste of time and resources. Hardly any of the major flaws identified by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) staff, Delta Stewardship Council (DSC) staff and Bay-Delta stakeholders for the California WaterFix project have been addressed or corrected. Another two years have gone by with no sustainable, real Bay-Delta solution in sight.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's anticipated water supply reliability benefits. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
546-5	On May 2, 2019, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Director Karla Nemeth withdrew the project approval of the WaterFix project and rescinded DWR's accompanying California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notice of Determination. DWR in coordination with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) also notified the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) they were withdrawing the pending Petition for Change in Points of Diversion and Rediversion (CPOD Petition) for the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) and the related application for Section 401 certification for WaterFix. The applications for a Department of the Army permit under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act were also officially withdrawn (May 3, 2019).	This comment discusses events related to projects DWR is no longer pursuing and is therefore not required to respond to. Chapter 1, Introduction, section The Bay Delta Conservation Plan and California WaterFix, discusses the evolution of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and California WaterFix project development and that in February 2019, the Governor announced that he did not "support WaterFix as currently configured" but does "support a single tunnel." In light of Governor Newsom's announcement and Executive Order N-10-19, DWR exercised its discretion to withdraw certification of the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR, rescinded the California WaterFix project approval and bond resolutions, and withdrew permit applications to begin a new project planning process. DWR did not withdraw certification because of Delta Stewardship Council findings.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	These withdrawals by DWR and Reclamation were required in large part because the Delta Stewardship staff had made a draft finding that WaterFix was not consistent with the Delta Plan [Footnote 1: Determination Regarding Appeals of the Certification of Consistency by the California Department of Water Resources for California WaterFix. Staff Draft. November 19, 2018 https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/Services/download.ashx?u=018bccad-02c2-4b2c-a8bd-6264896014f1]. Similarly, the SWRCB had received substantial credible testimony from protestants in the CPOD Petition hearings demonstrating that WaterFix would significantly harm Delta, Bay and Central Valley beneficial uses including endangered and threatened fish species, Delta water quality and Delta water supplies. Mr. Secretary, you and DWR had the opportunity in May 2019, to take a step back, recognize that your WaterFix project was seriously flawed, and begin developing entirely new alternatives that would eliminate or fully mitigate the adverse impacts of the twin-tunnel WaterFix proposal and provide actual sustainable benefits to the Delta ecosystem, Delta water quality and California's water supply.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
546-6	An important first step would have been to reach out to stakeholders who had identified and highlighted all the major issues with the isolated conveyance, conveyance-only concept and solicit and acknowledge their input. You did convene a few Delta Roundtable meetings with Delta stakeholders in 2019 but these never got much beyond the meet-and-greet stage. Your need to devote resources to addressing the California Drought and, later, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic did initially	Please see response to comment 546-2 regarding the outreach activities conducted by DWR throughout the EIR process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	mean postponement of the Delta Roundtable meetings. However, you never reconvened them. The availability of Zoom call technology would have made it possible to again work with Delta stakeholders prior to releasing this new inadequate and flawed Draft EIR. The proponents of the Delta Conveyance project, and their consultants continued working through the pandemic and drought.	
546-7	DWR would not have taken the drastic step of abandoning the WaterFix project, withdrawing the water right change petition and throwing out a very expensive certified environmental impact statement, if DWR had not recognized the twin tunnel proposal and its operations were seriously flawed and likely to receive embarrassing and potentially project-ending regulatory agency denials. Why then, after more than two years, did DWR release a Draft EIR with many of the same flaws? As described in more detailed in Attachment A [Attachment 1] to this comment letter, the Draft EIR for the Delta Conveyance project is woefully inadequate and must be withdrawn to allow a complete revision, and a new set of viable, sustainable alternatives.	The comment assertions are not consistent with the information contained in the EIR describing the withdrawal of BDCP/California Water Fix. As identified in Chapter 1, Introduction, in the section titled Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts, because of Governor Newsom's announcement in February 2019 and execution of Executive Order N-10-19, DWR exercised its discretion to withdraw certification of the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR, rescinded the California WaterFix project approval and bond resolutions, and withdrew permit applications to begin a new project planning process. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives.
546-8	Some of the problems with the current Draft EIR are: The proposed preferred alternative would add an additional 6,000 cfs [cubic feet per second] of extra export pumping capacity in the south Delta. This is a whopping 40% increase in export pumping capacity!	As stated in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project is seeking a new point of diversion but is not seeking to expand water right quantity. Please see the modeled results for water diversions for the proposed project and its alternatives provided in Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, which show the potential changes in State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) Delta exports with the Delta Conveyance Project in place compared to existing conditions. While the increased capacity would help capture additional flow during wet periods, the combined SWP diversions would still be limited by water rights such that both north and south Delta diversions could not be operating at full capacity at the same time.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Regulatory requirements would also often limit pumping in one or both locations. Project operations are fully described in Chapter 3, and further discussed in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description.
546-9	The Draft EIR fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives, and none that actually help to meet California's co-equal goals. A conveyance-only project will not be able to meet both of California's co-equal goals while also improving water quality in the Delta and reducing DWR's reliance on the Delta for its water supply. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that seriously considers and analyses the environmental impacts and benefits of Joint storage-conveyance alternatives that include additional south-of-Delta export-area storage.	The EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding how alternatives were screened and selected for analysis in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. The purposes and project objectives of the project are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding consistency with the Delta Reform Act.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-10	The Draft EIR preferred alternative increases rather than reduces DWR's Reliability on the Delta for water supply. The preferred alternative and other alternatives are unable to consistently reduce exports from the Delta during periods of low Delta flows (Little Sip concept). This was due to the inability of the proposed project to capture, convey and rapidly store sufficient water south of the Delta during periods of high flow.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Chapter 6, Water Supply, provides a summary of water deliveries estimated to occur under each project alternative. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
546-11	The Draft EIR fails to analyze alternatives that implement enhanced Delta outflow objectives consistent with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report. The SWRCB and other regulators are unable to determine whether the proposed project will be able to meet new Delta flow objectives based on percentages of unimpaired flow or whether the new tunnel would become a very expensive stranded asset if those SWRCB unimpaired flow-based objectives were implemented.	Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding a discussion of the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report and that agency's roles, responsibilities, and activities related to the water quality control planning process. As described in Common Response 8, the Flow Criteria Report cannot be implemented by DWR. DWR does not have the authority to implement the information contained in the Flow Criteria Report, and the report itself has no regulatory requirements or authority. The Delta Conveyance Project is not proposing changes to operations or amount of storage provided by upstream facilities. The Delta Conveyance Project also does not preclude future changes to the state's water supply either through modifications of the operation of existing facilities or increasing water storage. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, table titled Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria; table titled Delta Diversion Bypass Flow and Pulse Protection Requirements; and table titled Sub-Table A. North Delta Diversion Bypass Flow Criteria, describe the circumstances under which the project would divert water from the Sacramento River. In addition, Chapter 3, figure titled Seasonal Diversions, graphically depicts how the project would operate. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regulatory protections of existing standards and as prescribed by the federal and state environmental permitting process.
546-12	The Draft EIR fails to adequately disclose the daily impacts of the proposed project on flows and exports in the Delta. Despite repeated CEQA comment requests since the original BDCP proposal, DWR has still not modeling reservoir, flow and export operations using a daily timestep. The monthly-averaged output from CalSim 3 is not sufficient to disclose the adverse impacts of the proposed project on stakeholders' daily operations to meet their water supply and water quality goals.	The commenter requested daily timestep data for Delta operations. Please see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding best available tools, specifically the discussion on development, use and limitations with respect to monthly timestep.
546-13	The Draft EIR modeling of flows, exports, and water quality is invalid because it fails to comply with SWRCB water quality standards. The daily salinity data from the DSM2 water quality model indicates that the SWRCB daily chloride concentration objective of 250 mg/L is not being met which renders all the simulations of the adverse impacts of the proposed project on reservoir operations, Delta flows and exports and water quality invalid.	The State Water Resources Control Board's 250 mg/l chloride objective is applicable year-round at Contra Costa Pumping Plant #1 (CCPP#1), Mouth of Clifton Court Forebay, Jones Pumping Plant, Barker Slough at North Bay Aqueduct, and Cache Slough at the City of Vallejo Intake (Appendix 9F, Chloride, in the section titled Applicable Water Quality Criteria/Objectives). Modeling shows that the probability of chloride levels for project operations exceeding 250 mg/l at CCPP#1 is about the same as that for existing conditions. Also, the number of years within the 1923–2014 modeled period of record that the 150 mg/l chloride objective for Contra Costa Pumping Plant #1 was exceeded was 1 out of 92 years for existing conditions and the same for project operations. These findings do not invalidate the modeling or Impact WQ-4 (Chloride). Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the use of CalSim 3 as the best available tool for modeling hydrologic changes under project alternatives. Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the use of DSM2 to evaluate water quality and modeled assumptions associated with the use of this model.
546-14	The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to include alternatives where the SWP export diversions to Clifton Court Forebay are fully screened. DWR's November 2009 Conceptual Engineering Report on a Through-Delta Facility Conveyance	Please refer to response to comment 546-9 regarding the adequacy of the range of alternatives. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project to restore and protect the reliability of SWP deliveries south of the Delta. As noted in EIR Appendix

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Option recommended a new screened intake on Victoria Canal and a siphon to convey the diverted screened water into Clifton Court Forebay. DWR has failed to include this action in any of its alternatives even though water and imperiled fish species will still be drawn from the Delta into Clifton Court Forebay with the proposed project.	3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, alternatives identified in the previous BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS were not always directly or fully applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project objectives, which are more narrowly focused than BDCP/California WaterFix objectives. Where possible, previous alternatives were modified to be more applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project alternative screening process. Alternatives that made it through the screening process and could "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project" were retained for analysis in the EIR. Because the Delta Conveyance Project and its alternatives would rely on dual conveyance, flow through the Delta to the south Delta export facilities would continue. Replacing fish screens at Clifton Court Forebay or building a new screened intake and siphon on Victoria Canal would not achieve most of the basic project objectives, because these actions would not improve climate change or seismic and water supply resiliency for SWP Delta facilities. As demonstrated in Appendix 3A, a new Clifton Court Forebay fish screen could create impingement hazards for sensitive fish species and could potentially be infeasible because of sweeping velocity requirements near new fish screening facilities in this area of the Delta. Therefore, these actions were not considered for further review in the EIR. That these measures were not included as Delta Conveyance Project alternatives does not preclude considering them as separate projects at a later time.
546-15	The Draft EIR is inadequate because it presents the operations and water quality data in the form of long-term averages (by month, by water year type, etc.) such that the actual daily or hourly adverse impacts are hidden from the regulating agencies and the public. For example, the modeled daily chloride concentrations in the vicinity of the intake of the Contra Costa Canal at Rock Slough are well in excess of the SWRCB's municipal and industrial objective of 250 mg/L, but	Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the use of monthly average modeling results in the water quality impact analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the tables and graphs of averaged data show much lower values.	
546-16	The alternatives in the Draft EIR fail to comply with SWRCB water quality standards and the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that addresses all the flaws described in this comment letter and its attachment. To avoid wasting another three years, and further delaying rescuing the seriously degraded Delta ecosystem, DWR must include Bay-Delta stakeholders in the preparation of this new Draft EIR through regular technical workshops and information inputs and exchanges. The new Draft EIR must then be recirculated for public review and comment.	The EIR fully evaluates potential impacts in Chapters 7 through 32 of the EIR. As discussed in Volume 2, Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIR, recirculation is not required. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a discussion of the project's purpose and objectives, which inform the selection and analysis of alternatives. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for information on updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, and voluntary agreements. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. DWR will continue discussions with the Delta Stewardship Council regarding a potential consistency certification for the Delta Conveyance Project, if approved by DWR, through early consultation. For more information on the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan see Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8. DWR has offered multiple ways for interested parties to give input and provide comment on modeling or alternatives development. Establishing technical working groups regarding modeling or alternatives evaluated is not a requirement of CEQA. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for more information about efforts to engage the public. DWR has also been in coordination and consultation with federal, state, and local agencies, utility providers, and other interested parties throughout the development of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please note that DWR held an informational webinar about project modeling in July 2021 and encouraged attendance, questions, and comments.
546-17	Thank you for the opportunity to review this Delta Conveyance project Draft EIR.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
546-18	[ATT 1:] The proposed preferred alternative would add an additional 6,000 cfs of extra capacity for pumping water out of the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Alternative 5 (preferred alternative) would increase the capacity of the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) to export water from the Delta to areas south of the Delta from 14,900 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 20,900 cfs. The current capacity is 10,300 cfs at the SWP Banks Pumping Plant and 4,600 cfs at the CVP Jones Pumping Plant. That is a whopping 40% increase in export pumping capacity! Downstream of the Delta export facilities in the SWP California Aqueduct and the CVP Delta- Mendota Canal, conveyance capacity is limited to 10,300 cfs and 4,200 cfs, respectively. These canal capacities and the capacity of the South Bay Aqueduct (330 cfs) currently limit how much can actually be pumped south of the Delta. However, if DWR intends to later add immediately south-of-the-Delta storage, the full 20,900 cfs export pumping capacity could be used, with serious environmental impacts on the Delta. This would be piecemealing of a project under CEQA and	Please refer to response to comment 546-8 regarding the proposed project and export capacity of the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP). As stated in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project is seeking a new point of diversion but is not seeking to expand water right quantity. DWR will operate the proposed Delta intakes in conjunction with the existing SWP south Delta facilities and in coordination with CVP operations consistent with all applicable regulatory requirements under the State Water Board Bay-Delta Plan and applicable water right decision. Diversions up to the maximum combined capacity of the SWP and CVP, including that offered by the newly proposed north Delta intakes, were not modeled and analyzed in the EIR because that is not what DWR is proposing for operation of this project. The CalSim 3 modeling assumptions supporting the impact analyses presented throughout the resource chapters of the EIR are an accurate depiction of the proposed project and how it would be operated (see Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, Section B, Hydrology and Systems Operations Modeling). All potential impacts are disclosed and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed if necessary.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	is illegal. DWR's simulations of operations of Alternative 5, using CalSim 3, have a maximum total SWP and CVP south-of-Delta export of 14,426 cfs. Exports as high as 20,900 cfs were not modeled in the Draft EIR so the adverse impacts of such high export rates have not been disclosed or mitigated. DWR must agree to a water rights limit on combined SWP and CVP exports from the Delta of 14,500 cfs. No exports above 14,500 cfs should be permitted without a new detailed California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review of the impacts on the Delta ecosystem, Delta water quality and water supply in the Sacramento River Basin and Delta. The Draft EIR must be revised to include a commitment to accept a State Water Resources Control Board limit on combined SWP and CVP exports from the Delta to 14,500 cfs (the maximum analyzed in the Draft EIR). A new Draft EIR must then be released for public review and comment.	
546-19	[ATT1:] The Draft EIR fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives and none that actually help to meet California's co-equal goals. One major flaw of the earlier WaterFix project was that the proposed conveyance-only alternatives were unable to capture sufficient water when flows were high in the Delta and export diversions would be less harmful to the Delta ecosystem and Delta water quality. The WaterFix proposal frequently failed to do the promised "Big Gulp" during periods of high Delta flows because San Luis Reservoir (SNL) often filled rapidly and there was insufficient other south-of- the-Delta storage or demand.	Part of this comment compares certain aspects of the Delta Conveyance Project EIR to the previous Bay Delta Habitat Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix EIR/EIS. Thus, the comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project. The following response is provided for those elements of the comment that are applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR. DWR has developed the Delta Conveyance Project to meet the purpose and project objectives presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Instead of exports being largest during periods of high flow (wet months), WaterFix exports were low. The need for additional south-of-the-Delta export-area surface storage has been described and discussed in detailed, technical expert testimony by Contra Costa County and Solano County in the WaterFix Water Rights Change Petition hearings before the State Water Resources Control Board (January 2016 through October 2018) and in CEQA and NEPA comments on the Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and BDCP Draft EIR/EIS, (released in December 2013) and the Water Fix project Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS (RDEIR/SDEIS) which was released in 5 July 2015. However, DWR has continued to refuse to develop any joint storage-conveyance alternatives that would enable DWR to consistently rapidly capture water from the Delta for export and quickly store it in the export areas (Big Gulp) so that exports could be significantly reduced during low flow periods (dry months) when the Delta ecosystem is most vulnerable (Little Sip). In my April 17, 2020, scoping comments (Attachment B [Attachment 2]) on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project (Letter #734 in Appendix 1A of the July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and December 2020 Addendum A), I specifically stated: The January 15 [2020] NOP states that "the scoping process will inform preliminary locations, corridors, capacities and operations of new conveyance facilities to be evaluated in the EIR."	Objectives. The proposed North Delta Diversion facilities would improve climate change and seismic resiliency of SWP Delta export facilities and provide additional system operational flexibility when excess streamflow is available to be diverted and during certain south Delta salinity periods in summer and fall months or when south Delta facilities are subject to regulatory limitations. These improvements are designed to improve SWP water supply reliability by upgrading current SWP Delta export facilities. Additional reservoir storage was not considered as part of a Delta Conveyance Project alternative because additional reservoir storage, although potentially beneficial to the SWP, was outside the project scope and the project purpose to provide conveyance in the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project has independent utility from other projects including new reservoirs, is directed by executive order and identified in the State's Water Supply Resiliency Portfolio. Other potential reservoir projects such as for San Luis Reservoir, Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir, Los Vaqueros Reservoir expansion, and Sites Reservoir are identified as cumulative projects and analyzed in various resource chapters in combination with the Delta Conveyance Project. Chapter 6, Water Supply, provides an estimate of the average annual water supply increases for each alternative. Although additional water storage may have merits from a water supply perspective it is not within the project scope and is not required for the Delta Conveyance Project, which has independent utility, to meet the stated project objectives. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	However, the previous October 2006 – April 2015 Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and May 2015 - May 2019 WaterFix projects failed because they focused on a Delta-conveyance-only solution. Without additional storage in the south-of-Delta export areas, these two proposed projects were consistently unable to capture, export and store significant amounts of water during periods of high Delta flows (wet months), i.e., they were unable to consistently take a Big Gulp. During storm events, San Luis Reservoir filled and then there was nowhere to use (wet fields, low demand) or rapidly store any more exported water and export pumping was cut way back. This isn't a biological opinion restraint, an operational issue, or a conveyance limitation. It is due to a lack of export area surface storage.	the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Comments provided in Attachment 2 referenced in the comment are addressed in responses to comments 546-38 through 546-82.
546-20	[ATT 1:] Because a conveyance-only project is unable to capture sufficient water when it is plentiful and less harmful to the Delta ecosystem and Delta water quality meant the BDCP and WaterFix had to rely on (i.e., continue and increase) exports from the Delta during periods of low Delta flow when the Delta ecosystem was most vulnerable and Delta salinities were already high (dry months), i.e., they were unable to limit themselves to taking a Little Sip and reducing SWP and CVP reliability on the Delta for their water supply (Cal. Water Code §85021). My April 17, 2020, scoping letter made the following scoping comment request: The EIR must analyze and disclose the environmental impacts of joint storage-conveyance alternatives, enhanced through-	Please see response to comment 546-19 regarding reservoir storage as a component of a Delta Conveyance Project alternative, the applicability of comments pertaining to the BDCP/WaterFix projects, the April 17, 2020 scoping letter submitted by the commenter, the project purpose and objectives, the alternatives evaluation, and the operations for the Delta Conveyance Project. Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the appropriate use of modeling tools for the purposes of the CEQA analysis. Through-Delta alternatives with and without diversions were considered in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and found not to meet water supply, climate change and seismic resiliency project objectives and would not improve water supply operational flexibility. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a discussion of why Delta Conveyance Project operations did not incorporate, unapproved or unimplemented WQCP updates and why that would not be appropriate for

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Delta alternatives, operations based on the SWRCB's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan update enhanced flow requirements (outflows and inflows as a percentage of unimpaired flow) as well as operations based on the most current voluntary agreement proposal and the new SWP Incidental Take Permit and Federal Biological Opinions. Similar requests for Delta Conveyance project alternatives with additional south-of-Delta storage components were made in the scoping comments by Dr. Robert Pyke (Letter #117 in Appendix 1A of the July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and December 2020 Addendum A), S. Dean Ruiz, Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency (Letter #753), Justin Fredrickson, California Farm Bureau (Letter #615), and Robert Hunter, Municipal Water District of Orange County (Letter #632). Osha Meserve in her April 17, 2020, scoping comments (Letter #637) on behalf of the Local Agencies of the North Delta (LAND) also criticized DWR and the other project proponents for heralding the ability of their project to take a Big Gulp when (a) this is not supported by the environmental analysis modeling and (b) there is no corresponding reduction in exports in low flow months (little Sip). Specifically, she stated: References by project proponents to having the capacity to take a "big gulp" when flows are high should be matched by a commitment to take only "little sips" when flows are low. This type of operation, however, was not reflected in the CWF environmental review or modeling runs, with "big gulps" and inadequate bypass flows proposed in the summer and fall low flow months. The Draft EIR should clearly describe proposed	the purposes of proper CEQA analysis and could be considered speculative. Please also refer to Appendix 4C, Alternate Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis, for information provided on potential future regulatory requirements, including voluntary agreements. This scenario was not incorporated into an alternative to the proposed project because results of the sensitivity analyses revealed surface water and water supply conditions would not change substantially, their use in existing conditions and alternatives is premature and could be considered speculative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	operations that actually conform to this oft-repeated talking point, and then analyze the impacts of those operations. Despite these numerous comments regarding the Big Gulp/Little Sip concept and the need for new south-of-the-Delta export-area storage, the scoping report (Appendix 1A to the DEIR) makes almost no references to storage or new south-of-the-Delta storage and then only to "material storage" and "equipment storage." DWR's scoping report is an incomplete description of the issues raised by commenters.	
546-21	[ATT 1:] In August 2000, the Integrated Storage Investigation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program released a report on Initial Surface Water Storage Screening by Mark Cowin (who later served as DWR Director). This 2000 report identified a number of potential south-of-Delta storage sites including Orestimba Reservoir on Orestimba Creek (off-stream storage, potential storage range 380 to 1,140 thousand acre-feet (TAF)), Ingram Canyon on Ingram Creek (off-stream storage, 333 to 1,201 TAF), Garzas Reservoir on Garzas Creek (off-stream storage, 139 to 1,754 TAF) and Los Vaqueros Enlargement on Kellogg Creek (off-stream storage, additional 965 TAF). There are feasible reservoir sites south of the Delta, and north of San Luis Reservoir (SNL), in the export area. A new DEIR must be prepared that includes alternatives with new south-of-the-Delta export-area reservoir storage at locations such as these. The CalSim 3 modeling of monthly-averaged Delta outflows, exports and reservoir operations for the Delta Conveyance preferred alternative (Alternative 5) again shows that the proposed project would significantly increase south-of-the-	Please refer to response to comment 546-19 regarding the purpose, project objects and operation of the Delta Conveyance Project. Additional south of Delta storage is not a project component because the Delta Conveyance Project has independent utility to improve SWP Delta conveyance facilities and meets the stated purpose and project objectives. Please refer also to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for additional explanation regarding facility operations and operational criteria for the North Delta Diversions. Please refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding modeling for project operations.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Delta exports during periods of low Delta flows (the opposite of a Little Sip) and during periods of high Delta flows, exports from the Delta are consistently restricted (less than the existing maximum of 14,900 cfs) because there is nowhere to rapidly convey and store exported water. This is the exact opposite of the concept of a Big Gulp.	
546-22	[ATT 1:] Figure 1 [Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1] shows the monthly CVP and SWP exports from the Delta as a function of Delta outflow. When Delta outflows are very low (less than 7,000 cfs), DWR should not be relying on exporting water from the Delta. The existing maximum export capacity from the Delta when flows are low or medium is 6,680 + 4,600 = 11, 280 cfs. The 6,680 cfs limit applies during drier months because of the Army Corps limit on the inflow to Clifton Court Forebay. The maximum with the proposed single tunnel is 10,300 + 4,600 + 6,000 = 20,900 cfs although this is further limited by the maximum combined capacity of the California Aqueduct and Delta Mendota Canal (14,900 cfs). With a new isolated conveyance with an intake in the north Delta, DWR could regularly export up to 14,900 cfs. Even at low flows when the Delta ecosystem is most vulnerable. When Delta outflows are greater than 20,000 cfs, DWR should be capturing as much water as possible, storing it south of the Delta, first in new surface storage and then allowing some of that water to percolate into existing ground water basins. That would enable DWR to significantly reduce its exports during dry months.	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 546-8 and 546-16 regarding the proposed project and export capacity of the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP). Please also see response to comment 546-19 regarding reservoir storage as a component of a Delta Conveyance Project alternative. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Additional south of Delta storage is not a project component because the Delta Conveyance Project has independent utility to improve SWP Delta conveyance facilities and meets the stated purpose and project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	However, as shown in Figure 2 [Exhibit 2 of Attachment 1], the proposed conveyance-only project (Alternative 5) is unable to consistently take a Big Gulp during high flow periods. Additional south-of-the-Delta storage is needed.	
546-23	[ATT 1: Exhibit 1: Monthly SWP and CVP south-of-the-Delta (SOD) exports as a function of Delta outflow (NDO) for DCP Alternative 5.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-24	[ATT 1: Exhibit 2: Monthly SWP and CVP south-of-the-Delta (SOD) exports as a function of Delta Outflow (NDO) for DCP Alternative 5.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-25	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to include any joint storage-conveyance alternatives and therefore fails to consistently capture more water for export in wet periods and fails to reduce exports from the Delta during low flow periods when the Delta ecosystem is most vulnerable. The Draft EIR fails to reduce DWR's reliance on the Delta when the Delta is most vulnerable for its water supply. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that seriously considers and analyses the environmental impacts and benefits of improved conveyance combined with additional south-of-Delta export area storage. During the preparation time DWR must hold detailed technical workshops with Delta stakeholders. This will help ensure DWR does not again ignore stakeholder comments and come up with more flawed alternatives. The new Draft EIR should then be released for public review and comment.	Please refer to responses to comments 546-14, 546-19, 546-20, and 546-21 regarding the alternatives screening approach and why suggested alternatives were screened from or not, including in the EIR analysis. Holding detailed technical workshops is not required by CEQA. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to gather interested party input. The EIR complies with CEQA requirements and does not meet the criteria for recirculation.
546-26	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR preferred alternative increases rather than reduces DWR's Reliability on the Delta for water supply.	The commenter's assertion that the Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to reduce reliance on the Delta for DWR's water supply is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. The commenter has suggested that the Delta Conveyance Project increases reliance on the Delta for water supply,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	As discussed above [comments 18-25], the proposed alternative (Alternative 5) increases rather than decreases DWR's reliance on the Delta in meeting its future water supply. California Water Code § 85021 (2021) states: The policy of the State of California is to reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs through a statewide strategy of investing in improved regional supplies, conservation, and water use efficiency. Each region that depends on water from the Delta watershed shall improve its regional self-reliance for water through investment in water use efficiency, water recycling, advanced water technologies, local and regional water supply projects, and improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts. The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to reduce reliance on the Delta for DWR's water supply. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that seriously considers and analy[z]es the environmental impacts and benefits of joint storage-conveyance alternatives that would allow the proposed project to actually do Big Gulp/Little Sip export operations. During the Draft EIR preparation time, DWR must hold detailed technical workshops with Delta stakeholders to ensure important human and financial resources are not again wasted. The new Draft EIR should then be released for public review and comment.	instead of decreasing reliance on the Delta, in accordance with California Water Code Section 85021. As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the basic objective of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries. The Delta Conveyance Project helps meet this objective by constructing and operating new water supply facilities within the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project does not preclude the development of improved regional water supplies, conservation, water use efficiency, increases in water recycling, advanced water technologies, local and regional water supply projects, or improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts. As stated in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project is seeking a new point of diversion but is not seeking to expand water right quantity. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding a discussion concerning the identification, description, range, and adequacy of the project alternatives, including non-conveyance alternatives. DWR has offered multiple ways for interested parties to give input and provide comment on modeling or alternatives development. Establishing technical working groups regarding modeling or alternatives evaluated is not a requirement of CEQA. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for more information about efforts to engage the public.
546-27	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR fails to analyze alternatives that implement enhanced Delta outflows consistent with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report	The EIR appropriately considers the regulatory requirements of the State Water Board and the existing Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan throughout the EIR. The EIR does not need to incorporate unimpaired flows described by the comment to meet CEQA requirements or adequately and fully disclose potentially significant physical environmental impacts, as described in the response below. However, for informational disclosure

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The SWRCB is currently in the process of updating the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP) and has proposed new enhanced Delta inflow (Sacramento and San Joaquin River) and outflow objectives to help restore and sustain key Delta fish species. These minimum flow objectives are based on a percentage of unimpaired flow during part of the winter and spring as well. The SWRCB also proposed Fall X2 objectives (September, October and some Novembers) to help restore the Delta ecosystem. These objectives are based on the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria report. For example, the SWRCB report recommended that during January through June, the Net Delta Outflow should be 75% of 14-day average unimpaired flow or larger. Similarly, the San Joaquin River inflow to the Delta at Vernalis from February through June should be 60% of 14-day average unimpaired San Joaquin River flow or larger. The SWRCB has since considered lowering those percentages or replacing these potential outflow objectives with poorly defined, unenforceable, insufficient voluntary agreements with agricultural and urban water agencies. The reduced flow objectives currently offered by the water agencies as part of the voluntary agreement process are insufficient to protect the environment and help restore the health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem. In order for the SWRCB and other regulators to make important determinations with respect to changing water rights, consistency of the proposed project with the Delta Plan, and the adverse environmental impacts of the project on fish and wildlife, it is important that the Draft EIR present the simulated Delta flows with the proposed project as a function of unimpaired flow. Are the outflows, inflows and Rio Vista	purposes only, please refer to Appendix 4C, Alternative Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis. Appendix 4C discusses the ongoing updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan by the State Water Board and states that updates to the Bay-Delta WQCP could lead to changes in existing regulatory requirements affecting operations of the SWP. This appendix provides information regarding project operations under a potential scenario that could occur under the updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. DWR and the Delta Conveyance Project would be required to operate to updated water quality objectives approved by the State Water Board through the water quality control planning process. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding a discussion of the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report and that agency's roles, responsibilities, and activities related to the water quality control planning process. As described in Common Response 8, the Flow Criteria Report cannot be implemented by DWR. DWR does not have the authority to implement the information contained in the Flow Criteria Report, and the report itself has no regulatory requirements or authority. Please also see Common Response 8 for information regarding the State Water Board's water quality control planning process and potential updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan (i.e., unimpaired flow). Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, describes the appropriate use of and description of the existing conditions baseline consistent with CEQA and provides a discussion of the updates of the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. DWR has used the latest publicly approved descriptions regarding operations of the CVP and SWP for the 2020 environmental baseline and for the reasonably foreseeable future conditions. For example, X2 requirements for fall (September and October) exist for wet and above normal water year types as a result of the Summer-Fall

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	flows greater or lower than the percentages in the SWRCB's Delta Flow Criteria report? I requested this type of data presentation and disclosure of environmental impacts in my April 17, 2020, scoping comments on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project (Attachment B [ATT 2]). DWR did not included these data in the Draft EIR. It is also important to note that if the SWRCB does adopt outflow standards based on unimpaired flows in the future, the proposed tunnel and north Delta intakes will not be able to operate as currently simulated for Alternative 5 and would likely become a very expensive stranded asset with economic impacts on all Californians. The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to present flow and export data as a function of unimpaired flows and therefore fails to disclose key information about the adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project on fish and wildlife EIR [sic]. The Draft EIR fails to disclose to regulators and the public whether the Delta flows with the project would be anywhere near meeting the SWRCB's unimpaired flow criteria. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that includes, analyzes, and discloses the environmental impacts and benefits of alternatives that have enhanced Delta inflow and outflow objectives consistent with the SWRCB's recommendations and adopted objectives for the WQCP. The simulated outflows and exports for all the alternatives must also be presented as percentages of unimpaired flow and presented as graphs of flows and exports as a function of unimpaired flow to fully disclose how the proposed project performs relative to the	habitat action from the state and federal Endangered Species Act permits for SWP/CVP operations. As such, operations under existing conditions and the project alternatives operate to these requirements. Assessment of the effects of the project alternatives operating while meeting these requirements is incorporated into the alternative evaluation in resource chapters where appropriate (e.g., Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, from a water quality perspective and a fish habitat perspective). The basic project objectives would not be met by incorporating Fall X2 objectives into an alternative because Fall X2 would not develop facilities that would restore and protect the reliability of the SWP. The basic project objectives are described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives: to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. In addition, please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR and an explanation of why the updates to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan are not considered alternatives or incorporated into the project description of the Delta Conveyance Project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	SWRCB's unimpaired flow criteria. The new Draft EIR should then be released for public review and comment.	
546-28	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR fails adequately disclose the daily impacts of the proposed project on flows and exports in the Delta The Draft EIR models reservoir operations, Delta flows and exports using CalSim 3 which only uses a monthly time step. However, the SWRCB's municipal and industrial (M&I) water quality objectives and Spring X2 standards are daily objectives and other operational requirements are based on running averages of less than one month (e.g., 14-day and 7-day), the operations modeling for the proposed project in the Draft ER is inadequate. The Delta Conveyance operations modeling should have been performed using a daily time step. This request for a daily time step has been made since the start of the BDCP and WaterFix processes in the mid-2000s so DWR has had ample time to develop, calibrate and verify a daily timestep model. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that includes, analyzes and discloses the environmental impacts and benefits of alternatives using a daily time step for Delta operations. The new Draft EIR should then be released for public review and comment.	The commenter requested daily timestep data for Delta operations. Please see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding best available tools, specifically the discussion on development, use, and limitations with respect to monthly timestep. Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, provides additional information on how the water quality assessment was conducted and reported in the EIR. The water quality analysis was conducted, in part, using DSM2, which runs on a 15-minute timestep. When analyzing compliance with water quality objectives, appropriate timesteps were used as required in the D-1641.
546-29	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR modeling of flows, exports, and water quality is inadequate because it fails to comply with SWRCB water quality standards.	Please see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding best available tools for an explanation of the operational guidelines used to develop and apply CalSim 3 for various modeling scenarios. Chapter 9, Water Quality, fully discloses the impact of operating the proposed project and alternatives on a range of constituents. The

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The salinity-outflow calculations for previous CalSim modeling of the BDCP and WaterFix proposals were based on an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model that underestimated the amount of Delta outflow needed to meet the SWRCB's municipal and industrial chloride concentration objectives at Contra Costa Water District's intake at the entrance to the Contra Costa Canal off Rock Slough. When the effects of the project on Delta water quality were simulated using DWR's DSM2 model, the estimated chloride concentrations at Pumping Plant #1 and in Old River at the entrance to Rock Slough were frequently well in excess of 250 mg/L chloride concentration in violation of the SWRCB's daily January-December, standard. This meant that the proposed project operations did not meet SWRCB standards, obscured the potential water quality impacts of the project, and overestimated the amount of water available for export. This failure of the CalSim operations modeling to comply with important SWRCB water quality standards was discussed in great detail in Contra Costa County and Solano County's joint written testimony in the WaterFix water rights change petition hearing [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCCSC-51]. The simulated daily salinities in Old River at Bacon Island at the entrance to Rock Slough regularly exceeded the SWRCB year-round daily standard of 250 mg/L chloride (equivalent to a specific conductance (EC) of 1,053 µS/cm [Footnote 1: The conversion between chloride and EC is based on the seawater-dominated Delta water conversion equation Cl = 0.285 EC – 50 (see Appendix 9F, page 9F-2, line 24)]) and during one seawater intrusion event reached the equivalent of 761 mg/L chloride	analysis includes an assessment of effects on chloride at Contra Costa Pumping Plant #1. DWR believes the conclusion of the water quality impact analysis is based on the best available tools and is an accurate estimate of the impacts of the project. The comment refers to documentation of modeling efforts that were the basis for comments on previous planning processes (e.g., California WaterFix) supported by CalSim II. These comments are not related to the CalSim 3 modeling efforts described in Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, Section A, Modeling Overview, and Section B, Hydrology and Systems Operations Modeling. Finally, the comment introduces two figures, referred to in the comment as Figures 3 and 4 in support of their comment but provides no information on the data source the commenter used to develop these illustrations.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	concentration – much greater than the SWRCB's 250 mg/L standard. An April 2020 technical paper by Nimal Jayasundara, Sanjaya Seneviratne, Erik Reyes and Francis Chung (all DWR) titled "Artificial Neural Network for Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Flow – Salinity Relationship for CalSim 3.0," showed poor agreement between simulated CalSim and DSM2 salinity at Rock Slough and Jersey Point in previous CalSim modeling.[Footnote 2: American Society of Civil Engineers Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, Vol. 146, Issue 4 (April 2020), https://ascelibrary.org/doi/abs/10.1061/%28ASCE%29WR.1943-5452.0001192] They described the results of a new ANN salinity-outflow model that much more accurately reproduces the DSM2 model simulations. The Draft EIR DSM2 water quality modeling for the Delta Conveyance preferred alternative (Alternative 5) and the existing base case in the vicinity of Old River at Rock Slough Draft EIR show sequences of days when the daily EC exceed the EC-equivalents for the SWRCB's daily water quality objectives at the entrance to the Contra Costa Canal off Rock Slough, i.e., 250 and 150 mg/L chloride concentration (Figures 3 and 4 [Exhibits 3 and 4 of Attachment 1]). Any modeling of Central Valley reservoir operations, Delta flows and exports and Delta water quality that fail to comply with the SWRCB water quality objectives are not a valid environmental analysis under CEQA.	
546-30	[ATT 1:] The Figure 3 [Exhibit 3 of Attachment 1] scatter plot also shows that the preferred alternative would increase daily chloride	The comment (which is related to comment 546-65) suggests that DWR should use screening criteria from the September 1993 Los Vaqueros Project Final EIR/EIS as the threshold of significance for chloride impacts in the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. DWR, as the Lead Agency for the EIR, has

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	concentrations in the vicinity of Rock Slough by up to 60%. A water quality impact on urban drinking water agencies in the Delta is considered significant if the proposed project increases chloride concentrations by more than 5 mg/L or 5%, whichever is largest. These increases of 60% are very significant adverse impacts and are not consistent with policy of the State of California defined in the Delta Plan, 2009 Delta Reform Act and Cal. Water Code §85020€ to "Improve water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving water quality objectives in the Delta." 85020. The policy of the State of California is to achieve the following objectives that the Legislature declares are inherent in the coequal goals for management of the Delta: (a) Manage the Delta's water and environmental resources and the water resources of the state over the long term. (b) Protect and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the California Delta as an evolving place. (c) Restore the Delta ecosystem, including its fisheries and wildlife, as the heart of a healthy estuary and wetland ecosystem. (d) Promote statewide water conservation, water use efficiency, and sustainable water use. (e) Improve water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving water quality objectives in the Delta. (f) Improve the water conveyance system and expand statewide water storage. (g) Reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta by effective emergency preparedness, appropriate land uses, and investments in flood protection.	discretion to develop its own thresholds of significance and is not obligated to use the thresholds developed by other Lead Agencies under CEQA for other EIRs. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding thresholds of significance used for water quality impact analysis purposes in this EIR. The comment further states that a 60% increase in daily chloride concentration should be considered significant. However, the Delta Conveyance Project EIR thresholds of significance for water quality impacts address compliance with water quality objectives and adverse effects to beneficial uses, not just an increase in concentration, as part of the significance determination. Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impacts WQ-4 and Impact WQ-5 provide assessments of compliance with the State Water Resources Control Board's chloride and EC objectives contained within the Bay-Delta WQCP. Impact WQ-4 discloses modeled increases in chloride concentrations at Contra Costa Pumping Plant #1 (CCPP#1), which is the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan compliance location in the vicinity of Rock Slough. Impact WQ-4 also discloses that there were modeled increases in the frequency of exceeding the 250 mg/L (year-round) chloride objective at CCPP#1 and no modeled increases in the frequency of exceeding the 150 mg/L chloride objective at CCPP#1 applicable for a certain number of days per year depending on water year type. The modeled daily average chloride concentrations were compared to these objectives, which are expressed as maximum mean daily concentration. The analysis used output from DSM2, which is the best available model for conducting such assessments (as described in Common Response 10). The DSM2 output was post-processed to produce daily average chloride concentrations to support the compliance assessments for chloride. Assessment of compliance with the EC objectives in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan was also conducted using the averaging period corresponding to the objective type (e.g., 14-day average).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	(h) Establish a new governance structure with the authority, responsibility, accountability, scientific support, and adequate and secure funding to achieve these objectives. The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to perform an analysis of Delta operations and water quality that complies with the SWRCB's Delta water quality objectives. The Draft EIR also discloses that the project could significantly degrade water quality in the interior Delta near Rock Slough, i.e., increase daily salinities by up to 60% for extended periods of time. A new Draft EIR must be prepared that performs valid computer simulations of Bay-Delta operates (meets SWRCB Bay-Delta water quality standards) and eliminates or fully mitigates all adverse daily water quality impacts consistent with Cal. Water Code §85020€. DWR must include Bay-Delta stakeholders in the preparation of this new Draft EIR through regular technical workshops and information inputs and exchanges. The new Draft EIR must then be recirculated for public review and comment.	Caution must be applied when interpreting daily average values from the modeling because the flow inputs from CalSim 3 into DSM2 are monthly averages (i.e., fixed as the same flow value for all days of the month). This can lead to modeling artifacts on specific days in the simulation. These modeling artifacts can be readily avoided in actual real-time operations because flows are changed when needed in real-time operations to meet Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan objectives. Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the use of CalSim 3 as the best available tool for modeling hydrologic changes under project alternatives. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship between the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Conveyance Project as well as the Delta Plan. DWR has complied with California water codes and will continue to do so as operators of the State Water Project regardless of if the Delta Conveyance Project is approved. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA criteria for recirculation, none of which the EIR meets and therefore the EIR need not be recirculated.
546-31	[ATT 1:] [Exhibit 3: Daily Specific Conductance (EC) Water Quality Data at Rock Slough for DCP Alternative 5]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-32	[ATT 1:] [Exhibit 4: Time Series of the Daily Specific Conductance (EC) Water Quality Data at Rock Slough for DCP Alternative 5.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-33	[ATT 1:]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to include alternatives where the SWP export diversions to Clifton Court Forebay are fully screened. The Draft EIR alternatives still rely on some through Delta conveyance and export of water south-of-the-Delta via the Banks Pumping Plant. The Draft EIR is inadequate because it fails to include state-of-the-art fish screens for the intake to the Clifton Court Forebay. Although the current diversions can be as high as 10,300 cfs as a daily average, and even higher when the intake gates are open for only half of the tidal cycle, there are feasible solutions for screening Clifton Court. One such design was presented in DWR's November 2009 Conceptual Engineering Report – Through-Delta Facility Conveyance Option. This detailed Conceptual Engineering Report recommends a new screened intake on Victoria Canal and a siphon to convey the diverted screened water into Clifton Court Forebay. [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-31 which reproduced Figures 7-5 and 20-1 from the Conceptual Engineering Report.] Fish swept away from the intake screens for a Victoria Canal intake will have the opportunity to escape to other parts of the Delta. Without any fish screens, key endangered and threatened Delta fish species and other resident fish species will continue to be drawn directly into Clifton Court Forebay where they face predation and extinction. A new Draft EIR must be prepared with alternatives that include state-of-the-art fish screens for the intake to the Clifton Court Forebay at a more distant location such as Victoria Canal.	responses to the commenter's letter. Please see response to comment 546-19 regarding the applicability of comments pertaining to the BDCP/WaterFix projects, the project purpose and objectives, and the alternatives evaluation. Please refer to response to comment 546-14 regarding alternatives that would replace fish screens at Clifton Court Forebay or build a new screened intake and siphon at Victoria Canal.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The new Draft EIR must then be recirculated for public review and comment.	
546-34	[ATT 1:] The Draft EIR is inadequate because it uses long-term averaging of data which obscures and fails to fully disclose and mitigate significant water quality degradation. The Draft EIR is inadequate because it presents the operations and water quality data in the form of long-term averages by month, by water year type, etc., such that the actual daily or hourly adverse impacts are hidden from the regulating agencies and the public. As shown in Figure 3, for example, the modeled daily chloride concentrations in the vicinity of the intake of the Contra Costa Canal at Rock Slough are well in excess of the SWRCB's municipal and industrial objective of 250 mg/L, but the tables and graphs of averaged data show much lower values. A casual reader of the Draft EIR might only glance at a cumulative probability graph of monthly-averaged chloride concentrations at the intake to the Contra Costa Canal (Figure 5 [Exhibit 5 of Attachment 1]) and think that the chloride concentration never exceeded 319 mg/L. This exceeds the SWRCB's daily-averaged municipal and industrial standard of 250 mg/L year-round. However, if a casual reader only looked at the corresponding graph of the maximum long-term average of the monthly-averaged data (averaged over 94 years, 1922–2015), they might think that the maximum chloride concentration at the intake of the Contra Costa Canal off Rock Slough with	Please see response to comment 546-13 and 546-30 regarding the validity of the hydrologic and water quality modeling conducted to identify impacts from project operations, applicability of 250 mg/L as a chloride objective, and frequency of exceedance of the chloride objective. Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the use of monthly average modeling results in the water quality impact analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Alternative 5 will only be 143 mg/L (December of critical years). These monthly and 94-year averaged data are tabulated in Tables 9F-7-6-1 and 9F-7-6-2 in the Draft EIR (reproduced in Figure 7 [Exhibit 7 of Attachment 1]). There is a big difference between 319 and 143 mg/L chloride concentration, especially when the maximum simulated daily chloride concentration at this location during the full 94 years is 352 mg/L (equivalent to 1,412 µS/cm EC). DWR's use of long-term averaging obscures the actual magnitude of the water quality degradation that could occur with the proposed project and the magnitude of other adverse impacts on the Delta ecosystem and water supply. It also obscures the fact, if only looking at Figure 6 [Exhibit 6 of Attachment 1], that the simulated chloride concentrations with and without the proposed project are well in excess of the SWQRCB's daily water quality standard, rendering the modeling invalid for a CEQA environmental review.	
546-35	[ATT 1:] [Exhibit 5: Figure 9F-7-8 from DEIR - Contra Costa Water District Pumping Plant #1, Monthly Average Chloride (in milligrams per liter), February. Showing highest monthly chloride concentration is 319 mg/L.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-36	[ATT 1:] [Exhibit 6: Figure 9F-7-1 from DEIR - Contra Costa Water District Pumping Plant #1, Monthly Average Chloride (in milligrams per liter) - Showing maximum long term average of monthly-averaged daily chloride is only 143 mg/L.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-37	[ATT 1:] [Exhibit 7: Tables 9F-7-6-1 and 9F-7-6-2 from DEIR Showing Contra Costa Canal Pumping Plant #1 monthly-chloride concentration is 318 mg/L.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-38	[ATT 2:] Thank you for the opportunity to review the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) January 15, 2020 Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project and have the following scoping comments on this modified but basically unchanged proposal.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
546-39	[ATT 2:] This proposal is best described by the well known quote: The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. This single tunnel version is a barely different, somewhat smaller (up to 7,500 cfs compared to 9,000 cfs), version of the seriously flawed California WaterFix project. On May 2, 2019, DWR Director Nemeth withdrew the project approval of the WaterFix project and rescinded DWR's accompanying California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) notice of determination. DWR in coordination with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) also notified the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) they were withdrawing the pending Petition for Change in Points of Diversion and Rediversion (CPOD Petition) for the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) and the related application for Section 401 certification for WaterFix. The applications for a Department of the Army permit under Section10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act were also officially withdrawn (May 3, 2019).	This is a comment submitted on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. Thus, the comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project or the Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comments provided by the commenter and provided responses where comments may still be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from BDCP/WaterFix. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project, background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California, and prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled New Operational Criteria for the Proposed North Delta Intakes, regarding the proposed operations for the Delta Conveyance Project, which are different than those proposed under BDCP and California WaterFix. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for details regarding project operations and operational criteria descriptions.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	These withdrawals were necessary in large part because the Delta Stewardship staff had made a draft finding that WaterFix was not consistent with the Delta Plan [Footnote 1: Determination Regarding Appeals of the Certification of Consistency by the California Department of Water Resources for California WaterFix. Staff Draft. November 19, 2018 https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/Services/download.ashx?u=018bccad-02c2-4b2ca8bd-6264896014f1]. The DSC staff draft determination found that DWR's Certification of Consistency was not supported with respect to the five Delta Plan policies: • Full consistency infeasible, but on the whole the covered action is consistent with the coequal goals (23 CCR § 5002, subd. (b)(1)) ("G P1(b)(1)") • Best Available Science (23 CCR § 5002, subd. (b)(3)) ("G P1(b)(3)") • Reduce Reliance on the Delta Through Improved Regional Water Self Reliance (23 CCR § 5003) ("WR P1") • Delta Flow Objectives (23 CCR § 5005) ("ER P1") • Respect Local Land Use When Siting Water or Flood Facilities or Restoration Habitats (23 CCR § 5011) ("DP P2") Similarly, the SWRCB had received substantial credible testimony from protestants in the CPOD Petition hearings demonstrating that WaterFix would significantly harm Delta, Bay and Central Valley beneficial uses including endangered and threatened fish species, Delta water quality and Delta water supplies.	The analyses provided in EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all project alternatives, including those related to the environmental resources raised by the comment. The EIR evaluates impacts on fish in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. Chapter 6, Water Supply, describes potential changes to water supply that could result from implementation of the project alternatives. However, changes to water supply are not themselves considered an impact of the project alternatives under CEQA and, thus, are not evaluated as impacts. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the Delta Plan and the Delta Reform Act; water supply and reliance on the Delta; and co-equal goals, related to the Delta Conveyance Project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	DWR would not have taken the drastic step of abandoning the WaterFix project, withdrawing the water right change petition and throwing out a very expensive certified environmental impact statement, if DWR had not recognized the twin tunnel proposal and its operations were seriously flawed and likely to receive embarrassing and potentially project-ending regulatory agency denials.	
546-40	[ATT 2:] The NOP at the top of page 9 states: "As described above, the proposed project has been informed by past efforts taken within the Delta and the watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, including those undertaken through the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix." This is clearly incorrect. DWR has apparently learnt nothing from its narrowly focused studies of the past about the need for additional south-of-the-Delta storage and completely different operations to ensure a true "Big Gulp, Little Sip" solution.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a description of why a water storage alternative was not included in the range of alternatives for the Delta Conveyance Project.
546-41	[ATT 2:] Starting over again, essentially from scratch, with the same flawed conveyance-only concept is indeed madness and is doomed to fail, again. My scoping comments are listed below followed by a detailed discussion of each comment. 1. The EIR must analyze a full range of alternatives 2. The EIR must analyze a holistic Delta solution comprising of a portfolio of actions. 3. The EIR must extends the previous modeling period for reservoir and Delta operations and Bay and Delta water quality 4. CalSim operations modeling for the EIR must meet SWRCB urban water quality standards	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline and the purpose and objectives of the project. As described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, the modeling period used for the hydrologic modeling is October 1921 through September 2015, which includes a number of extended dry and wet periods and is adequate for the purposes of CEQA analysis. The hydrologic

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	5. Analysis of the water quality impacts of the proposed project in the EIR must use the full available historical period, 1922-2019 6. The presentation of modeling data and disclosure of environmental impacts in the EIR must be in a form that is usable and useful for decision makers and the public 7. The EIR must fully mitigate any significant water quality impacts of the proposed project 8. The EIR must fully model the infrastructure required to comply with the settlement agreement with the Contra Costa Water District 9. The EIR must analyze alternatives that implement enhanced Delta outflows consistent with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report 10. The EIR alternatives must include Fall X2 objectives 11. The EIR should use a Daily Operations model 12. DWR should establish a technical workgroup to provide input to development of the EIR and make modeling data available to the public as early as possible 13. The EIR must include alternatives where the SWP export diversions to Clifton Court Forebay are fully screened 14. Other EIR Modeling Requests	modeling included the assumption that the project would be operated to meet existing water quality requirements. Please refer to Common Response 1 regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, synthesize the modeling results sufficient for decision makers and the public to understand the potential changes in hydrology as a result of project operations. Chapters 7 through 32 fully evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with changes in hydrology. DWR will comply with environmental review requirements for any agreements it may make with other entities as applicable to the project. As described in the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts. As described in Appendix 5A, a monthly timestep model, such as CalSim 3, is appropriate for long-term planning analyses of operations. DWR is no longer pursuing BDCP/California WaterFix or the settlement agreement pursuant to BDCP/California WaterFix. DWR and Contra Costa Water District entered into a settlement agreement regarding the Delta Conveyance Project in July 2023. This agreement is referenced in Chapter 9, Water Quality, and further described in Appendix 9M, Contra Costa Water District Interconnection Facility Mitigation Measure, of the Final EIR. None of the information described in the Final EIR in Chapter 9 or Appendix 9M resulted in a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		in the severity of an environmental impact or required additional mitigation measures to which DWR was unwilling to commit. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public involvement activities conducted for the environmental review period and the multiple opportunities for the public to provide input on the development of the EIR. Additionally, DWR responded to all requests for detailed modeling information within the comment period.
546-42	[ATT 2:] Detailed Discussion The EIR must analyze a full range of alternatives As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), the "EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible." The January 15 NOP states that "the scoping process will inform preliminary locations, corridors, capacities and operations of new conveyance facilities to be evaluated in the EIR." However, the previous October 2006 – April 2015 Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and May 2015 - May 2019 WaterFix projects failed because they focused on a Delta-conveyance-only solution. Without additional storage in the south-of-Delta	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to response to comment 546-9 regarding development of project alternatives. Please refer to response to comment 546-19 regarding south of Delta storage.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	export areas, these two proposed projects were consistently unable to capture, export and store significant amounts of water during periods of high Delta flows (wet months), i.e., they were unable to consistently take a Big Gulp. During storm events, San Luis Reservoir filled and then there was nowhere to use (wet fields, low demand) or rapidly store any more exported water and export pumping was cut way back. This isn't a biological opinion restraint, an operational issue, or a conveyance limitation. It is due to a lack of export area surface storage. Similarly, because a conveyance-only project is unable to capture sufficient water when it is plentiful and less harmful to the Delta ecosystem and Delta water quality meant the BDCP and WaterFix had to rely on (i.e., continue and increase) exports from the Delta during periods of low Delta flow when the Delta ecosystem was most vulnerable and Delta salinities were already high (dry months), i.e., they were unable to limit themselves to taking a Little Sip and reducing SWP and CVP reliability on the Delta for their water supply (Cal. Water Code §85021).	
546-43	[ATT 2:] The current NOP states that "DWR is currently considering alternatives with capacities that range from 3,000 to 7,500 cfs, with varying degrees of involvement of the CVP, including no involvement." DWR also proposes to consider two different tunnel routes under the Delta, one of which, in December 2019, was found by a group of engineers from major tunneling companies around the world to be infeasible. This Independent Technical Review Panel convened by the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) recently found that constructing the main tunnel in the original WaterFix project footprint was impractical due to access issues,	Concerns about access to the central alignment and the suitability of reusable tunnel material for certain applications did not render central alignment alternatives infeasible for the purposes of environmental review under CEQA. CEQA Guidelines direct lead agencies to consider whether alternatives to the proposed project are potentially feasible, would meet project objectives and could reduce significant environmental impacts of the project. DWR determined that Alternatives 1, 2a, 2b, and 2c meet the alternative screening criteria. Please refer to responses to comments 546-14, 546-19, 546-20, and 546-21 regarding the alternatives screening approach and why suggested alternatives were screened from or not included in the EIR analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and that the tunnel muck was likely not reusable [Footnote 2: 2 See https://www.dcdca.org/pdf/2020-02-20DCABoardPkgV2.pdf, ITR report, page 6.]. The NOP proposes only one feasible tunnel route and a range of tunnel capacities, but does not consider any meaningful alternatives such as water conservation and local water supply actions to reduce export water demand from the Delta, joint storage-conveyance alternatives that would allow actual "Big Gulp, Little Sip" operations, or any enhanced through-Delta alternatives. It is frustrating and unacceptable that the NOP does not discuss any holistic Delta solution alternatives that include water use efficiency actions, groundwater recharge, local water supply projects and joint storage-conveyance. The EIR must analyze and disclose the environmental impacts of joint storage-conveyance alternatives, enhanced through-Delta alternatives, operations based on the SWRCB's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan update enhanced flow requirements (outflows and inflows as a percentage of unimpaired flow) as well as operations based on the most current voluntary agreement proposal and the new SWP Incidental Take Permit and Federal Biological Opinions.	CEQA requires an NOP include a brief description of the project and project location; probable environment effects of the project; date, time, and place of public hearings; address where applicable documents or files relating to the project are available for review; where written comments on the scope of the EIR may be sent; and deadline for submitting comments. The NOP is one of several scoping tools which help to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth and helps to inform what warrants consideration in the EIR. As described in Appendix 1A, July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and Addenda, DWR undertook a robust scoping process that garnered input from interested parties, some of whom supported and opposed the project. The Delta Conveyance Project does not preclude the development of improved regional water supplies, conservation, water use efficiency, increases in water recycling, advanced water technologies, local and regional water supply projects, or improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts. These and other water management actions are being pursued independent of the Delta Conveyance Project as described in the State's Water Supply Resiliency Portfolio and are not required to meet the project objectives described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. Please see Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project operations criteria include those outlined in the 2019 BiOps, the 2020 SWP ITP, and State Water Board D-1641. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the baseline approach for

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		analyses and why this approach meets the requirements of CEQA. The voluntary agreements are considered in Appendix 4C, Alternate Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis. This analysis is provided for information and comparative purposes only and indicates minor differences compared to the Delta Conveyance Project analyses that would not be expected to substantively change the EIR impact conclusions.
546-44	[ATT 2:] The EIR must analyze a holistic Delta solution comprising of a portfolio of actions. DWR's mission is: To sustainably manage the water resources of California, in cooperation with other agencies, to benefit the state's people and protect, restore, and enhance the natural and human environments. This includes improving the water resources supply for those within the Delta and in the upstream tributaries. It also includes improving the Delta ecosystem and water quality in the Delta for drinking water supply, irrigation, fish and wildlife and recreation. This is also State policy per California Water Code sections 85020 and 85054. DWR is failing to fulfill its mission by using State resources to pursue a Delta conveyance-only solution that will only benefit water users in export regions south of the Delta. To achieve a sustainable solution to the multiple problems of the Delta, the State of California should be fully analyzing a holistic solution along the line of the Portfolio-Based BDCP Conceptual Alternative [Footnote 3: https://www.nrdc.org/resources/portfolio-based-conceptual-alternative-bay-delta] suggested in January 2013 by Barry Nelson (then of the Natural Resources Defense Council) and	DWR's mission is to sustainably manage the water resources of California, in cooperation with other agencies, to benefit the state's people and protect, restore, and enhance the natural and human environments. Part of its responsibilities is to update the California Water Plan, the State's strategic plan for sustainably managing and developing water resources for current and future generations. This plan, in part, guides State investments and helps guide DWR 's implementation of the California's Water Resilience Portfolio (WRP). The WRP identifies modernization of Delta water supply infrastructure, including new diversion and conveyance facilities, as an action needed to improve water supply resiliency for the health and welfare of all Californians. The Delta Conveyance Project is meant to complement and support other portfolio water supply management actions.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Governor Brown's 2014 California Water Action Plan [Footnote 4: 2014 California Water Action Plan https://resources.ca.gov/CNRALegacyFiles/docs/california_water_action_plan/2014_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf].	
546-45	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 1. Develop and fund actions to enhance water use efficiency and water reuse throughout California	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the adequacy of the range of project alternatives chosen for the CEQA analysis. Common Response 3 also includes a description of why local water supply projects including portfolio-type alternatives were not chosen as an alternative to the Delta Conveyance Project. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for an overview of the alternatives considered and screened from further review in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is one action contemplated by the California Water Resilience Portfolio which includes numerous local and regional water management and conservation actions. These actions are occurring concurrently, recognizing that multiple actions, including local actions, are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. The Delta Conveyance Project would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.
546-46	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 2. Develop and fund local water supply projects throughout California, including desalination projects	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions, including local actions, that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience.
546-47	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 3. Develop and fund groundwater recharge projects, especially in areas with serious groundwater overdraft and subsidence.	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the scope of the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is not a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	These could involve flood storage systems to enhance recharge from storm flows, as well as recharge using exported water (as was promised with the original State Water Project)	groundwater management project. The focus of the groundwater assessment in Chapter 8, Groundwater, is to disclose localized construction- and operation-related impacts on groundwater and groundwater resources that could result from the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project, which is primarily to increase the reliability of SWP and potentially CVP, water deliveries. The proposed project would not conflict with other regional or local programs aimed at enhancing groundwater recharge. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies, please refer to the section titled No Project Alternative in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis.
546-48	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 4. Strengthen levees in the Delta and upstream tributaries. This is needed anyway to protect the large proportion of export water still conveyed through the Delta to the south Delta export pumps	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how alternatives were developed and carried forward for assessment in the EIR. As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		protect the reliability of SWP deliveries. Although the Delta Conveyance Project is not a flood control project, it has been designed to ensure that intake structures on the Sacramento River and modified flood control levees have been designed to maintain the existing levels of flood protection. Please refer to the Chapter 7, Flood Protection, section Regional Planning Efforts Related to Delta Flood Management, for a discussion of levee programs that DWR manages that are critical to Delta flood risk management, including levee maintenance and improvements.
546-49	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 5. Implement ecosystem habitat restoration projects such as those being carried out under the auspices of California EcoRestore. The BDCP analyses shows significant adverse water quality impacts due in large part to the proposed habitat restoration actions. Any such ecosystem projects are part of the whole Delta solution and must be part of the current Delta conveyance project and disclosed in the new EIR. Otherwise the EIR will be inadequate under CEQA because would piecemeal the full project (See 14 C.C.R. §15378(a) (defining "project" for CEQA purposes as "the whole of the action"); see generally Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376.)	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. The Delta Conveyance Project objectives do not include restoring the Delta; refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. CEQA does not require study of alternatives that cannot feasibly achieve most of the basic project objectives; refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description. The Compensatory Mitigation Plan (CMP) is presented to mitigate impacts on habitat for special-status species and on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. that may result from the construction and operation of the project. The CMP describes several sites at which habitat creation and enhancement could take place. Refer to Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources for more information. Additional information about how the CMP was considered in the analyses in Chapters 7-32 is provided in Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis. DWR is separately implementing the California EcoRestore, a multiagency collaboration to restore habitat in the Delta. Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives to consider in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-50	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 6. Increase minimum inflow and outflow requirements in the Delta, consistent with the recommendations of the SWRCB (2010 "Delta Flow Criteria Report"[Footnote 5: 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/final_rpt.shtml]), the Cal. Department of Fish and Wildlife [Footnote 6: Previously called Department of Fish and Game (DFG)] (2010 "Quantifiable Biological Objectives and Flow Criteria for Aquatic and Terrestrial Species of Concern Dependent on the Delta."[Footnote 7: 2010 DFG Quantifiable Biological Objectives and Flow Criteria Report http://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentVersionID=43063]) This is currently being carried out by the SWRCB as part of their update of the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. It is important to first determine how much water needs to remain as flow through the Delta to the Bay to restore and sustain the key fish species and the Delta ecosystem. This was a requirement of the 2009 Delta Reform Act (Cal. Water Plan §85320(b)(2)(A).) Designing a project in advance of knowing the conditions under which it may reliably operate makes no sense and is a huge waste of resources and renders the CEQA review meaningless. Only after the baseline flow needs for the Delta ecosystem are known will it be possible to determine the best combination and size of storage and conveyance facilities to optimize water supply reliability for California. Note that the WaterFix project, a conveyance-only proposal, was	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. As explained further in Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, the State Water Resources Control Board's 2010 Flow Criteria Report has no binding regulatory effect on the Delta Conveyance Project, includes express warnings that it does not take into account other beneficial uses of water, including flood control, upstream habitat, or beneficial uses for human needs, and is not evidence that the project or any project alternatives will have significant impacts on the environment. Basing the EIR analyses on potential future WQCP updates or other unapproved reports is counter to CEQA guidance which directs lead agencies to identify existing conditions at the time of the NOP. Use of a potential future baseline or conditions for project operations could be considered speculative for CEQA analysis purposes. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to the 2010 State Water Resources Control Board Delta Flow Criteria Report, the Delta Reform Act, and other documents.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	incompatible with the need to capture more water during high flow months and reduce exports during dry months when more water is needed for the Delta ecosystem	
546-51	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 7. Capture water when there is high flow in the Delta and its upstream tributaries in excess of the needs of the Delta ecosystem. This will require additional storage in or close to the Delta and in the south of Delta export areas. Additional north of Delta storage may provide some benefits but will not directly address the current need to capture and deliver more "new" water south of the Delta.	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. Please refer to response to comment 546-19 and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding south-of-Delta reservoir storage and Delta Conveyance Project operations and operational criteria.
546-52	[ATT 2:] The EIR should focus instead on a portfolio of actions [as opposed to its proposed Delta conveyance-only system], fully developed, analyzed and disclosed, that consists of the following actions: 8. Exporting and storing more captured water in wet periods will reduce the pressure on the SWP and CVP to rely on the Delta for exports in drier periods. This would represent win-win-win solution (actual benefits to water supply, the ecosystem and Delta water quality) compared to the current lose-lose-lose situation where "balancing beneficial uses" means continued heavy export pumping is drier months to the detriment of the Delta ecosystem and Delta water quality.	Please see response to comment 546-45 regarding the Delta Conveyance Project as part of a portfolio of actions that are needed to improve California's water supply resilience. The commenter has provided suggestions of alternative methods of SWP and CVP operations in lieu of implementation of the Delta Conveyance Project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how alternatives were developed and brought forward for detailed assessment in the EIR.
546-53	[ATT 2:] This approach [portfolio of actions vs. conveyance-only action; see comments 45-52] will directly address the requirement for Bay-Delta projects to contribute to achievement of the co-equal goals (Water Code §85020,	Please refer to response to comment 546-45 regarding consideration of portfolio-type alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	§85304, Public Resources Code §29702(a)). A conveyance-only proposal with none of the above associated portfolio actions will fail to make any meaningful contribution to either of the coequal goals and would be unable to protect and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.	
546-54	[ATT 2:] If increases in exports are focused on periods of high Delta outflow, water quality may often be good enough in the western Delta to meet export needs. The EIR should also include an alternative that includes new intakes in the western Delta in the vicinity of Sherman Island. That would reduce the number of intakes needed in the north Delta and reduce the size of the tunnel from the north Delta. Taking some water from the western Delta and less from the north Delta would maintain much needed flow through the Delta for the out-migration and return of anadromous fish species. This western Delta alternative, like DWR's proposed Delta conveyance(-only) alternative allows up to 10,300 cfs to be exported at the SWP Banks Pumping Plant and 4,600 cfs at the CVP Jones Pumping Plant (total of 14,900 cfs). For more information on the western Delta intake alternative please read Dr. Robert Pyke's December 2012 white paper: "A Self-Regulating, Inclusive and Sustainable Solution for the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta." http://nebula.wsimg.com/3c6d6f90274da0db82d946bcf7831fc3 Tom Zuckerman in July 2007 discussed in detail the need for additional storage south of the Delta to increase the CVP and SWP's ability to carry over more exported water into subsequent years during dry periods.	As discussed in EIR Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, the western Delta could be subject to salinity intrusion due to levee failures, including failures due to seismic activities. Western Delta intakes or barriers would be more subject to salinity intrusion effects as compared to south Delta or north Delta intakes. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. Please also see response to comment 546-19 regarding new water storage. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Http://nebula.wsimg.com/595e6fbcbe2738977a5973a0e478cbb1 The NOP at the top of page 9 states: "As described above, the proposed project has been informed by past efforts taken within the Delta and the watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, including those undertaken through the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix." This is clearly incorrect. DWR has apparently learnt nothing from its narrowly focused studies of the past about the need for additional south-of-the-Delta storage and completely different operations to ensure a true "Big Gulp, Little Sip" solution. To paraphrase George Santayana: Those who do not learn from the mistakes of the past are condemned to repeat them. The EIR must analyze in detail joint storage-conveyance alternatives, with and without new intakes in the western Delta, to make the "Big Gulp" concept a reality, and with a portfolio of other actions to reduce the SWP and CVP's reliance on exports from the Delta in dry months.	
546-55	[ATT 2:] The EIR should also include an alternative with additional upstream-of-the-Delta-pumps storage. That would allow water to be captured during high outflows at a rate higher than 14,900 cfs. Water captured in excess of 14,900 cfs could be stored, temporarily, immediately upstream of the Delta pumps and moved south of the Delta later when Banks and Jones pumping plant capacity becomes available.	Please refer to response to comment 546-54 regarding the range of alternatives and the suggestion for additional water storage.
546-56	[ATT 2:] The EIR must extends the previous modeling period for reservoir and Delta operations and Bay & Delta water quality	Part of this comment is regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project and the comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the proposed Delta

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The EIR must model both the operations and water quality, with and without the project alternatives, for the full historical hydrologic period, water years 1922-2019. The operations modeling performed for the BDCP and WaterFix proposals was for the 82 years from October 1921 through September 2003. This simulation period must be updated to include the subsequent 16 years of historical hydrology. The water quality simulations for WaterFix only used a 16-year period (water years 1976-1991). As discussed elsewhere in this letter, this brief 16-year period is not representative of the range of adverse water quality impacts for the longer 82-year period. The new single-tunnel EIR must simulate water quality over the full available historical hydrology period October 1921 through September 2019.	Conveyance Project and has responded to the parts of the comment regarding potential water transfers under the Delta Conveyance Project as applicable. Hydrologic modeling was conducted using CalSim 3, which is the most current and best available tool for simulating project operations. CalSim 3 extended the period of record modeled (relative to its predecessor CalSim 2) to include water years 2004 through 2015, resulting in the period of record modeled for the EIR being 1922 through 2015. DSM2 modeling of the Delta for source water fingerprinting, electrical conductivity, channel velocity, and temperature was for the same 94-year period. This modeled period fully and adequately represents the multiple types of hydrologic conditions that have occurred more recently (e.g., 2016 to 2019). Dissolved organic carbon was modeled for the 1976-1991 period, as this is the period for which DSM2 is calibrated and verified. This 16-year period also represents multiple hydrologic conditions. Therefore, the modeled hydrologic period is sufficient from which to make determinations regarding impacts of project operations on Delta water quality.
546-57	[ATT 2:] CalSim operations modeling for the EIR must meet SWRCB urban water quality standards The salinity-outflow calculations for previous CalSim modeling for BDCP and WaterFix was based on an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model that underestimated the amount of Delta outflow needed to meet the SWRCB's municipal and industrial chloride concentration objectives at Contra Costa Water District's intake at the entrance to the Contra Costa Canal off Rock Slough. When the effects of the project on Delta water quality were simulated using DWR's DSM2 model, the estimated chloride concentrations at Pumping Plant #1 and in Old River at the entrance to Rock Slough were frequently well in excess of 250 mg/L chloride concentration in violation of the	This comment focuses on modeling and subsequent analysis supporting BDCP and California WaterFix presented in a 2015 EIR. DWR is no longer pursuing BDCP/California WaterFix. Chapter 9, Water Quality, fully evaluates and discloses the impacts of the project on water quality, including chloride at Contra Costa Pumping Plant #1. Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the use of CalSim 3 as the best available tool for modeling outflows consistent with federal and state regulatory guidelines. The modeling for the EIR relied on the best ANN available at the time, which is consistent with the improved ANN referenced in the 2020 publication that commenter references.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	SWRCB's daily January-December, standard. This mean that the proposed project operations did not meet SWRCB standards, obscured the potential water quality impacts of the project, and overestimated the amount of water available for export. As discussed in Contra Costa County and Solano County's joint written testimony in the WaterFix water rights change petition hearing [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-51], the simulated daily salinities in Old River at Bacon Island at the entrance to Rock Slough regularly exceeded the SWRCB year round daily standard of 250 mg/L chloride (equivalent to 1,053 µS/cm EC) and during one seawater intrusion event reached the equivalent of 761 mg/L chloride concentration (Figure 1) [Exhibit 1 of ATT 2]. A recent technical paper by Nimal Jayasundara, Sanjaya Seneviratne, Erik Reyes and Francis Chung (all DWR) titled "Artificial Neural Network for Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Flow– Salinity Relationship for CalSim 3.0," showed the poor agreement between simulated CalSim and DSM2 salinity at Rock Slough and Jersey Point in previous CalSim modeling. [Footnote 8: American Society of Civil Engineers Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, Vol. 146, Issue 4]. They described the results of a new ANN salinity-outflow model that much more accurately reproduces the DSM2 model simulations. The EIR analyses must use a salinity-outflow model that is able to accurately simulate the amount of Delta outflow needed to meet existing SWRCB water quality standards.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-58	[Exhibit 1 of ATT 2: Old Bacon Island Daily EC -- November for WaterFix project.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-59	[ATT 2:] Analysis of the water quality impacts of the proposed project in the EIR must use the full available historical period, 1922-2019 The water quality impact analyses for the WaterFix project focused on a short 16-year period, 1976-1991, rather than the 82-year period, 1922-2003, used for the CalSim operations studies. As shown in WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-28 (reproduced below as Figure 2 [Exhibit 2 of ATT 2]), the 16-year period gave very different results than the 82-year period. In March, the 82-year average suggests the WaterFix project would have degraded water quality (expressed as EC) by 97 µS/cm, which is 3.5 times larger than the 16-year average (28 µS/cm). Similarly, in November, the average improvement in water quality for the full 82 years (-160 µS/cm) is appreciably less than the 16-year average (-210 µS/cm). In other words, using a 16- year average underestimated the adverse impacts on water quality of the WaterFix project and exaggerated the improvements. Note that the Old River at Bacon Island location is representative of the water quality influencing the chloride concentrations at the SWRCB's D-1641 municipal and industrial compliance location at the intake to the Contra Costa Canal.	A portion of this comment addresses the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Please see response to comment 546-56 regarding the hydrologic period modeled for those elements of the comment that are applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Because the current year is now 2020, both the operations and water quality simulations for the EIR should be for the full available historical hydrology period 1922-2019.	
546-60	[Exhibit 2 of ATT 2: Increases in EC in Old River at Bacon Island from 1922-2003 and 1976-1991]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-61	[ATT 2:] The presentation of modeling data and disclosure of environmental impacts in the EIR must be in a form that is usable and useful for decision makers and the public The long-term (16- and 82-year) averages previously used by DWR to present the WaterFix modeling data masked potentially serious adverse impacts in individual months within the full 1922-2003 period. These long-term averages also hide the fact that the water quality modeling studies for the WaterFix project exceed the SWRCB's D-1641 water quality standards by a very large margin (See Figure 1 above) [Exhibit 1 of ATT 2]. The long-term averaging for each month of the year also means there are only 12 data points for each alternative. Long-term averaging by water year type means the range of future flows and water quality changes for a given alternative are reduced to being represented by only five data points (one each for critical, dry, below normal. Above normal and wet water year types). To clearly disclose the full range of environmental impacts and the details regarding the timing and magnitude of these impacts, the simulation data for the EIR should also be presented in the form of scatter plots like Figure 1 [Exhibit 1 of ATT 2].	A portion of this comment is about Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. Thus, this portion does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The following response is provided for those elements of the comment that are applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR. The CalSim 3 model is the model used for the Delta Conveyance Project. The model uses a 94-year historical hydrologic sequence to simulate a wide range of hydrologic conditions that could occur, including extended wet periods and dry/critical dry periods. Chapter 9, Water Quality, utilized modeling output to support impact analyses and discloses environmental impacts in a manner that is useful to decision makers. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the use of monthly average modeling results in the water quality impact analysis.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-62	[ATT 2:] A major flaw of the earlier proposed WaterFix project, and presumably, the barely-modified new single tunnel proposal, was that a conveyance-only alternative will be unable to capture and export sufficient "new" water during wet months to allow exports to be reduced and Delta flows increased during dry months when the Delta ecosystem is most vulnerable. The EIR should include plots of monthly (preferably daily) total south-of-Delta exports via Banks and Jones pumping plants as a function of the corresponding Delta outflow for each alternative. Without a Delta tunnel and additional north or western Delta intakes, the maximum export capacity is typically 4,600 + 6,680 = 11,280 cfs. The new single-tunnel proposal would allow Banks Pumping Plant to operate up at up to 10,300 cfs, beyond the current limits imposed by an Army Corps of Engineers permit for Clifton Court Forebay. With the single-tunnel project, it would be possible to export at 4,600 + 10,300 = 14,900 cfs even during drier months. However, State policy (California Water Code §85021 [Footnote 9: 85021. The policy of the State of California is to reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs through a statewide strategy of investing in improved regional supplies, conservation, and water use efficiency. Each region that depends on water from the Delta watershed shall improve its regional self-reliance for water through investment in water use efficiency, water recycling, advanced water technologies, local and regional water supply projects, and improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts.]) requires that Bay-Delta projects reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting water supply needs	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the basic objective of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries. The Delta Conveyance Project helps meet this by constructing and operating new water supply facilities within the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project is not proposing changes to operations or amount of storage. The Delta Conveyance Project also does not preclude future changes to the state's water supply either through modifications of the operation of existing facilities or increasing water storage. The comment's assertion that operational alternatives would increase water diversions from the Delta and reduce Delta outflows is not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Intake Operations and Maintenance, specifically notes that operation of the proposed north Delta intakes would remain consistent with all existing regulatory requirements and is not seeking to expand water right quantity. Please refer to Comment Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for a discussion of the approach to the range of project operation alternatives and regarding water rights, contracts, and use of water. Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, section titled Model Assumptions, Uncertainties, and Limitations, provides information on CalSim 3 and limitations on developing daily time steps.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and this is most important during dry months when Delta outflows are low and the Delta ecosystem is most vulnerable. Any project that increases rather than decreases exports during periods of low Delta outflow is not consistent with this State policy, the 2009 Delta Reform Act and, like the WaterFix proposal, would be inconsistent with the Delta Plan. Figure 3 [Exhibit 3 of ATT 2] below shows WaterFix monthly exports as a function of Delta outflow during lower outflow months (outflow [less than] 12,000 cfs). The now-withdrawn WaterFix project would have increased exports beyond the typical 11,280 cfs existing level up to 14,900 cfs (more than a 30% increase). The EIR must analyze and disclose alternatives, such as a joint storage-conveyance alternative, that reduce reliance (exports) from the Delta during dry periods. Figure 3 also shows a reasonable limit on exports as a function of Delta outflow, maximum export [less than or equal to] 1.5 times Delta outflow, which would help ensure operations do indeed reduce reliability on the Delta and are consistent with the "Little Sip" concept. The EIR should include alternatives using this important restraint on exports at very low Delta outflow.	
546-63	[Exhibit 3 of ATT 2: Monthly-averaged total south-of-Delta exports for the previously proposed WaterFix project CWF H3+]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-64	[ATT 2:] The Delta Independent Science Board, in a September 30, 2015 comment letter to the Chair of the Delta Stewardship Council and Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, described the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix as "sufficiently incomplete and opaque to deter its evaluation and use by	Reference to efforts associated with California WaterFix do not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Presentation of modeling data in the section titled Presentation of Results in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, Section B, Hydrology and Systems Operations Modeling, is consistent with DWR direction and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	decision makers, resource managers, scientists and the broader public." [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-20, p. 1.] The proposed single-tunnel EIR must present the modeling data in forms such as scatter plots of daily water quality and monthly (preferably daily) flow and export data to make the EIR usable and useful for decision makers, resource managers, Bay-Delta stakeholders, and the general public. Merely summarizing the data as long-term (16- or 82-year) averages is not acceptable.	conform to established practices for presentation of CalSim 3 modeling results.
546-65	[ATT 2:] The EIR must fully mitigate any significant water quality impacts of the proposed project. The original BDCP project had significant adverse water quality impacts that DWR declared were "unavoidable." The next version of the Delta Conveyance Project, WaterFix, also had significant water quality impacts (see Figure 1 [Exhibit 1 of ATT 2] above) but the primary mitigation proposal was to meet and confer with impacted water rights holders after the project had been constructed and brought online. DWR did, however, recognize that this was not a defendable position so, in March 2016 entered into a water rights settlement agreement with the Contra Costa Water District (WaterFix Hearing Exhibit DWR-334). Under this settlement agreement, DWR would provide high quality water to CCWD via EBMUD's Freeport project or by a direct connection to the tunnel(s) to offset the water quality impacts of the WaterFix project. The EIR must use the water quality significance criteria of 5 mg/l chloride or 5% increase, whichever is greater. In the case	A portion of this comment is about the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. Thus, this portion of comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR, and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The following response is provided for those elements of the comment that are applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR. DWR, as the Lead Agency for the EIR, has discretion to develop its own thresholds of significance, and is not obligated to use the thresholds developed by other lead agencies under CEQA for other EIRs. Please also see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding thresholds of significance used for water quality impact analysis purposes in this EIR. See Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Finally, Chapter 9, Water Quality, included 17 numbered impacts (Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-17). Only Impact WQ-6 (mercury) identified a potentially significant impact, due to compensatory mitigation, which was mitigated to a less-than-significant level via Mitigation Measure WQ-6. Please see Common Response 8,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	of specific conductance (EC) the corresponding criterion should be 20 µS/cm. These significance criteria were developed as significance screening criteria by CCWD for the September 1993 Los Vaqueros Project Final EIR/EIS (SCH #91063072, Volume 1, page 5-9). These significance criteria were also used by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) for the July 2003 Freeport Regional Water Project EIR/EIS (see Draft EIR/EIS Modeling Technical Appendix, page 4-228). In the December 2019 Lookout Slough Tidal Habitat Restoration and Flood Improvement Project Draft EIR, DWR argued that whether a change is considered "significant" depends on whether there would be an exceedance of a standard set forth in the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB's) Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan (Bay-Delta Plan) and/or Water Rights Decision 1641 (D-1641). This is incorrect. According to CEQA Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form, under VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, term (f), water quality impacts must be deemed significant if they "otherwise substantially degrade water quality." This term recognizes there can still be significant adverse water quality impacts when water quality is well below any regulatory standard such as those in the SWRCB's D-1641. The single-tunnel EIR must include graphs showing the daily percentage increases in chloride concentration or EC as a function of time to fully disclose to decision makers and the public whether significant water quality degradation would occur. Notwithstanding a lead agencies requirements under CEQA to fully mitigate the significant environmental impacts of a proposed project, the 2009 Delta Reform Act (Water Code §85021 [Footnote 10: 85020. The policy of the State of	Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship between the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Conveyance Project as well as consistency with the Delta Plan.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	California is to achieve the following objectives that the Legislature declares are inherent in the coequal goals for management of the Delta: (e) Improve water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving water quality objectives in the Delta.]) found that improving water quality to protect human health and the environment in the Delta is inherent in the State policy of achieving the coequal goals for management of the Delta. Logically, any degradation of water quality would be inconsistent with the 2009 Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan. Significant water quality impacts can be avoided by selecting a joint storage-conveyance preferred alternative that is able to capture, export then store more water during wet months (Big Gulp) and increase Delta flows, reduce exports and decrease salinity and other water quality contaminants during dry months (Little Sip). If significant water quality impacts are still identified, they must be clearly disclosed and fully mitigated in the EIR.	
546-66	[ATT 2:] The EIR must fully model the infrastructure required to comply with the settlement agreement with the Contra Costa Water District In March 2016, DWR entered into a water rights settlement agreement with the Contra Costa Water District [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit DWR-334]. Under this settlement agreement, DWR agreed to provide high quality water to CCWD via EBMUD's [East Bay Municipal Utility District's] Freeport project	The agreement with the Contra Costa Water District for the BDCP/California WaterFix project was voided when the project effort ended. Thus, the March 2016 settlement agreement is not included in the current document as either part of the project description in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, or as a mitigation measure. Please see Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, which describes that mitigation measures are incorporated where appropriate in the EIR and that mitigation measures are also evaluated throughout the EIR, including those mitigation measures presented in Chapter 9, Water Quality.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	or by a direct connection to the new Delta tunnel(s) to offset the water quality impacts of the WaterFix project on CCWD [Contra County Water District] and the residents of Contra Costa County. DWR has recently entered into a new settlement agreement with the City of Antioch. The EIR must include these settlement agreement infrastructure and mitigation operations as part of the proposed project operations, and fully disclose the corresponding water supply impacts on other water users.	
546-67	[ATT 2:] The EIR must analyze alternatives that implement enhanced Delta outflows consistent with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report The SWRCB is currently in the process of updating the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP) and has proposed new enhanced Delta inflow (Sacramento and San Joaquin River) and outflow objectives to help restore and sustain key Delta fish species. These minimum flow objectives are based on a percentage of unimpaired flow during part of the winter and spring as well. The SWRCB also proposed Fall X2 objectives (September, October and some Novembers) to help restore the Delta ecosystem. The EIR must include, analyze and disclose the environmental impacts and benefits of alternatives that have enhanced Delta inflow and outflow objectives consistent with the SWRCB's recommendations and adopted objectives for the WQCP. The WaterFix modeling and environmental review, for example, not only suggested that the now-withdrawn WaterFix proposed project would reduce the Sacramento River flow	Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, section titled Existing Conditions, describes the facilities and ongoing programs that were incorporated into CalSim 3. These included physical features (e.g., upstream reservoirs, Delta Cross channel) and regulatory scenarios (e.g., Water Right Decision 1641) which collectively provided the basis for simulation of existing conditions and alternatives using CalSim 3 and other modeling tools. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, describes the process for identifying and screening alternatives, including through Delta Conveyance alternatives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding a discussion concerning the identification, description, range, and adequacy of the project alternatives. Presentation of modeling data in Appendix 5A, section titled Presentation of Results, is consistent with DWR direction and conform to established practices for presentation of CalSim modeling results. Comments on WaterFix modeling are not applicable to the CalSim 3 modeling effort used to support the EIR and documented in Appendix 5A.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	through the Delta (downstream of the proposed north Delta intakes) but would also, in many months, reduce the Sacramento inflow at Freeport (Figure 4 [Exhibit 4 of ATT 2]). The months when Sacramento inflow is decreased include many during the SWRCB's January-June regulatory period (Figure 5 [Exhibit 5 of ATT 2]). This is exactly the opposite of what was recommended in 2009 by the SWRCB. [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-64]	
546-68	[Exhibit 4 of ATT 2: Monthly-averaged Sacramento River flows into the Delta at Freeport for the proposed WaterFix project CWF H3+ from October 1, 1921 through September 30, 2003 for flows of less than 35,000 cfs]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-69	[Exhibit 5 of ATT 2: Monthly-averaged Sacramento River flows into the Delta at Freeport for the proposed WaterFix project CWF H3+ from 1922-2003 for flows of less than 35,000 cfs]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-70	[ATT 2:] For all alternatives, the EIR must present the Sacramento inflow at Freeport, San Joaquin at Vernalis flow and Delta outflow as a percentage of unimpaired flow so that the EIR is usable and useful for decision makers like the SWRCB, Bay-Delta stakeholders and the general public. If the EIR includes alternatives operated according to a WQCP voluntary agreement, for example, it is important to fully disclose whether those operations actually increase any of the key Delta flows and whether the corresponding percentages of unimpaired flow are consistent with the SWRCB's original 2009 Delta Flow Criteria recommendations.	As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, the alternatives developed and analyzed in the EIR incorporate facilities, program, and legal requirements in place when the NOP was issued. Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, provides additional explanation with respect to the operational constraints used to develop the CalSim 3 model. Regarding the commenter's suggestion that the alternatives should be operated according to the WQCP Voluntary Agreements, please refer to EIR Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Delta Outflow Criteria. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, the Delta Flow Criteria, and other documents. The Delta Flow Criteria Report is a State Water Board planning document and not a binding regulatory requirement. Please also refer to Appendix 4C, Alternative Regulatory Scenario Sensitivity Analysis, for analysis considering possible future water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		quality and flow regulatory changes. This analysis is provided for information and comparative purposes only.
546-71	[ATT 2:] The EIR alternatives must include Fall X2 objectives. Figure 6 [Exhibit 6 of ATT 2] show the historical monthly-averaged X2 data for the month of October as a function of the Sacramento 40-30-30 water year index for the period 1955-2016 [Figure 3 [Exhibit 3 of ATT 2] from WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-74]. The data are categorized into four historical periods: Pre-SWP (1956-1967); Pre-Bay-Delta Accord (1968-1994), Post Accord (1995-2008); Post 2008-2009 Biological Opinions (2009-2017). The historical October Fall X2 data after the Bay-Delta Accord is significantly different than the early trend in X2 as a function of water year index. X2 values after 1994 during above normal and wet years are much higher and are more consistent with Fall X2 values in drier historical years. This period also represents the time when there was a significant decline in pelagic organisms in the Delta. Figure 6 [Exhibit 6 of ATT 2] also compares these data with the current Fall X2 limits of 74 km in wet years and 81 km in above normal years (USFWS 2008 Biological Opinion) [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit SWRCB-87] and SWRCB Delta Flow Criteria Report [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit SWRCB-25]. These Fall X2 limits are consistent with historical trends prior to 1994. Note that the SWRCB's Spring X2 standards were developed based on restoring Delta flow and salinity conditions to those that existed during the period 1968-1975 to protect and restore key	X2 requirements for fall (September and October) exist for wet and above normal water year types as a result of the Summer-Fall habitat action from the state and federal Endangered Species Act permits for SWP/CVP operations. (Note that the comment is incorrect in suggesting that current fall X2 limits are 74 km in wet years and 81 km in above normal years; the current September/October limits are 80 km as part of the Summer-Fall habitat action described above.) As such, operations under existing conditions and the project alternatives operate to these requirements. Assessment of the effects of the project alternatives operating while meeting these requirements is incorporated into the alternative evaluation in both Chapter 9, Water Quality, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, as appropriate from a water quality perspective and a fish habitat perspective. The basic project objectives would not be met by incorporating Fall X2 objectives into an alternative because Fall X2 would not develop facilities that would restore and protect the reliability of the SWP. The basic project objectives are described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	fish species. The Fall X2 objectives have a similar effect of restoring 1968-1975 flow and salinity conditions in the Delta. There have been recent efforts by export water contractors to argue away the need for Fall X2 limits or replace them with other operational requirements. The EIR should still fully analyze alternatives that comply with these Fall X2 objectives so that decision makers and the public can understand the benefits to key Bay-Delta fish species of restoring fall salinities back to pre-1994 conditions.	
546-72	[Exhibit 7 of ATT 2: Historical monthly-averaged X2 for the month of October as a function of the Sacramento 40-30-30 water year index for the period 1955-2016.]	The commenter is providing this exhibit in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter.
546-73	[ATT 2:] The EIR should use a Daily Operations model. The modeling of reservoir operations, Delta flows and exports using CalSim have typically been carried out using a monthly time step. Because the SWRCB's M&I water quality objectives and Spring X2 standards are daily objectives and other operational requirements are based on running averages of less than one month, the operations modeling for the proposed project should be performed using a daily timestep. This request has been made since the start of the BDCP and WaterFix processes allowing plenty of time to develop a daily timestep model. The EIR should use a daily time step for both operations and water quality modeling for the full historical hydrology time period 1922-2019.	Please see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding daily timestep data for Delta operations. Additionally, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, Section A, Modeling Overview, in the section titled Appropriate Use of Modeling Results, sub-monthly reporting of raw model results is not consistent with how CalSim 3 was developed; and the section titled Modeling Limitations provides additional discussion and refers the reader to the specific attachments for additional model limitations. Please also see Common Response 9 regarding information on CalSim 3 and limitations on developing daily timesteps.
546-74	[ATT 2:]	Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding the background for the development of the Delta Conveyance Project and prior Delta conveyance planning efforts, which included multiple steering committees and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	DWR should establish a technical workgroup to provide input to development of the EIR and make modeling data available to the public as early as possible. The BDCP process included a Steering Committee consisting of project proponents and key Bay-Delta stakeholders. There were also a number of technical committees that met and provided valuable input to DWR and Reclamation. This process of involving stakeholders in the planning of the project was unfortunately dropped just before the start of the WaterFix environmental review process which resulted in DWR losing its way. DWR should establish, at a minimum, a technical steering committee to help guide the modeling process and selection and analysis of alternatives for the EIR.	workgroups associated with the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan; a Habitat Conservation Plan is not an element proposed under the Delta Conveyance Project. These comments were submitted during the scoping period for the Delta Conveyance Project and considered in the development of the EIR. DWR has offered multiple ways for interested parties to give input and provide comment on modeling or alternatives development. Establishing technical working groups regarding modeling or alternatives evaluated is not a requirement of CEQA. Please refer to Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, and Chapter 35, Public Involvement, for more information about efforts to engage the public. DWR has also been in coordination and consultation with federal, state, and local agencies, utility providers, and other interested parties throughout the development of the EIR. Please note that DWR held an informational webinar about project modeling in July 2021 and encouraged attendance, questions, and comments. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a discussion of the project's purpose and objectives, which inform the selection and analysis of alternatives. Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, further describes the selection of alternatives for analysis in the EIR.
546-75	[ATT 2:] During the Water Fix Change Petition hearing, DWR withheld the modeling for its CWF H3+ alternative until after the SWRCB deadline for other hearing parties to submit their water rights	This comment raises concerns related to the California WaterFix Change in Point of Diversion proceedings. This is not a comment on the Delta Conveyance Project EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	hearing exhibits. This meant that these exhibits were obsolete the moment they were submitted while DWR's were not. This conflicts with the need for transparency in the planning process and was a waste of the SWRCB and hearing participants' time. DWR should regularly make modeling data available in electronic form to the public during the planning process, and well in advance of any decisions that will be predicated on the modeling, especially when specifically requested by a stakeholder.	Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, provides the assumptions and results for the hydrologic modeling conducted for the purposes of the EIR's environmental impact analysis. DWR will provide the information necessary and required for future approval processes such as the change in point of diversion application process. Additionally, DWR responded to all requests for detailed modeling information within the comment period of the Draft EIR.
546-76	[ATT 2:] The EIR must include alternatives where the SWP export diversions to Clifton Court Forebay are fully screened. The proposed project must include state-of-the-art fish screens for the intake to the Clifton Court Forebay. Although the current diversions can be as high as 10,300 cfs as a daily average, and even higher when the intake gates are open for only half of the tidal cycle, there are feasible solutions for screening Clifton Court. One such design was presented in DWR's November 2009 Conceptual Engineering Report – Through-Delta Facility Conveyance Option. This detailed Conceptual Engineering Report recommends a new screened intake on Victoria Canal and a siphon to convey the diverted screened water into Clifton Court Forebay. [WaterFix Hearing Exhibit CCC-SC-31 which reproduced Figures 7-5 and 20-1 from the Conceptual Engineering Report.] The proposed WaterFix project still relied on diversions from the south Delta into Clifton Court for approximately half of the total WaterFix south-of-Delta exports. The current single tunnel proposal will likely also rely on continued south Delta diversions for the SWP. A Delta project that fails to screen the largest diversion point in the Delta is not in the public interest.	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to response to comment 546-33 regarding Clifton Court Forebay screens.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The EIR must analyze south Delta exports through fully screened intakes.	
546-77	[ATT 2:] Other EIR Modeling Requests 1. The EIR must accurately model the conveyance of CVP water, if any, through any new Delta conveyance. The WaterFix CWF H3+ assumed approximately 40% of the water diverted at the north Delta intakes was CVP water even though the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation was no longer agreeing to participate in the project.	The comment appears to generally refer to the modeling effort that supported the 2017 WaterFix EIR. Thus, the comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comment's content to determine whether the comment may be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Draft EIR Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Use of North Delta Intakes for Wheeling, appropriately described the circumstances under which CVP water could be conveyed through the Delta Conveyance Project, and the modeling appropriately reflects the description.
546-78	[ATT 2:] 2. The EIR must simulate the actual proposed project operations. In the WaterFix modeling, a Rio Vista minimum flow requirement of 3,000 cfs was assumed for January-August to ensure modeling stability, but DWR did not intend to operate the project with that minimum flow constraint.	A complete description of the hydrologic modeling undertaken for the Delta Conveyance Project environmental analysis is provided in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. Please also refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the reasonable representation of project operations in the hydrologic model (CalSim 3). The modeling results are an accurate depiction of project operations. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how operations descriptions are modeled and limitations to the modeling results versus real time operations. Also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
546-79	[ATT 2:] 3. The EIR must include alternatives that operate to the existing SWRCB Bay-Delta standards, state and federal biological opinions and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits.	DWR will comply with all applicable future Delta regulatory requirements including future Biological Opinions as they related to operation of the Delta Conveyance Project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Art various times during the BDCP and WaterFix environmental review processes, DWR assumed the Emmaton D-1641 agricultural water quality standard compliance location would be relocated to Three Mile Slough, ignored the Army Corps limits on inflows to Clifton Court Forebay and ignored the biological opinion limit on the ratio of San Joaquin River inflow to south Delta exports. If such changes are going to be part of the future project operations, they must be clearly stated in the project description and then modeling studies should be performed with and without each of the individual changes so that decision makers and the public can fully understand the environmental impacts of such changes.	Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Intake Operations and Maintenance for a description of the operations approach and operational criteria. EIR Chapter 9, Water Quality, evaluates the effects of the alternatives on water quality compared to existing conditions, including compliance with Water Right Decision D-1641 at all compliance locations. EIR Appendices 9C through 9K provide details of the modeling for all constituents of concern. For example, the table titled Delta Assessment Locations and EC Calculation Method in Appendix 9G for Electrical Conductivity lists all of the modeled assessment locations which includes the Emmaton compliance locations. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, for other specific modeling assumptions presented in Section B, Attachment 2. Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, discusses the project's relationship to Water Right Decision D-1641. Chapter 5, Surface Water; Chapter 6, Water Supply; Chapter 7, Flood Protection; Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, use the findings in Appendix 5A to support their analyses. Appendix 5A presents the modeling approach used for the Delta Conveyance Project, assumptions used, and the results obtained. Please refer to Section B, Attachment 2, CalSim 3 Regulatory Assumptions and State Water Project/Central Valley Project Operational Criteria regarding operational criteria.
546-80	[ATT 2:] 4. The EIR must simulate the operations of the proposed project with and without climate change. The EIR should not only simulate project operations at early long-term but also late long-term when the effects of climate change and sea level rise will be most significant. The original BDCP modeling looked at year 2025 and 2060, but the WaterFix simulations were only disclosed to the public for early long	The EIR correctly analyzes the impacts of the proposed project and alternatives compared to existing conditions at the time of the NOP which does not include climate change assumptions. The assertion that the EIR does not analyze how the project's potential operational impacts on resources in the study area would be affected by climate change is not consistent with the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 30, Climate Change,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	term (year 2025). The WaterFix construction period was considered to be about 17 years. The twin tunnels would not have been completed and on line by the year, DWR was using to represent the future operations of the project. For the BDCP, 2060 represented about 45 years in the future. The late long term for the new EIR should be for year 2020 + 45 = 2065.	regarding the impacts of both the No Project and the project alternatives with climate change. Refer also to Appendix 30A, CalSim 3 Results Sensitivity to 2040 Climate Change and Sea Level Projections, the year that the Delta Conveyance Project is assumed to begin operation. Appendix 30A analyzes project impacts considering different climate change and sea level rise projections at 2040 than what were analyzed in the Final EIR for the No Project Alternative (2040) and Alternative 5 (2040). This analysis is not required by CEQA and is not used in support of the CEQA findings provided in Chapters 7 through 32 of the Final EIR. Appendix 4A, Considerations of 2070 Conditions, provides information regarding possible future hydrologic and regulatory conditions under a potential 2070 scenario, and potential future water management actions in 2070, in consideration of climate change. Appendix 4A is provided for informational purposes only, is not a requirement of CEQA, and is not used to support the CEQA findings presented in Chapters 7 through 32 of the Final EIR.
546-81	[ATT 2:] 5. The EIR must analyze and disclose the effect of the new intakes on the flow through Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs and the corresponding effect on the passage of migrating anadromous fish, and smelt, through the Sacramento River and Delta Cross Channel system. Flow measurements in these sloughs by USGS suggest that reducing the flow in the Sacramento River below the proposed north Delta intakes could also reduce the percentage of outmigrating fish taking the safer route to the ocean via Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs. This could have a significant adverse impact on already threatened Bay-Delta fish species.	This mechanism of effect was analyzed in the EIR; see, for example, Impact AQUA-2, in particular the analysis in the section titled Indirect Mortality Within the Delta. The impact is concluded to be potentially significant and is reduced to less than significant with Mitigation Measure CMP (specifically CMP-25), which addresses potential changes in routing of downstream-migrating fish, in particular entry into the interior Delta through Georgiana Slough. Further detail has been added to the Final EIR to document the means of calculation of mitigation extent for Mitigation Measure CMP, specifically CMP-25.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
546-82	[ATT 2:] Thank you for considering my scoping comments.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
548-1	I am commenting to voice my opposition to the Delta Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
548-2	This project would disturb many cultural resources for several Native tribes. This impact cannot be mitigated.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible.
548-3	Furthermore, it would result in lower survival rates for salmon, a keystone species. Salmon are already facing enough threats. They have already declined enough. It is time to start treating salmon with respect.	Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce impacts on salmon to less-than-significant levels. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on Chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
548-4	This tunnel is unnecessary. Californians are already saving water by reducing water use, and Californians overwhelmingly support conservation. Please do not build the Delta Tunnel.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
554-1	I want to make note of my preference for the no-build alternative for this project. Northern California and the Delta	Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments in support of the No Project Alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	are also experiencing drought like conditions and cannot afford to lose the water that provides ecosystem to countless species and provides water for agriculture and infrastructure throughout the area. If there was an abundance of water, the construction of this system alone would be a massive environmental impact. The amount of water left in the Sacramento area after the melting of each annual snowpack is reduced and dangerously low. We are also providing water throughout the state to ever expanding orchards, there is too much demand for what little resources we have left.	DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please also see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
554-2	Get your water elsewhere, there's an ocean right next door.	This comment does not provide evidence or describe specific areas where the EIR has failed to provide a good-faith disclosure of potential impacts, as required by CEQA, and therefore, no specific response to that portion of the comment can be provided. Responses to more specific comments provided in this comment letter are provided herein.
555-1	I am a homeowner in Discovery Bay CA and strongly oppose the Tunnels for many reasons listed below. Location of the Intakes on top of Hood, California. The "alternative" intakes	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	analyzed are all destructive to Hood and all in the area we'd strongly objected to before. Evaluating which way destroys the legacy community of Hood worse when they are all bad and destroy wetlands are not true alternatives.	environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please also refer to Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report, Part 1 of 2, Central and Eastern Options (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022d), for a summary of the intake site selection process. Intake locations were previously intensively analyzed for the BDCP/California WaterFix Project and re-evaluated for the analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project. For the proposed project, DWR also assessed alternative intake locations upstream and downstream, and found that these alternate locations did not meet the project objectives and/or did not have the potential to lessen potential significant environmental effects, which are the screening criteria for whether alternatives should move forward for further evaluation in the EIR. Screening criteria for assessing intake site suitability included proximity to existing development (including the town of Hood), number of structures and residences within the permanent footprint, and potential impacts from construction traffic and new roads and road improvements. Please refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum for detailed information on site selection criteria (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The comment assertion that the Delta

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Conveyance Project would destroy the legacy community of Hood and destroy wetlands is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. While significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated for some resources such as in Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, and Chapter 20, Transportation, other resources evaluated found no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the town of Hood and vicinity. Examples include Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; Chapter 14, Land Use; Chapter 16, Recreation; Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities; and Chapter 26, Public Health. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
555-2	No Alternatives to a Tunnel Just like the prior EIR, there are various "alternatives" – two primary routes and minor alternatives whether to end up at a new Forebay near Clifton Court Forebay or go all the way to the Bethany Reservoir. The two primary routes, Central and East, both go through prime Delta wetlands and farms and include ground water impacts and leave tunnel muck everywhere. Both routes go through soft Delta alluvial soil. The worst, the Central, riskily drills under the railroad trestle. The East is not far enough East by I-5, out of the Delta wetlands and farmlands. Construction should not go through the Delta!	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for information about the alternatives development process and the two-step screening process used to arrive at a reasonable range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including agriculture in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources; wetlands in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources; and groundwater in Chapter 8, Groundwater. Please also see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material. RTM that may be deemed unsuitable for reuse would be disposed of at a site approved for disposal of such material and is expected to be approximately 1% to 5% of the total volume of excavated material.
555-3	The other "Alternative" is "No Action." That's just silly. Why aren't they evaluating real alternatives, like Congressman Garamendi and Governor Newsom proposed including a portfolio: Desalination, conservation, levee repair, infrastructure repair (i.e., leaking pipes throughout L.A.), covering the aqueduct to prevent evaporation, … Many improvements have been recommended. The best make new water for L.A. and long-term could reduce the huge electrical costs of pumping over the Tehachapis while saving more water for farmers.	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. The proposed project is not intended to create new water supplies. The above stated purpose, in turn, gives rise to several related objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project which includes, but is not limited to, providing operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives considered but eliminated(e.g., local water supply projects or portfolio alternatives). Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
555-4	Long-Term Issues In general, taking the fresh water out of the Delta before it can flow through the estuary is a bad, bad idea – impacting the environment, Delta communities, Delta farms. More salt water and farm runoff in the Delta. More blue-green toxic algae and weeds.	Please see response to comment 555-1 regarding the analysis of potentially significant impacts on the environment provided in the EIR. Effects related to Delta communities are evaluated in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, as well as Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis. Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding salinity and water quality in the Delta. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project related to electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.
555-5	Thank you for your time in this matter.	The comment provides general closing text. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
558-1	I am a homeowner in Discovery Bay CA and strongly oppose the Tunnels for many reasons listed below. Location of the Intakes on top of Hood, California. The "alternative" intakes analyzed are all destructive to Hood and all in the area we'd strongly objected to before. Evaluating which way destroys the legacy community of Hood worse when they are all bad and destroy wetlands are not true alternatives.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report—Part 1 of 2, Central and Eastern Options (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022d), for a summary of the intake site selection process. Intake locations were previously intensively analyzed for the BDCP/California WaterFix Project and re-evaluated for the analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project. For the proposed project, DWR also assessed alternative intake locations upstream and downstream, and found that these alternate locations did not meet the project objectives and/or did not have the potential to lessen potential significant environmental effects, which are the screening criteria for whether alternatives should move forward for further evaluation in the EIR. Screening criteria for assessing intake site suitability included proximity to existing development (including the town of Hood), number of structures and residences within the permanent footprint, and potential impacts from construction traffic and new roads and road improvements. Please refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum for detailed information on site selection criteria (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The comment assertion that the Delta Conveyance Project would destroy the legacy community of Hood and destroy wetlands is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. While significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated for some resources such as in Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources and Chapter 20, Transportation, other resources evaluated found no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the town of Hood and vicinity. Examples include Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; Chapter 14, Land Use;

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 16, Recreation; Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities; and Chapter 26, Public Health. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
558-2	No Alternatives to a Tunnel Just like the prior EIR, there are various "alternatives" - two primary routes and minor alternatives whether to end up at a new Forebay near Clifton Court Forebay or go all the way to the Bethany Reservoir. The two primary routes, Central and East, both go through prime Delta wetlands and farms and	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for information about the alternatives development process and the two-step screening process used to arrive at a reasonable range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for multiple environmental resources in the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	include ground water impacts and leave tunnel muck everywhere. Both routes go through soft Delta alluvial soil. The worst, the Central, riskily drills under the railroad trestle. The East is not far enough East by I-5, out of the Delta wetlands and farmlands. Construction should not go through the Delta!	Delta, including agriculture in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources; wetlands in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources; and groundwater in Chapter 8, Groundwater. Please also see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material. RTM that may be deemed unsuitable for reuse would be disposed of at a site approved for disposal of such material and is expected to be approximately 1% to 5% of the total volume of excavated material.
558-3	The other "Alternative" is "No Action." That's just silly. Why aren't they evaluating real alternatives, like Congressman Garamendi and Governor Newsom proposed including a portfolio: Desalination, conservation, levee repair, infrastructure repair (i.e., leaking pipes throughout L.A.), covering the aqueduct to prevent evaporation, … Many improvements have been recommended. The best make new water for L.A. and long-term could reduce the huge electrical costs of pumping over the Tehachapis while saving more water for farmers.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives considered but eliminated (e.g., local water supply projects or portfolio alternatives). Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
558-4	Long-Term Issues In general, taking the fresh water out of the Delta before it can flow through the estuary is a bad, bad idea – impacting the environment, Delta communities, Delta farms. More salt water and farm runoff in the Delta. More blue-green toxic algae and weeds.	Please see response to comment 558-1 regarding the analysis of potentially significant impacts on the environment provided in the EIR. Effects related to Delta communities are evaluated in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, as well as Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis. Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding salinity and water quality in the Delta. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project related to electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and Cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
558-5	Thank you for your time in this matter.	This comment provides general closing text. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
561-1	I see a number of problems with the tunnel project and would propose other solutions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Responses to more specific comments provided in this comment letter are provided herein.
561-2	The tunnel does not create any new water, it just moves water from one part of the state to another at great monetary and environmental costs. Rising sea levels due to climate change will cause increased salt water intrusion into the Delta which will further erode the currently fragile environment for local water supplies, fish and wildlife, agriculture, and recreation. The actual construction of the tunnel will destroy the legacy community of Hood and the surrounding bird refuge. The muck removed from the ground for the tunnels is not recyclable and will be dumped on islands and farmland. The tunnel in operation would require an enormous amount of energy to pump the water south to its destination.	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio in a cost-effective manner. The project is not intended to create new water supplies. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. To illustrate potential differences in effects as a result of climate change and sea level rise, the EIR includes supplemental analyses not required by CEQA for various resource areas, including fish and aquatic

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		resources, terrestrial biological resources, water supply, agricultural resources, and recreation. For example, Appendix 12C, Fish and Aquatic Resources 2040 Analysis, compares the No Project Alternative at 2040 to the project alternatives at 2040 using modeling tools and methods appropriate for the evaluation of impacts on fish and aquatic resources; in Appendix 12C, modeling for the No Project Alternative at 2040 and project alternatives at 2040 incorporates assumptions regarding changes to hydrology and sea level rise as a result of climate change; this appendix shows that the relative difference between the project alternatives and No Project Alternative at 2040 is generally similar to difference between the project alternatives and existing conditions at 2020. The comment assertions regarding impacts on Hood and the surrounding bird refuge are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, including those related to local communities and wildlife. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potentially significant impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Additionally, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The section titled Reusable Tunnel Material in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, contains information regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material. RTM that may be deemed unsuitable for reuse would be disposed of at a site approved for disposal of such material and is expected to be approximately 1% to 5% of the total volume of excavated material. Please see Chapter 22, Energy, for an analysis of the project's impacts on energy use, which are less than significant.
561-3	Instead, I would suggest that the state has a number of other ways to address the issues of providing water for the future: Use less water, and by this I mean limit water usage for certain purposes such as residential landscaping and put onerous rates, rules and fines in place.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding how the reasonably foreseeable actions considered part of the No Project Alternative are not an alternative because they fail to meet the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be one component of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
561-4	Instead, I would suggest that the state has a number of other ways to address the issues of providing water for the future: Use the revenue to fund more recycling of water where feasible and increasing the capacity of existing reservoirs.	Please see response to comment 561-3 regarding the alternatives developed.
561-5	Instead, I would suggest that the state has a number of other ways to address the issues of providing water for the future: Longer term, move toward regional self-sufficiency by looking to California's long coastline and great technology talents to move to more desalinization using renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, or ocean waves. Creating more energy from renewable sources could also contribute to reducing carbon emissions causing global warning.	Please see response to comment 561-3 regarding the alternatives developed.
561-6	California needs to be a leader in managing its incredible natural and human resources and not just fall back on pitting one part of the state against another. Let's create more water and energy for everyone!	This comment provides general closing text. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
562-1	Please add me to the notice list and we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.	The contact information provided by the commenter has been added to project email list as requested.
562-2	As a concerned 30 year resident of Discovery Bay, I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel). We have lived on the deep water for the last 26 years on Reef Bay in Discovery Bay and raised our family in this boating community. We frequently enjoy taking our family and friends waterskiing on the delta which also includes stopping at various marinas for gas, ice-cream, and other refreshments. These trips as well as other planned trips will result in visiting the various dining establishments with water access.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
562-3	We are also members of the Discovery Bay Yacht Club and enjoy taking our houseboat on trips to other marinas or "anchoring" out on the delta and enjoying the fishing and	The comment assertions regarding the project's impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	wildlife. The Tunnel project has a major impact on the flow of water into the delta which has not been adequately reviewed and we know that the environmental and economic impact will be massive. With an unhealthy delta, boating waterways will be restricted, family outdoor activities will be harmed, restaurants and marinas will lose significant revenue further hurting the local communities. Furthermore people who work on boats will lose business and homeowners will lose equity in their primary investment, which is their home. This will directly hurt myself, my family and will crush the local economy of all impacted by the boating and yachting community as everyone depends on a healthy delta which the Tunnel project turns the delta into its sacrificial lamb.	would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. As described in Chapter 5, Surface Water, the long-term average monthly flows for the project alternatives are similar to existing conditions based on the hydrologic simulated model results. Therefore, the project would not have a major impact on flows as the comment claims. Please also see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the hydrologic modeled representation of project operations, which evaluates changes in flow into and through the Delta. Please also see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities, particularly the construction effects on fishing and boating opportunities. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation, and socioeconomic effects in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.
569-1	I have concerns and opposition to the latest draft Delta Conveyance that would negatively impact the ability of the recreational boating public to navigate in the waterways of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This project has several fatal flaws. Specific to recreation, the project would severely disrupt navigation, boating-related commerce and communities throughout the lengthy, fourteen years of construction. It is a false assumption that recreational activity would merely move to other areas. There is a potential for the project to significantly increase the transport of invasive species into the Delta waterways, and to exacerbate the occurrence of harmful algal blooms. These reduce recreational opportunities on the waterways and already impose significant costs on the boating	Please refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, and specifically Impact TRANS-5, regarding disruption of boat traffic. As noted in Chapter 20, the Delta waterways including the Sacramento River would always remain open to boat traffic during construction. Furthermore, the maximum changes in surface water flows under any alternative would not impede navigation of waterways. The comment assertion regarding recreational activity being unable to move to another location is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, for further discussion on the evaluation and methods used for analysis of effects on specific recreation opportunities from the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	community. These boating impacts would be long-term and even permanent. However, the project fails to adequately identify and fully mitigate these impacts with certainty.	For potential socioeconomic effects resulting from the project, please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Regarding increased transport of invasive species into Delta waterways, Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Impact BIO-52 states "equipment is cleaned and inspected before entering new areas." In addition, Environmental Commitment EC-14 has been revised to include monitoring for invasive plants as well as management techniques where necessary to control terrestrial invasive species. Finally, please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, for a discussion of the analysis of harmful algal blooms from the project. The EIR provides an impact analysis of invasive species, including Chapter 9, Impact WQ-14 and associated appendices, regarding analysis of harmful alga blooms. The analysis related to the multiple Delta locations evaluated for cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (CHABs) concluded that CHABs "are not expected to cause Delta CHABs to be substantially larger in size, and because bloom size does not necessarily dictate toxin concentration in the water, the project alternatives are not expected to substantially increase microcystin or any other cyanotoxins in the Delta, relative to existing conditions at the Delta assessment locations." This analysis provides evidence that the project will not exacerbate the occurrence of harmful algal blooms.
569-2	While the project might enhance the availability of fresh water for transport out of the Delta, the $14 billion expenditure would hasten the demise of aquatic conditions in the Delta as climate change occurs. The foreseeable impacts include higher air temperatures, varying seasonality of inflows, fluctuations in wet weather periods as well as droughts, decreased snow melt, increased risk of wildfires, saltwater intrusion further into the Delta, higher sea levels, and decreased water quality especially during droughts. However, the draft environmental impact analysis inadequately analyses these future risks. It	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding uncertainty and the use of best available tools to conduct analyses contained in the EIR as well as the CEQA environmental baseline used for assessing significance of impacts. The analyses in the EIR, which are based on quantitative and qualitative consideration of aquatic species impacts developed by subject matter experts do not support the comment assertion regarding hastening the demise of aquatic conditions. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, provides a description of analyses considering water temperature, as well as analyses of the proposed project and project alternatives impacts on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	unrealistically limits the future conditions only to the year 2040 for the evaluation of the climate as well as social impacts. It also fails to either disclose or evaluate numerous uncertainties, unknowns, and assumptions associated with the project.	state- and federally listed fish species. While not required by CEQA, the EIR includes analyses for informational purposes that consider potential climate change conditions at both 2040 and 2070. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the climate change analyses contained in the EIR.
569-3	To the contrary [Contrary to the DEIR], the laws, policies and projects that are already in place including water conservation, recycling, ground water recovery, desalination plants, surface water storage, ground water management, support a No Project Alternative.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, which describes the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, which describes the No Project Alternative. Many of the reasonably foreseeable actions included in the No Project Alternative include water conservation, recycling, groundwater recovery, desalination plants, surface water storage, and groundwater management; however, they would not address the basic objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, including the risks to the State Water Project supplies from the Delta presented by climate change, sea level rise, flooding, and earthquakes.
569-4	RBOC [Recreational Boaters of California] remains concerned that this project creates no new sources of water to address the impacts of the drought, climate change, and population growth. The primary emphasis is to move high quality water from the Delta, which would leave poor quality water for the inhabitant fish species, wildlife and humans. The project does not restore and protect the Delta and its ecosystems. The mitigations are weak to non-existent and in many instances, impacts are mischaracterized as 'LTS' [less than significant] to 'NI' [No Impact]. In summary, the key concerns are: -Disruption to navigable waters in the Delta for 14 years during construction	The comment assertions regarding project impacts are not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. The fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is not to create a new source of water as asserted by the commenter, but to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries, as described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, which does not include new water storage. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the lead agency's discretion in identifying the project objectives and the consideration of other objectives. Ancillary objectives of the project also include addressing anticipated rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and reducing the potential for a Delta levee breach from a major earthquake. The Delta Conveyance Project would be one component of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	-Does not adequately address climate change and its impacts on decreased snow melt -Unquantified Groundwater Impacts (for Example Table 8.0) non meaningful LTS--Less Than Significant -Does not create any new sources of water -Will wreak havoc on the aquatic species, wildlife, inhabitants, recreational users and supporting industries	Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. The project's impact on fish is analyzed in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, where all impacts were determined to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. The project's impact on wildlife is analyzed in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, where all impacts were determined to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Please see Chapter 16, Recreation, for an analysis of the project's effects on recreational resources. All recreation impacts were determined to be less than significant. Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, analyzes the potential effects of the project on the community character. As described in the chapter, the effects are not anticipated to be adverse. Community impacts would be further addressed through implementation of the Community Benefits Plan, as described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework. The Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local community effects that may occur beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please see Common Response 1 regarding the adequacy of the mitigation measures presented in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, in the section titled Relation to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers EIS and NEPA Compliance, USACE has regulatory authority over certain activities and the agency's authorization is required for any activity that falls under the regulation of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including effects on navigable waters. Please see Common Response 1 for more information on coordination DWR has engaged in with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the NEPA Process. Potential impacts on navigable water ways are addressed in Chapter 20, Transportation, specifically Impact TRANS-5, which addresses potential effects on marine navigation which were found to be less than significant due to minimal use of boats and barges to only place riprap at the completion of intake construction and initial geotechnical investigations during the design phase. Potential impacts on groundwater resources are addressed in Chapter 8, Groundwater, where all impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation. Potential impacts on climate change are addressed in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for the purposes of CEQA and Chapter 30, Climate Change. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses potential impacts on water quality as a result of the project and found that impacts would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
570-1	I object to this project to build a tunnel under the Delta from Hood to Byron because it is a waste of money and will make salt water intrusion into the Delta much worse.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Common Response 1 also describes the project's purpose and project objectives and has a discussion of resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake. Chapter 9, Water Quality, evaluates surface water quality in the Delta,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		including electroconductivity (EC) and chloride, both constituents of saltwater. Chapter 9 concludes that impacts would be less than significant and exceedances of these water quality constituents would not substantially change from baseline existing conditions. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development and screening process.
570-2a	You have failed to consider anything except a tunnel under the Delta.	Please see response to comment 570-1. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of the proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
570-2b	There are better ways to improve the reliability of the water system, take care of earthquake risk from failing levees, and do better by the Delta Smelt and other fish that get sucked into the pumps. I don't believe that a tunnel is the only possible solution. You need to do better offering other solutions for the benefit of the public you serve.	Please see response to comment 570-1 regarding the project's purpose and project objectives, resilience of the project in the event of an earthquake, analysis of potential water quality impacts, and alternatives evaluated.
570-3	For the levees, the plain solution is to strengthen the levees. That solves your salt water rushing in problem and also protects valuable farmland and our treasured Delta ecosystem. Anything that does double duty is always a better solution than a single purpose project.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding comments about repairing existing levees. Please see response to comment 570-1 regarding Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Review Issues, Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources. Please also see response to comment 570-2 regarding Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives. In addition, in Appendix 3A, section titled Identification of Alternatives under CEQA, explains that the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a rule of reason that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that do not meet the underlying purpose or are infeasible.
570-4	Moving the intakes up north by Hood decreases the fresh water that will flow through the Delta and changes the system so that there is no need for you to maintain fresh water in the Delta. This makes the effects of climate change induced salt water intrusion worse. You can't abandon the Delta to salt water. The original purpose of the State Water Project was to repel salinity from the Delta. Governor Pat Brown made clear back in the day when he campaigned for the original bond measure that the Delta would be saved from salt water by holding water upstream in dams and then releasing it into the Delta when flows were low. This pushes back the bay and keeps the fresh water balance in the Delta. Your plan to suck out the fresh water before it enters the Delta turns Pat Brown's great achievement onto its head.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the Delta Conveyance Project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, dryer future. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, which analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
570-5	Instead, you should reduce the amount of water sent to Los Angeles and use that extra water to flow through the Delta and push back the salt water. That's the way to deal with climate change: save the Delta; don't destroy it. Pumping Delta water over the Tehachapi Mountains to Los Angeles makes Delta water the most expensive source of water that can be imagined. Water reuse, replacing all those green Los Angeles lawns with rock gardens, and even desalination are much cheaper ways to provide water to Los Angeles. Even Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti has decided to get Los Angeles off of imported water. If the Mayor of Los Angeles agrees that importing Delta water has to stop, why can't the state consider that as an alternative to a tunnel?	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Common Response 3 also explains how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
570-6	Please go back to the drawing board and come up with a reasonable range of alternatives that include options other than a tunnel through the Delta.	Please see the responses to comments 570-2, 570-3, and 570-5 regarding the reasonable range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
571-1	We live in the Delta and are concerned about the waste of electricity in this project. My goodness, we worry about every appliance and light bulb in our homes and are told that climate change is a threat to everyone if we don't conserve. But the state can pump billions of gallons of water every year over the mountains to Los Angeles and it isn't a problem?	Please see Chapter 22, Energy, for an analysis of the project's impacts on energy use, which are less than significant. Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
571-2	The salinity coming into the Delta is a real problem. Salt water should stay in the ocean. Moving your intake away from the problem is cowardly. Stay and solve the problem. Cutting exports to Southern California solves many problems. It saves electricity because desalination and other sources of water available to Southern California use less electricity. It leaves more water to flow down the river to push back salt water. And please fix the levees. Assuming the levees will never be fixed as the basis for your decisions is wrong. Fix them. Put all this together and come up with some real alternatives.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Common Response 3 also addresses comments regarding fixing levees and alternatives considered but eliminated (e.g., repairing existing levees; increase of freshwater flows; demand management; local water supply projects; and portfolio alternatives). Common Response 3 also discusses the location of the north Delta intakes. Please also see Appendix 3A,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
572-1	I started coming to the Delta in 1965 or 1966. And then moved here in 2004. I have a 25 foot Cobalt. I swim in the Delta; I waterski; I putter around in my boat. I also have a paddle boat.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
572-2	I am concerned about all of the negative impacts of the Tunnel Project, but in particular the terrible injustice you are foisting on Hood and the idea that you would reduce flows through the Delta at a time when we need more fresh water are really bothersome to me.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Common Response 3 also includes a discussion of comments suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
572-3	You say you will abide by rules about how much fresh water will flow through the Delta; but the setup you are proposing is to be able to divert water before it flows through the Delta. You will have no incentive to continue maintaining fresh water flows through the Delta. Let alone doing more, as you should, to keep the Delta fresh. We don't want a salt water Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding regulations governing project approvals, permitting, and other required actions, such as the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, Clean Water Act, and water quality standards. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).
572-4	I don't understand how a tunnel and only a tunnel can be the next step in the State Water Project. It simply can't be believed that no alternative except a tunnel under the Delta can solve the problems you are after. Nobody will believe this.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives considered but eliminated. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
572-5	We need to reduce reliance on exported water, exactly like the law says. We need a reduced reliance-increased seaward flow	Please see responses to comments 572-3 and 572-4. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	alternative. We need several of these alternatives to look at, as a matter of fact, and then choose the best one. Please try again.	Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives.
573-1	I live I Discovery Bay. I have a company that designs and builds railroads in the western United States. Our boat is in our backyard. We utilize it twice a month twelve months a year. We enjoy taking multiple children through the summer to experience the Delta as it is today.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter, and general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
573-2	We have noticed the increase in shallow water and weeds at the top of the water, which is alarming. I personally feel that if the water is lowered or the salt goes farther up the river that everything is going to change for the worse. We fish stripers in my backyard and it has always been great but recently sea lions show up more than they ever have. Sea lions are a salt water creature and belong in the bay. Something is wrong.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and includes general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
573-3	As a railroad construction guy in the industry, surveying all the refineries, the Port of Stockton, and Concord Navel Weapons Station, I can see that the obvious solution to concerns about levee collapse is to fix the levees. Remember the levees were built by Chinese labor after they built the railroad.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel, and fixing the levees.
573-4	Your plan to move the diversions up north will only make the salt water problem in the Delta that we see now worse. There are better ways to make water exports secure that will also help the Delta. You are committed to export more water than you can ever supply. Everyone knows that. Face the facts and reduce exports so there is enough water to flow downstream and push rising waters back. It is obvious Los Angeles can survive without Delta water. Cutting exports to L.A. will give more water for Central Valley farmers too. This is a real solution that conforms with law and solves problems. Your EIR says only one thing in the world can help our problems: A	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	tunnel. This can't be right. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with some real alternatives.	Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
574-1	We have been in Discovery Bay for twenty years but we have been skiing the Delta for forty years. It took us this long to afford to buy a house here; and now we don't want to see the Delta ruined by the tunnel. We have a Supreme ski boat that we use in the summer about three times a week. And we use our pontoon boat about once a week. We ski on Twin Sloughs and Railroad Cut.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This information also describes the background of the individual commenter and general introductory text. This information is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
574-2	We worked on the Peripheral Canal Committee when we lived in Antioch. We have been fighting to save the Delta for a long time and aren't going to give up now.	Please see response to comment 574-1 regarding information that describes the background of the individual commenter, general introductory text, and general opposition to the project.
574-3	The tunnel plan is still a fiasco; going from two tunnels to one doesn't make a bad idea any better. Environmentally, it is still a disaster.	Please see response to comment 574-1 regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
574-4	You haven't allowed any real public input or dialog with the public.	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding public outreach, public meetings, and the public review and comment period for the EIR.
574-5	We aren't allowed to talk about anything but a tunnel. You don't want to hear ideas like building desal plants, sending less water to Los Angeles, conserving water in Los Angeles, or anything but a tunnel. Please take a serious look at solutions other than a tunnel. I know that for the money being proposed to be spent, there are a lot of other things that can be	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	considered in that price range. Revise the EIR to show serious consideration of non-tunnel alternatives.	would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Project Requirements, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 19, Demand Management, Water Conservation, and Other Actions by Participating Water Agencies, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
575-1	We have resided in Discovery Bay for six years and in Brentwood for twenty-seven years before that. Charles grew up going to Bethel Island fishing. I spend a lot of time on the Delta in our ski/wakeboard boat.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
575-2	I am concerned about the health of the estuary and our fish habitat being impacted. The water quality of our beautiful Delta waterways is going downhill. This project will make it worse adversely impacting all of the above. This project does nothing to improve water conditions in the Delta. It does nothing to help fish habitat. Water conditions of both the Delta and the bay will suffer if fresh water is diverted upstream of the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the purpose of the project. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.
575-3	Please obey the Delta Reform Act and come up with alternatives that reduce reliance on the Delta and restore the Delta ecosystem. You can do better than a tunnel, a tunnel, and only a tunnel in every so-called alternative.	Please refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and coequal goals, including dependence on the Delta as a source of future water.
576-1	I moved to Discovery Bay in 1988 and have been here ever since. I started skiing and fishing in the Delta in about 1978, at least that long ago. I got out of the service in 1964, and went to work for the phone company. I was involved in the communications projects around the Delta Mendota Canal when it was being put in. The sales job for the Delta Mendota was that Los Angeles would put in desalination and other water supply measures so more water would not have to be drawn from the Delta. But no matter what they say, they always want more. The line has to be drawn somewhere sometime. The time is now and the place is this EIR. I am a boater. I have a cobalt 25 foot runabout and I use it on the Delta often. I've gone all the way up to Sacramento on my boat, down to Martinez, and all points in between. I watch the 4th of July fireworks at Mandeville Tip off of my boat most years.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
576-2	You can't go anywhere in the Delta now without running afoul of weeds. The Egeria densa, we call it pickleweed, is particularly bad. It thrives in areas of low flow; standing water is the friend of weeds and the enemy of boaters. I read in your EIR that the tunnel will "increase residence time" in June. That means to me that there will be less flow and more still water. You said weeds aren't a problem in June so not to worry. Wrong. The weeds start in Discovery Bay in April and run all the way through the summer and fall.	The commenter makes several statements regarding weeds or weed concerns, which are presumed here to include nonnative, invasive, or noxious plants. Environmental Commitment EC-14 (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices) has been revised in the Final EIR to require the use of weed mapping and treatment plans recommended by the California Invasive Plant Council, as well as other invasive plant species management techniques as necessary. None of the revisions described in the EIR resulted in a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact or required additional mitigation measures to which DWR was unwilling to commit. Environmental Commitment EC-14 also requires that all equipment used in aquatic habitats be thoroughly cleaned and inspected for aquatic invasive species before entering aquatic habitats. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, DSM2 modeling results show there would be little to no change in median residence in Discovery Bay in the month of June. DSM2 modeling shows there would be increases in median residence time in July through October. However, these increases would be less than a 10% increase in residence time relative to existing conditions. Impact BIO-52 in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, has been revised to clarify that the analysis in Chapter 9 indicates that project operations would not substantially change the factors that contribute to growth of invasive aquatic macrophytes (i.e., water hyacinth [Eichhornia crassipes] and Brazilian waterweed [Egeria densa]). The revision to Chapter 13 did not result in a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact or require additional mitigation measures to which DWR was unwilling to commit. Based on the above considerations, project operations would not cause an expansion of invasive aquatic macrophytes in the Discovery Bay area or in other areas of the Delta.
576-3a	The poisonous algae, microsystis thrives on top of the Egeria Densa. It can be bad in June. I know. I see it with my own eyes.	Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14 (CHABs) thoroughly evaluates the effects of project operations on CHABs in the Delta, with an emphasis on Microcystis—the most studied cyanobacteria in the Delta. Based on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	So the EIR is wrong when it says slowing down the water in June won't be a problem. It will.	extensive analysis that is consistent with the current scientific understanding of CHABs in the Delta, and that included assessment of residence time effects of the project for June through November, this impact assessment determined that operations of the project alternatives would have less-than-significant impacts on Delta CHABs.
576-3b	We live on Indian Bay, which is the first bay off of fast water, off of Indian Slough. We have some of the best flow and deepest water in Discovery Bay. When the weeds are a problem for us, they are much worse in other parts of Discovery Bay and other parts of the Delta.	Please see response to comment 576-2 regarding invasive weeds and the water quality analysis provided in the EIR.
576-4	What we need is increased flow through the Delta. Moving the export intakes upstream to siphon off the water before it flows through the Delta makes no sense at all to anyone who cares at all about saving the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. The project is seeking a new point of diversion and is not seeking to expand water right quantity. Furthermore, the Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria table in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, describes the criteria under which the North Delta Diversions would operate and identifies specific flows the Sacramento River must meet before the diversions can occur, all guided by specific permits and regulatory requirements. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a history of the upgraded conveyance needs in the Delta, why the intakes are proposed for the north Delta, justification for the Delta Conveyance Project and a description of the process for identifying and screening alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft EIR, focusing on the project objectives (see Chapter 1, Introduction).
576-5	You are one-note Willie with this EIR. A tunnel, a tunnel, or a tunnel. Those are the only choices. Please get serious and do it over. Put in some real alternatives that will increase flow through the Delta and reduce reliance on the Delta, like the Delta Reform Act says. Los Angeles has plenty of options: desal, recycling, putting in water saving landscape instead of lush green thirsty lawns. Send them some of the $16,000,000,000	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and pay them to use less water if you have to but don't kill the Delta with this hairbrained tunnel.	
576-6	Water thirsty crops are a problem too. Why should Delta farmers be put out of business because you want to turn the Delta to salt so some Almond King can get rich growing water thirsty crops in the Desert?	The comment assertion regarding the significance of impacts from changes in salinity is not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of CEQA impact determinations for impacts on water quality. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, which concludes that while there could be some increases in salinity (based on modeled electrical conductivity) at some Delta locations in some months, these effects would be less than significant.
577-1	I moved to the Delta in 2005. We moved here from Los Angeles. We are members of the Discovery Bay Yacht Club and the Coast Guard Auxiliary.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
577-2	We already have a lot of problems with our water quality. Changing the balance of the way the water flows through the Delta is very risky and isn't necessary. In fact, diverting fresh water before it flows through the Delta can only make salt water intrusion worse. It doesn't make sense to cut off the fresh water flow from the Delta if the concern is salt water intrusion.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
577-3	It doesn't make sense to abandon the levees. The levees need to be fixed. It is a faulty assumption to say that the levees will collapse in an earthquake because the levees can, and should, be fixed to withstand an earthquake.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel, and fixing the levees.
577-4	Please come back with alternatives that aren't just a tunnel. Please look at the problem and don't write a report to justify the decision that has already been made.	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel. Please also see

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of the proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
578-1	I have been coming to the Delta since 1960 and have had wonderful experiences with my kids staying overnight at the meadows.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
578-2	It is a shame that the Department of Water Resources has nothing to offer to halt the decline of the Delta. Your project does nothing to restore the Delta or reduce reliance on the Delta as a source of exported water. The pleasure the Delta has given us and tens of thousands of others over the years is just amazing. Please don't turn your back on the Delta. Please don't needlessly cut off the fresh water from the Delta before it can nourish the Delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
578-3	Nor does it address aging levees. Surely with a budget of tens of billions of dollars you can come up with alternatives to at least look at that aren't a tunnel. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with something better than a tunnel.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding the project and its background, particularly the sections titled Climate Change and Delta Levee Risks, which detail the State of California programs to manage risk and improve levees in the Delta. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel, and fixing the levees.
579-1	I am writing to object to the location of the intakes. No consideration has been given to alternate intake locations, other than where they will destroy the Town of Hood.	Please refer to Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report—Part 1 of 2, Central and Eastern Options (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022b), for a summary of the intake site selection process. Intake locations were previously intensively analyzed for the BDCP/California WaterFix Project and re-evaluated for the analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project. For the Delta Conveyance Project, DWR also assessed alternative intake locations upstream and downstream, and found that these alternate locations did not meet the project objectives and/or did not have the potential to lessen potential significant environmental effects, which are the screening criteria for whether alternatives should move forward for further evaluation in the EIR. Screening criteria for assessing intake site suitability included proximity to existing development (including the town of Hood), number of structures and residences within the permanent footprint, and potential impacts from construction traffic and new roads and road improvements. Please refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum in the Engineering Project Reports for detailed information on site selection criteria (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. CEQA requires an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. The comment assertion that the Delta Conveyance Project would destroy the town Hood is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. While significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated for some resources such as in Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources and Chapter 20, Transportation, other resources evaluated found no impacts or less-than-significant impacts for the town of Hood and vicinity. Examples include Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; Chapter 14, Land Use; Chapter 16, Recreation; Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities; and Chapter 26, Public Health.
579-2	In a June 22, 2020, Zoom meeting with DCA Executive Director Kathryn Mallon, Phil Ryan, and Nazli Parvizi, I asked why we were not allowed to discuss alternate intake locations. Kathryn's reply was that this was the only possible location for the intakes and that the DCA was directed by DWR not to discuss other locations with anybody.	Please see response to comment 579-1 regarding intake locations. Please also see Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding DWR's efforts to engage with the public about the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	I don't think Kathryn knew why DWR was putting a muzzle on intake locations or why DWR wanted them at Hood. I know that DWR simply wants to take advantage of a supposed existing water right at Hood to make life a little easier when they go before the SWRCB. Administrative convenience isn't a reason to refuse to study reasonable alternative intake locations that will have less environmental impact and will not destroy the Town of Hood.	
579-3	Please recirculate the DEIR to include alternative intake locations.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding how DWR is following the appropriate legal process and complying with CEQA in preparing the EIR for the proposed project and the topic of recirculation.
580-1	I HAVE BEEN IN THE DELTA SINCE '92. I CAME HERE FOR BOATING.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
580-2	I'M WORRIED ABOUT THE INTRUSION OF SALT WATER, ALL OF THE HABITAT BEING RUINED.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9, Water Quality, evaluates surface water quality in the Delta, including electroconductivity (EC) and chloride, both constituents of saltwater. Chapter 9 concludes that impacts would be less than significant

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		and exceedances of these water quality constituents would not substantially change from baseline conditions. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
580-3	IT SEEMS TO ME You· ARE NOT EXPLORING AVENUES OTHER THAN A PIPE UNDER THE DELTA TO SEND MORE WATER TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WE NEED TO LOOK AT LESS EXPORTS, MORE INSTREAM FLOW, FIXING THE LEVEES, AND MORE CREATIVE WAYS TO PROTECT FISH FROM BEING SUCKED INTO THE PUMPS. A PIPE UNDER THE DELTA CAN'T BE THE ONLY WAY FORWARD.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel and fixing levees. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
581-1	I have been out here since 1984, damn near forty years. I like fishing and I like having a boat in the water. I have seen the Delta go downhill. The weeds are awful. We have toxic algae in our bay. They call it Microcystis. The toxic algae starts at the end of March and gets worse through the summer. I see it every year now. I read in your EIR that the project will slow down water flow in June but that won't be a problem because there is no algae problem in June. Not so.	The comment provides a characterization of baseline conditions in the Delta. The EIR describes baseline conditions using multiple sources of information, including modeled results of the hydrologic conditions within the Delta. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-14, for the analysis of cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms resulting from facility operations and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		maintenance. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
581-2	Please revise the EIR to address the negative impact on algae in Discovery Bay in June, and all through the summer.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 9 and its supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of harmful algal blooms.
582-1	I am an avid fisherman. I moved to Discovery Bay about nine years ago from South San Jose so I could be closer to the water because I was fishing tournaments every other weekend for large mouth bass. Since I moved to Discovery Bay I now have three boats: one for fishing; one for fun; and my 37 foot Rinker Fiesta Vee. When I go out on the Delta I see the fish species diminishing. Crappie are really down. Large Mouth Bass are down. Salmon are down. Removing fresh water from the Delta system can only make matters worse.	This information describes the background of the individual commenter and general introductory text. This information is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding aquatic species in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. As described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please also refer to Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding concerns with surface water quality impacts in the Delta.
582-2	One thing that does not make sense to me: one of the problems you are trying to solve is what if there is an earthquake and the levees collapse and salt water rushes in from the bay? But you don't consider fixing the levees so they won't collapse. It seems obvious that would be the first thing to look at. You wouldn't have to fix all the levees, just enough to keep a corridor for fresh water to reach the pumps. Next, you don't want rising sea levels to push salt water further into the Delta and reach the pumps at Tracy. But you don't think about letting more fresh water run down stream to push the	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, that more fully describes the purpose and objectives of the project, which focus on the SWP's ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize disruption of SWP operations from earthquakes in and around the Delta, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	salt water back and you don't think about sending less water to Los Angeles. It is not appropriate for people in Southern California to have any kind of landscaping they want, using imported Delta water to irrigate acres of useless green lawns, and then ask Delta farmers to cut back their water use because there isn't enough water to go around. Reducing exports from the Delta has to be part of the solution. And other sources for Southern California. Desai, water reuse, and other means. A proper EIR will consider all of these alternatives in different combinations. A tunnel only and only a tunnel is not consideration of alternatives.	the performance of the project objectives associated with sea level rise, extreme weather, and seismic events. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, including alternatives that reduce or eliminate exports or to modify existing levees. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs regarding DWR's levee management efforts in the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
583-1	I am a real estate agent, new to Discovery Bay. I moved here from Livermore. I grew up going to the Delta with my parents. I have many wonderful boating memories from my childhood on the Delta. It is a special place to me and I don't want to see it ruined.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
583-2	The EIR fails because it doesn't do anything to restore the Delta ecosystem or reduce reliance on the Delta. The Delta Reform Act requires that major projects do that.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. Please refer to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a discussion of the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and coequal goals.
583-3	Next, it makes no sense to say the idea is to deal with a collapse of the levees in an earthquake but not even consider fixing the levees. Finally, salt water coming in from the bay as sea level rises can be pushed back by more fresh water going downstream-diverting the river before it reaches the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding prior Delta conveyance planning efforts and a detailed discussion of the project's purpose and objectives. The sections in Chapter 1, Introduction, titled Climate Change and Delta Levee Risks detail the State of California programs to manage risk and improve levees in the Delta. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for more information about the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
583-4	Southern California wastes an enormous amount of water on green lawns and pumping water over the mountains to Los Angeles wastes an enormous amount of electricity. Desal plants in Southern California would use a lot less electricity, could supply water dependably, and exports from the Delta could be reduced or eliminated. Likewise with water reuse and recycling. These solutions must be part of a revised EIR.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
584-1	I have lived in the same house in Discovery Bay since 1982. I have had many boats, including a 32 foot Challenger sailboat, a 38 foot Holiday Mansion houseboat, a 21 foot Boston Whaler, several smaller sailboats, and a paddle boat. I sailed San Francisco Bay for twenty years. I've seen changes in the Delta, including channels and bays getting silted up and the clarity of the water decreasing. We now have aquatic weeds taking over the Delta. The fish are going down hill.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding aquatic species in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources.
584-2	The Delta is in trouble. Please pay attention and put forward alternatives that will reduce the reliance of Southern California on imported Delta water. Exports are the main driver of the Delta's decline. The USEPA has said so; The Delta Plan says so; we see it with our own eyes. What more evidence do you need?	Please refer to EIR Chapter 1, Introduction, for an overview of the complex issues affecting the Delta and the State Water Project which include environmental conditions such as climate change, levee conditions, invasive species and water management. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.
584-3	The 2013 Delta Reform Act mandated that future actions of the state must "reduce reliance on the Delta" as a source of exported water. I don't understand why the only alternatives in your EIR are to build a tunnel under the Delta that does nothing to reduce exports. Please obey the law and go back to the drawing board and include several "reduced reliance" alternatives in your EIR.	Please see response to comment 584-2 regarding the range of alternatives and why alternatives to reduce or eliminate exports do not meet the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to the Delta Reform Act.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
584-4	No one is going to believe that a tunnel under the Delta is the only feasible way to improve reliability of the water system and deal with salinity coming into the Delta from failed levees in an earthquake or sea level rise [See comments 5 through 9].	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
584-5	First off, fix the levees. It is impossible to believe you can't figure that out.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how repairing levees would not meet most of the basic project objectives. However, the Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs regarding DWR's levee management efforts in the Delta.
584-6	Next, do a better job of timing your siphoning off of water and put in a better fish protection system at the existing pumps. If you can spend $16,000,000,000 to build a tunnel, surely you can afford $10 or $20 or even a $100 million dollars to build new forebays and better fish diversions.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how various other suggested alternatives would not meet most of the basic project objectives, including alternatives that would screen the existing diversion facilities and/or construction of new reservoirs. The Delta Conveyance Project's dual conveyance would allow for SWP operational flexibility to avoid impacts on fish species at the existing SWP pumps during times when sensitive species are present in the southern Delta. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs and financing.
584-7	What about bubblers?	Bubble barriers are a potential solution to reduce fish entrainment in Delta pumps at certain location under specific conditions; however, they would not be considered an alternative to the proposed project because they would not meet most of the basic project objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how various other suggested alternatives would not meet most project objectives.
584-8	What about changing the way the water flows near Clifton Court so the fish will be shunted off to the side? Why haven't you commissioned a study to look at how this might be fixed?	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding potential strategies at Clifton Court Forebay. These efforts would be separate from the Delta Conveyance Project as changes at Clifton Court would not meet most of the basic project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
584-9	I bet if you offered a $100,000 prize for the best science idea to all the graduate schools in California some bright student would come up with an idea you haven't thought of. Then you could study it in detail.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
584-10	Regardless, we need a serious study of how to reduce fish deaths without moving the intakes up north. Maybe they need to be relocated within the south Delta, but they need to stay in the south Delta because Sacramento River water has to flow through the Delta to nourish the sloughs and push back the salt water from the Bay.	The proposed project and alternatives are all dual conveyance alternatives that propose prioritizing use of the south Delta SWP facilities for water supply exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be used during excess flow conditions and to improve SWP operational efficiency and flexibility. Current operational criteria as presented in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, are incorporated into project operations and all applicable Delta regulatory requirements would continue to be met as required by state and federal law. Moving the existing intakes to another location in the south Delta would not meet most of the basic project objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how various other suggested alternatives would not meet most project objectives.
584-11	We need a serious EIR that looks at real alternatives, not an afterthought to justify a tunnel that has already been decided.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, potentially certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
585-1	I bought my first house in Discovery Bay in 1976. I have a Malibu Sunsetter, twenty-one feet. I boat on Twin Sloughs, Victoria South Canal, down to Stockton, over to Moore's Riverboat, Guisti's on the North Fork of the Mokelumne River, and many other spots on the Delta. My two kids and three of my grandkids were raised on the Delta.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
585-2	Changing the whole dynamic of the Delta is a drastic step. All kinds of terrible consequences are possible. To change the way water flows through an entire ecosystem and predict with certainty the outcome is beyond human capacity. It doesn't make sense when there is no intended possible benefit to the Delta ecosystem.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As stated in Chapter 5, long-term average flows are expected to be similar to existing conditions, contrary to the comment assertion that the project would change the dynamic of the Delta. Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, discloses the limitations of the modeling tools used for the analysis. Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, regarding the use of appropriate modeling tools for the purposes of the CEQA analysis. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the appropriate scope of project objectives, which include an objective to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta and the consideration of other project objectives such as restoring the Delta ecosystem.
585-3	After many years of Delta decline the legislature passed the Delta Reform Act in 2009. It says the main points for Delta projects are to reduce reliance on the Delta for exported water and to fix the Delta ecosystem. The Tunnel Project does neither. Perhaps if you had a plan to do the Delta some good, drastic changes could be considered. But just to send more water south, no way.	Please see Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, for a discussion of the Delta Reform Act's coequal goals and how the practical effect of many of the proposed mitigation measures and environmental commitments cited in the EIR would protect Delta values. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship between the Delta Conveyance Project and the Delta Reform Act, including information on the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
585-4	Please try again and be guided by the Delta Reform Act with a better plan to improve the water quality in the Delta. We need more alternatives than a tunnel. You can do better. The public you serve deserves it.	Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the relationship of the Delta Conveyance Project with Delta Reform Act. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of feasible alternatives considered in the EIR.
586-1	Delta tunnel EIR comments please take these comments on the EIR as they are intended: to help you do better. Sometimes straight talk is best and you need to hear that this EIR is a failure. It needs to be done over. Here's why: we need to clean up the delta, get the water clear, clean up the weeds, and get the water flowing like it should. Your EIR does nothing to fix any of these problems. it sticks in my craw that you are spending $16,000,000,000 of the public's money and doing nothing to help the delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding costs to water users, taxpayers, and rate increases for water agency customers using project water.
586-2	I know you want to send more water to Los Angeles. You want to be ready for an earthquake, which might collapse the levees and send salt water to the pumps, and you want to stop sucking so many fish the wrong way down old river to get chopped up in your pumps. But, a tunnel is the only way to fix these problems? Really? You spent how many hundreds of millions of dollars preparing this EIR since the BDCP and the Waterfix, and now this, and you have only one idea? Please do it over and put forward some real solutions that do not include a tunnel.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies.
587-1	I have been enjoying the Delta for about ten years. I purchased a houseboat and kept it in the Discovery Bay Marina and used it every weekend. Then we moved up here full time, and now I have two boats behind my house at mv own dock. We cruise to the Rusty Porthole, The Sugar Barge, The Tiki Lagoon. Moores Riverboat, Windmill cove, Korths Pirates Lair, the San Joaquin Yacht Club and points in between.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
587-2	When we first started to come to Discovery Bay, we used to swim in the Marina. Now the water is disgusting and I wouldn't swim in it. There have been algae blooms behind my house every year for at least the last three years. I saw that the Tunnel Project will increase residence time but that you don't think that this will be a problem because the algae doesn't bloom in June. Not so. I can tell you that there are algae blooms in June in sand Bay behind mv house. This is an impact you haven’t adequately considered or mitigated.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of project impacts related to growth of harmful algal blooms are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 9, Water Quality, potential impacts related to cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (CHABs) resulting from the operation of the project would be less than significant without mitigation because the frequency and magnitude of CHABs are not expected to increase substantially, if at all, compared to existing conditions.
587-3	More to the point you include no alternatives that will help the Delta ecosystem. Increasing exports to southern California is the only consideration. But when I go to Southern California, I see green lawns everywhere and sprinklers running until water spills over and runs down the street. You have to ruin the Delta to a encourage this kind of disgusting behavior? Please include alternatives that obey the Delta Reform Act: reduce reliance on exported Delta water and restore the Delta ecosystem. lt isn't that hard to come up with ideas that make the water system more reliable, mitigate earthquake risk and deal with sea level rise, that aren't a tunnel.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR and the consideration of alternatives that would reduce or eliminate exports from the Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project would be one component of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California’s water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) recognizes and will fully comply with applicable obligations under the Delta Reform Act; refer to Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding consistency with the Delta Reform Act.
587-4	For one, desal plants in Southern California can replace Delta water and at lower cost This leaves more water to flow through the Della and push back salt water. And fix the levees for God's sake. That isn't too hard to figure out. You can do a better job of screening out fish so they don't get chopped up in the pumps. The fish facilities at your Tracy plant are very primitive. At least study a more advanced wav to filter out the fish without killing them. it can't be that hard. At least try.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR, and discussion of why levee repair and desalination would not meet most of the basic project objectives. Desalination and replacing fish screens at Tracy would not achieve most of the basic project objectives because these actions would not improve climate change, seismic and water supply resiliency for SWP Delta facilities, therefore these actions were not considered for further review in the EIR. That these measures were not included as Delta Conveyance Project alternatives does not preclude considering them as separate projects at a later time. Such strategies are included in the California Water Resilience Portfolio, which also identifies the Delta Conveyance Project as one of the actions needed to modernize Delta water supply infrastructure.
595-1	I am writing to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
595-2	The DCA advocates tunnel project as a remedy to the structural integrity of our levee system due to aging and rising sea level.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The proposed tunnel project will not remedy the said concerns. This is a poor matching of the needs and the remedy.	and its background, particularly the sections titled Climate Change and Delta Levee Risks, which detail the State of California programs to manage risk and improve levees in the Delta. Please also see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
595-3	In the name of protecting the people and the properties of the Delta, DWR should allocate resources to bring our levee system up to FEMA 100-year protection standard. This will directly benefit the Delta without any controversy. It will certainly cost far less than construction of a 50-mile tunnel, 120 ft under the surface.	Please see response to comment 595-2 for details on programs to manage risk and improve levees in the Delta. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel and fixing the levees.
595-4	I urge DWR to fulfill the immediate duty of your department which is to protect lives and properties of the people. The tunnel does not create any more supply of water. It will make more sense to use our resources to create more supply of water instead of spending tens of billions of dollars just to sacrifice one community for the benefit of another community.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives and DWR's role as lead agency under CEQA. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the alternatives considered but eliminated, including no tunnel. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
595-5	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	This information provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. The contact information provided by the commenter has been added to the project email list as requested.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
598-1	Instead of a tunnel whose main function is to obscure problematic water transfers, Bendway weirs should be constructed to preserve the Delta and replenish beaches which will be more in need as sea level rises due to global warming.	The purpose and objective of the project is described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives. Contrary to the suggestion of the comment, the purpose and project objectives as described in Chapter 2 are not related to facilitating water transfers. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives considered for the analysis and how alternatives were screened for consideration in the EIR. The suggested weirs were not considered as alternatives to the proposed project because they would not improve water supply reliability, climate change and seismic resiliency or operational flexibility of the SWP Delta conveyance facilities, all stated project objectives.
598-2	Funding for any project should be secure and China, whose premier would find local infrastructure meets his criteria for capitalism disruption, should be banned from bond purchases.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding funding for the project.
598-3	Also be warned that funding from the 'Zones of Benefit' which taxes urban Bakersfield for water purchases which are then transferred for rural use are a risk. Because of the violation of Prop 218, this funding could be readily terminated.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Please see response to comment 598-2 regarding funding for the Delta Conveyance Project.
598-4	In the 1930's, urban Bakersfield's waste water was transferred to a sewer farm which is Still operating. Dependence on a snow pack, which is water evaporated from the ocean, is relying on a varying climate and oscillation.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
598-5	More assured would be desalination of sea water for urban use and the resulting waste water transferred to the Central Valley for agricultural and aquifer recharge use.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding why desalination and other suggested alternatives would not meet project objectives. Desalination was not considered an alternative to the proposed project for the same reasons stated for response to comment 598-1. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
598-6	A refocus from north to south transfers as a sole source to an inclusion of urban to rural waste water use would provide a predictable and consistent water supply.	Please see response to comment 598-5 regarding how alternatives do not preclude other actions. Wastewater reuse was not considered an alternative to the proposed project for the same reasons stated in response to comment 598-1.
600-1	Dear Department of Water Resources: I am writing to submit comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project (Delta Tunnel).	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
600-2	The Department of Water Resources (DWR) has been actively pursuing unsustainable isolated, water conveyance infrastructure that would remove freshwater flows from the Delta for the benefit of other parts of the state since the 1980s. The Delta Tunnel is the latest iteration, however, many of the impacts that plagued previous versions (the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and California WaterFix) are still present in the Delta Tunnel.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
600-3	The DEIR is inadequate and fails to inform the public of the true extent of the environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).	Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR and are summarized in tabular form in the Executive Summary. Please also see Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding DWR's efforts to engage with the public about the project.
600-4	I understand that the state faces a difficult task in combating the current water crisis. However, the Delta Tunnel would create a sacrifice zone in the Delta region from the social, economic , and environmental impacts of the project.	The EIR evaluates the physical environmental impacts for the purposes of CEQA throughout the EIR (e.g., Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10). In addition, environmental justice effects and socioeconomics impacts are disclosed in Chapters 29 and 17, respectively. These chapters generally identify that many physical environmental impacts are less than significant or would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Please see response to comment 600-3 regarding potential environmental impacts of the project and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		proposed mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding the evaluation and disclosure of relatively minor changes to community character and economic effects of the project. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
600-5	The DEIR fails to analyze the many significant impacts associated with building and operating a system capable of removing up to 6,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Sacramento River. Removing about one-third to one-half of the average flow of the river would increase salinity as well as increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms (HABs), among other water quality impacts. These and other impacts would reduce water supply reliability for the Delta region. Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts would magically be less than significant.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts.
600-6	Additionally, the DEIR does not adequately analyze and mitigate the impacts on Delta communities. The project would destroy nearly 3,800 acres of highly productive Delta farmland, which currently helps feed the people of California. A so-called "Community Benefits Program" cannot address the very real impacts to residents during and after construction. This is unacceptable given the extensive and lasting impacts the project would have on the quality of life in the region. For example, criteria and toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, as a result of project construction, endangering the health of Delta residents. Additionally, many Delta residents would be exposed	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, conversion of agricultural land would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Mitigation Measure AG-1 would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible; however, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impact AG-3 was found to be less than significant with mitigation. As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, most of the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would reduce the extent of Impact AQ-5; however, Impact AQ-5 could still result in significant and unavoidable impacts. As described in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, while most impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, there is potential for significant and unavoidable impacts associated with noise.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	to years of construction noise, further d grading their quality of life.	Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the community benefits program and implementation, and how the effects on Delta communities are considered in the socioeconomic analysis.
600-7	I urge DWR to abandon the Delta Tunnel in favor of other projects that can meet water supply needs without destroying the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives evaluated and the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
600-8	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	This information provides general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. The contact information provided by the commenter has been added to the project email list as requested. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
601-1	Please find my comments on the Delta Water Conveyance EIR/EIS attached to this e-mail and confirm receipt by e-mail.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
601-2	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIR/EIS for the proposed Delta Conveyance	This comment presents introductory information and information characterizing the project from the perspective of the commenter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The object of a Delta Conveyance is to increase the ability of Delta users to capture as much of the high flows that are over required amounts and consistent with the State Policy of "Big Gulp, Little Sip" with Improvements to accomplish this to be paid for by the beneficiaries.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding operations of the Delta Conveyance Project, including how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring).
601-3	In addition. the State should undertake and pay for overall improvements to the Delta that protect the structural integrity of the West Delta, decrease the large amount of Methane being released there, protect the Highways, Electrical Transmission lines and Gas Storage currently existing in the West Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
601-4	The current EIR/EIS option #5 proposes a 42-mile single Tunnel to capture excess high flows with two intakes located on the East side of the Sacramento River opposite Courtland. Other alternatives are also included with alignments more through the center of the Delta but with the same point for the intakes. Absent is an alternative for a Western Delta which I am including along with arguments for its consideration and requesting a full study be included in the Final EIR/EIS without which the EIR/EIS should be considered deficient.	A western Delta alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA lead agencies develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of feasible alternatives; An EIR should include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		alternatives to the proposed project. The project's purpose and objectives are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, explains how diversion alternatives located in the western Delta were screened from further review in the EIR. In general diversion points farther west were judged to not meet the seismic, climate and water supply resiliency project objects. Please refer to the description of screening criteria and the screening analysis for multiple alternatives in Appendix 3A.
601-5	The proposed West Side approach would begin as with the current Option #5 at Bethany Reservoir, with a single tunnel that could accommodate up to 7500 CFS which passes to the south and east of Clifton Court, then heads north passing to the east of the Discovery Bay Community, continues to head North until after crossing under the EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utility District] Mokelumne aqueducts, turns northwest and heads across Jersey Island and then under the San Joaquin River across Sherman Island to a point along the Sacramento River West of Decker Island. The Ox Bow (Old River channel around the southerly part of Decker Island would be used as a pumping forebay with fish screens along the north side of Sherman Island. (In the alternative the Ox Bow could be sealed off while a fish friendly intake system could be installed in it then reopened to the river). The presence of major transmission lines proximate to the location of the pumping plant should reduce the cost to access power to operate the facility. Advantages: 1. The tunnel that is approximately 20 miles in length is less than half the length of the proposed Alt # 5 and/or the other alternatives being considered and should lower the cost about	Please refer to response to comment 601-4 regarding the process of screening and selecting alternatives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	40% making the project more affordable and thereby attracting more funding participants. 2. A significant portion of the route is under land that is currently publicly owned either by the State of by Iron House Sanitary. 3. Electrical transmission power is proximate to the location of the pumping plant. 4. The presence of the Montezuma Hills on the North side of the Sacramento River and the more robust Federally maintained levees on the South side will focus the flow of this wide section of the Sacramento River even with higher water levels. 5. The site is downstream of the Sacramento Bypass so can access the full flow of the river without impeding flow in the narrower part of the river in Option #5 and other options being considered thereby lowering flood risk to the communities above the proposed intakes. 6. Water quality during the higher flow events when the facility is to be used is good and better than the current location at Clifton Court. This better water quality is especially better if the intakes take water from the upper part of the river flow minimizing salt wedge incursion. 7. The proposed site is out of the area covered by the North Delta Agreement so should have less obstacles in order to construct and operate. 8. The intakes location self-limits use during periods of low flow as water quality during those periods is poor enough to preclude use. 9. The intakes are further removed from major sanitary discharges. The intakes in the EIR/EIS are very close to the large discharge of the Sacramento Regional Sewer Plant.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Recommended enhancements to the West Side approach to be undertaken and paid for by the State. 1. An additional tunnel segment be constructed across the Sacramento River to the Montezuma Hills to enable conveyors to be installed to bring material mined from the Hills to provide a suitable building site for the pumping plant, stronger setback levees around Sherman Island, a protective corridor across Sherman Island for the existing power lies and the tunnel, and an elevated and wider roadway for State Route 160. 2. An additional tunnel under the San Joaquin River to be able to extend a conveyer to Jersey Island for similar purposes. Once these two Islands are protected sufficiently, solar facilities can be installed to help power the conveyer systems and existing Ag could be converted to habitat that promotes wildlife, slows of reverses subsidence, and reduces methane releases. The cost to protect these two islands by barging in material would be prohibitive and unless new and stronger bridges are constructed the sheer weight of the material would preclude trucking it in. Absent the protection of the west Delta islands, a substantial portion of the existing primary Delta will become an inland saltwater sea which will preclude freshwater movement across the Delta to the existing pumps, most agriculture other than fish farms, threaten to existing electrical transmission, gas storage, transportation and currently inhabited areas such as Discovery Bay and parts of Stockton.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	If in later years it appears that the Delta is in eminent failure, the current tunnel system can be extended to either the existing Sacramento Ship canal or further North under the Sacramento Bypass.	
602-1	Note: In the past, there have been occasions where DWR staff claimed PorgansIAssociates did not file comments in a timely manner. We will try to telephone DWR's staff to also confirm our comments have been received. Fine [sic] name: Synopsis of Patrick Porgans Delta Conveyance Project EIR	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, or clarification on the submittal of the comment letter. The Department of Water Resources is committed to working with all interested parties. Confirmation emails were sent automatically to all senders upon receipt of emailed comments during the public review period for the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR.
602-2	Patrick PorgansIAssociates comments submitted on behalf of our clients PROJECT Objectives: DWR's Proposed Delta Conveyance Project - Protect the ability of the SWP to reliably deliver water [Refer to Porgans Comment 1] - Provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta [Porgans Comments 2] - Address the effects of sea level rise and climate change [Refer to Porgans Comment 3] "What is the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Conveyance Project?" Synopsis of Patrick Porgans-Solutionist, PorgansIAssociates (PIA), and Planetary Solutionaries Response to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Draft ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE DELTA CONVEYANCE Project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. [hyperlink: https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/conveyance] Please be advised that there are some redundancies in the following comments, which were necessary to maintain continuity of thought.	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
602-3	Protect the ability of the SWP to reliably deliver water [Refer to Porgans Comment 1] The Department of Water Resources (DWR) has had 62-years to protect the ability of the SWP to reliably deliver water, which, due to its inherent conflict of interests as a water purveyor and public trustee, it has failed to do so. The Unresolved Issue – DWR had 62 Year to "Fix" the Bay-Delta Estuary – and has Failed The Bay-Delta Estuary is the largest remaining estuary on the west coast of the Americas, and essentially is being studied to death. While DWR asserts that it intends to conduct a thorough environmental assessment to mitigate the impacts of the proposed alternative Project, to date, it has failed to adequately address, assess, and mitigate the impacts attributable to the management and operation of the SWP!	CEQA does not require analysis of or mitigation for existing conditions; nor does it require the lead agency to restore the ecosystem. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information which details how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purposes of the project, one of which is to enhance reliability of the water delivery systems. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please see Chapters 7–32 regarding analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources, including those located in the Delta. Please refer to Common Response 17, Public Trust, regarding resources in the context of the public trust.
602-4	Background: Patrick Porgans, PorgansIAssociates (PIA) spent the past 45 years conducting extensive fact-finding forensic reports covering all aspect of the State Water Project. In PIAs series of reports, it revealed that fact that the SWP was not paying-for-itself promised to the voters back in November 1960. Furthermore, the data indicate that the SWP was knowing underfinanced and consummated water contracts for more water than the SWP can provide. Those inherent shortcomings have been at the core of California's water wars. To make up for those deficits, DWR officials resorted to stealing water from the Delta, causing irreparable harm to Delta farmers, and all other life forms that depend upon it for survival. Also, DWR and the SWP have supported the issuance of billions of dollars in General Obligation bonds, portions of	The comment includes assertions related to the State Water Project. No specific comment is raised on the Delta Conveyance Project specifically. While the Delta Conveyance Project would be implemented to restore and protect the reliability of the State Water Project, it is a wholly separate project for the purposes of CEQA. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	those funds have been used to fund projects, plans, mitigation costs, and funds to increase water supply reliability. Expenditures of bond funds for such purposes appear to be inconsistent with the SWP enabling legislation and the language contained in the SWP Water Supply Contracts. Funds for such expenditures are classified as reimbursable and are the responsibility of the SWP contractors to repay, not the public. The DWR officials allege that the SWP supplies water to 27 million Californians, that assertion is misleading, as the SWP provides about four (4) percent of the State's annual water needs. DWR officials claim that more than 27 million Californians rely on the State Water Project [hyperlink: https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project] [for] their water supply.^1 [Footnote 1: State Water Project https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project] That claim is dubious at best and misleading, as the SWP only provide about four (4) percent of the state's annual water needs!	regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
602-5	Exhibit 1: California Water Supply Systems Sources	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
602-6	In February 2020, PIA [PorgansIAssociates] submitted comments on DWR NOP for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Our position has remained the same. Simply stated, it would be redundant to repeat our previous comments; refer to your records. [Footnote 2: PorgansIAssociates' comments to the Department of Water Resources, Comments submitted to [author name] via e-mail to [author email] Date: Friday, 20 March 2020 Note: PLEASE CONFIRM RECIEPT OF THIS E-MAIL VIA E-MAIL] Also, neither time nor resources permit us to	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, and directs DWR to review the commenter's letters sent in during the scoping period in 2020 which are identified as letter number 428 and 602 in Appendix 1A, July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and Addenda. These comments were reviewed in 2020 and the issues raised were included in the project's 2020 scoping summary report. DWR reviewed the commenter's scoping comments and included the below responses related to the topics in their scoping comment letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	respond to all the deficiencies and inherent shortcomings in the draft EIR.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process. Please refer to Common Response 1 regarding the appropriate use of the baseline for the purposes of the CEQA analysis. Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5–32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
602-7	Furthermore, it is difficult to comment on the proposed impacts attributable to DWR's current undertaking, because, based on DWR's deplorable track-record, PIA [PorgansIAssociates] CANNOT place credence in how DWR officials propose to mitigate for future impacts associated with the latest re-branded rendition of the "Delta fix" when its historical operation of the State Water Project (SWP) is the primary cause of the imperiled state of the San Francisco Bay Estuary and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Bay-Delta Estuary). Public records attest to the simple fact, that the deplorable conditions of the Bay-Delta Estuary are the direct result of a myriad of broken promises espoused by DWR officials over the course of the past 62 years.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws and the CEQA baseline for the purposes of the EIR's impact analysis. Please also see Common Response 1 regarding the adequacy of the mitigation measures presented in the EIR. All mitigation measures will be implemented according to a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included with the EIR.
602-8	[Porgans Comments 2] - Provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta PROJECT: "The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is proposing the Delta Conveyance Project to modernize the SWP water transport infrastructure in the Delta to restore and protect the reliability of this important state water supply." [Emphasis added] The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is pursuing an environmental review to evaluate a single tunnel option to modernized Delta Conveyance under the California environmental Quality Act (CEQA)...potential project effects and mitigation measures, and possible alternatives to the proposed project. [Footnote 3: California Department of Water Resources, Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact	The purpose of the public scoping meeting was to solicit public input on the EIR, and DWR did not attempt to provide responses in real-time. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Report for the Delta Conveyance Project, Description of Proposed Project Facilities, 15 January 2020, p. 2.] [Emphasis added] In 1959, the State Legislature enacted the California Water Resources Development Bond Act to finance construction of the State Water Resources Development System. The bond act was approved by California electorate in November 1960. The State Water Facilities, the initial features of the system, will complement continuing local and federal water development programs including the very necessary works [hyperlink: https://www.bing.com/search?q=California+Water+Resources+Development+Bond+Act+of+November+1960&form=IENTHT&pc=UF02&mkt=en-us&httpsmsn=1&msnews=1&refig=5854faefcc7a4ba78c14deb3002bd22b&sp=-1&pq=california+water+resources+development+bond+act+of+november+1&sc=0-61&qs=n&sk=&cvid=5854faefcc7a4ba78c14deb3002bd22b] in the Delta.^4 [Footnote 4: 1960-surplus water only - California State Water Resources … [hyperlink: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/SHR/SHR-255.pdf] https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california…] At DWR's February 2020 NOP public outreach session, Patrick Porgans, PorgansIAssociates (PIA) asked DWR personnel to point out the existing Delta conveyance system that it proposed to modernize. They appeared somewhat perplexed	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and disoriented and could not identify the presence of the existing Delta conveyance system, because it does not exist!	
602-9	Conveyance | Definition of Conveyance by Lexico The action or process of transporting someone or something from one place to another. [Footnote 5: Conveyance | Definition of Conveyance by Lexico https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/conveyance The action or process of transporting someone or something from one place to another.] If DWR officials are cognizant of the history of the SWP and are familiar with the enabling legislation, they would have to concede that their proposal to upgrade the existing Delta conveyance system, is a misnomer. Since 1960, the DWR has been under a legislative and voter mandate to construct, maintain and operate a Delta conveyance system to move water across the Delta to the Banks Pumping Plant in the south Delta. The Delta Conveyance system was identified, authorized, and funded via the California Water Resources Development Bond Act, approved by the voters in November 1960, and is codified in the California Water Code, section 12934(d)(3) as Delta Master Levees. [Footnote 6: https://california.public.law/codes/ca_water_code_section_12934 Master levees, control structures, channel improvements, and appurtenant facilities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water conservation, water supply in the Delta, transfer of water across the Delta, flood and salinity control, and related functions.]	The assertions of the comment that the Delta Conveyance Project is knowingly underfinanced and the SWP is contractually overcommitted are not consistent with the information in the EIR and the comment does not provide evidence to support the claims. The Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) conducts engineering and design work to inform DWR's environmental review and planning process of a proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Members of the DCA Board of Directors are elected from participating public water agencies throughout the state of California that receive water from the State Water Project. Board meetings are public and include information regarding the finances of the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please also see Chapter 1, Introduction, for background on the project including prior and current Delta conveyance planning efforts. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project and/or is beyond the scope of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Public records document the fact that DWR and the State Legislature opted to delay construction of this vital component of the SWP and rerouted the funds for this crucial conveyance link to make-up for other features of the knowingly underfinanced and contractually overcommitted SWP.	
602-10	Regarding DWR's alleged concerns about levee failure due to earthquakes[.] Although DWR failed to construct the Master Levees, it has conveyed and exported hundreds-of-millions of acre-feet of water across the Delta, causing irreparable damages to privately own and maintained levees, and is responsible for bringing the San Francisco Bay Estuary and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Bay-Delta Estuary) to the brink of a catastrophic ecological collapse and causing the death of millions [of] aquatic species already listed on the Endangered Species Act. Had DWR officials shown real concern they would have built the authorized Master Levees. Since the year 2000, several General Obligation bonds were approved by the voters, that included significant sums of money to improve levees; unfortunately, DWR has been slow in allocating funds for levee improvements. It is important to note, 75 percent of the Delta levees are privately owned and maintained. PorgansIAssociates [PIA] conducted a series of fact-finding reports in the late 1980s and early 1990s, at the request of Delta farmers and reclamation districts. Those reports were based on government documents that proved DWR transfer of water across the Delta caused significant damage, including levee breaks. PIA[']s reports were presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Water that resulted in a series of hearing in 1993-1994. The data contained in the reports	DWR does not own or maintain all levees in the Delta. DWR is involved in multiple programs and funding opportunities aimed at maintaining levees that are independent of the Delta Conveyance Project. These programs include grant funding to levee maintaining agencies, working with local governments, and other initiatives to maintain and improve the levees that protect the Delta. Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for a description of the State's obligations and commitments to levee maintenance or management throughout the Delta. Please also refer to the section in Chapter 7, Flood Protection, titled Regional Planning Efforts Related to Delta Flood Management for a discussion of levee programs that DWR manages that are critical to Delta flood risk management, including levee maintenance and improvements. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the basis for the project objectives and objective performance associated with seismic reliability. As described in Common Response 1 and Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of the State Water Project, and potentially, the Central Valley Project. The remaining portion of the comment related to Master Levees and fact-finding reports prepared by Porgans Associates in the 1980s and 1990s are outside the scope of the Delta Conveyance Project environmental review process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	proved that contrary to government rhetoric, the SWP was not paying-for-itself as promised. In fact, it was heavily subsidized with money earned off the publicly owned tideland oil reserves and money from the state's General Fund. In unison with Delta landowners, the Senate Committee, PIA was influential in getting DWR to repay $500 million back to the State, $120 million went to improve the private levees, damaged by DWRs transport of water across the Delta. Tim Wilson, a Delta farmer, told PIA had it not been for those funds, the Town of Walnut Grove and Isleton would have been devastated by the 1997 flood.	
602-11	Delta Conveyance Project -- Just Another Re-Branded Rendition of a Myriad of Failed Plans DWR's latest "one-tunnel alternative" is just the latest rendition of a myriad of failed attempts to suck more water from the Delta to keep the SWP financially afloat. It is important to note, that DWR had 62-years to provide the Delta protection, which has cost California's more than $13 billion in borrowed money to fund a plethora of studies and programs purportedly to protect the Delta and double salmon and pelagic species. The federal and state program to double anadromous fisheries failed, the latest trawl failed to find even one Delta smelt, the $6.5 billion CALFED plan failed, a fact that was confirmed by its former executive officer, Joe Grindstaff, in his testimony before the Little Hoover Commission. DWR's decision not to construct the authorized Delta conveyance system, placed the residents, farmers, businesses, and the Bay-Delta Estuary, at an unacceptable level of risk, from liquefaction, earthquakes, subsidence, flooding, and other forces contributing to levee failures. Therefore, DWR's	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, and Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to increase deliveries during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements. The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5 through 32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	objective to ensure the protection of levee failure from an earthquake is disingenuous.	
602-12	The DWR'S abysmal historical performance and track-record of failure to maintain and operate the California State Water Project (SWP) in accordance with applicable regional, state, and federal rules and regulations, continues to place the lives, wellbeing, and public trust resources at an unacceptable level of risk. The current proposed one-tunnel project is but another version of a litany of revamped projects that have been morphed for the past 60 years. From DWR's initial failure to provide the necessary Delta Master Levees, its failed attempt in 1982 to obtain voter approval of the Peripheral Canal, the 1994 Bay Delta Accord (Voluntary agreement consummated behind closed doors), the 2009 BDCP, CALFED $6.5 billion debacle, Delta Vision, the failed dual conveyance canals, the California Water "Fix" (Delta twin tunnels), and the presently proposed one-tunnel Delta vision. The DWR's abysmal track-record raises the legitimate question as to what level of confidence the public can place in anything that DWR officials espouse. Patrick PorgansIAssociates (PIA) was an active participant and respondent on all the proposed projects. PIA attended countless meetings and submitted endless reams of written comments providing documentation as to why each of those "alternative" proposals/plans were doomed to fail. In the process, like so many other participants, PIA had to and inordinate amount of time, years of our lives, and an immeasurable sum of our own funds to participate in the process. While DWR and SWP contractors paid a portion of the cost for these endless studies and ineffective plans and programs, a portion of the billions-of-dollars expended have	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from the projects raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. As alluded to by the commenter, numerous efforts have been made to address water supply, climate change, seismic risk, and regulatory challenges to the Delta and improve existing conveyance facilities. These efforts are described in detail in the Chapter 1 section titled Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts. Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, provides a description of the Delta Conveyance Project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's commitment to operating the State Water Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see response to comment 602-10 regarding the State's obligations or commitments to levee maintenance or management throughout the Delta. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding sources. Please see Common Response 17, Public Trust, regarding the EIR's analysis of public trust resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	and will continued to be paid for by Californians from the state's General Fund.	
602-13	Address the effects of sea level rise and climate change Synopsis: PorgansIAssociates (PIA) Identified the Pending Threat Posed by the Inevitability of an aRkStorm-Megaflood Event Occurring in the Feather River Watershed. Climatologists claim, It Is Only a Matter of When! Documentation contained in PIAs fact-finding forensic report indicate that climate change has the real potential to destroy the tunnel during and after its construction. Since the mid-1970s, PIA conducted a series of Forensic Fact-Finding Reports within the Feather River Watershed (FRW), identifying natural and government-induced forces and factors that led up to the 1980, 1986, 1997, and the 2017 flood events, and identified flood damages sustained by property owners downstream from Oroville Dam. In 1985, PIA instituted a Reservoir Watch Program within the FRW monitoring the California Department of Water Resources (DWRs) compliance with federal and state laws and regulations germane to the operational criteria of the State Water Project's (SWP's) Oroville flood control facilities. The cost for the Flood Control Facilities is paid for by the taxpayers, it is not a cost funded by State Water Project contractors. PIA conducted a forensic assessment of DWRs responsibilities and performance to ensure that the downstream levee system is properly maintained to pass the permissible floodwater releases from the reservoir. Oroville Dam has two major outlets for floodwater releases, they are the Flood Control	Chapter 30, Climate Change, addresses the potential impacts associated with climate change, including aRkStorms. Additionally, Chapter 7, Flood Protection, and Appendix 7A, Flood Protection 2040/2072 Analysis, describe that the proposed project would involve no change in flood management operations in the SWP/CVP system, based on the 2-D steady-state Sacramento River system Hydrologic Engineering Center River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) analysis, which incorporates climate change effects. Permanent project features would also be designed to accommodate the 200-year flood event with climate change–induced hydrology and sea level rise for year 2100, as described in Chapter 30.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Spillway Outlet Chute, maximum release is 250,000 cubic feet per second (cfs), and when the reservoir reaches an elevation above 894 feet, floodwater flows over the Emergency Spillway, have a combine release of 646,000 cfs, which exceeds the downstream channel capacity, just above the confluence of the Yuba River, by more than 400,000 cfs! [Footnote 7: Department of the Army, Sacramento District, Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, California, Oroville Dam and Reservoir, Feather River, California, Report on Reservoir Regulation for Flood Control, August 1970.] To put this floodwater release in perspective, the average flow of the Mississippi River's discharge into the Gulf of Mexico is around 530,000 CFS. The total carrying capacity of the Sacramento Flood Control System is 600,000 cfs! The 1997 floods exceeded the System's carrying capacity, as the maximum release from Oroville Reservoir was only 301,000 cfs. Although the Oroville Reservoir has a storage capacity of more than 3.5 million acre-feet of water, only 750,000 cfs is designated for flood storage during the rainy season. The maximum annual recorded runoff in the upper Feather River Watershed was nine (9) million acre-feet during the 1907 flood. That is almost three times as much as the reservoir storage capacity. [Footnote 8: Department of the Army, Sacramento District, Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, California, Oroville Dam and Reservoir, Feather River, California, Report on Reservoir Regulation for Flood Control, Historical Floods, Feather River at Oroville, 1904, 9.33 million Acre-Feet of Water, August 1970, page 11.] "Normal annual precipitation over Feather River Basin varies greatly as illustrated on chart 5, ranging from about 15 inches on the portion of the basin draining the eastern slopes of the Sierra	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Nevada to close to 90 inches over the higher ridges on the western slopes near the headwaters west Branch and North Fork of Feather River." [Footnote 9: Ibid., p. 6.] (Note: Chart is in the Flood Control Manual.) PIA was retained by property owners and law firms in every major lawsuit resulting from floodwater releases from the State Water Project's (SWPs) Oroville Dam and Reservoirs flood control facilities. In each case, plaintiffs won. Earlier this year, PIA released an article, entitled, Oroville Dam: Viable Flood Protection or a Catastrophic Disaster Waiting to Happen? [Footnote 10: Patrick Porgans-Solutionist, Oroville Dam: Viable Flood Protection or a Catastrophic Disaster Waiting to Happen? Feb 13, 2022, 1:39pm PST by Dan Bacher, Investigative Reporter. Oroville Dam: Viable Flood Protection or a Catastrophic Disaster Waiting to Happen? (dailykos.com)] [hyperlink:m.dailykos.com/stories/2022/2/13/2080160/-Oroville-Dam-Viable-Flood-Protection-or-a-Catastrophic-Disaster-Waiting-to-Happen] FINDINGS: "If it [Oroville Dam] failed, it would be the worst disaster in the history of the United States."1 [hyperlink:i.berkeley.edu/california-magazine/just-in/2017-07-27/bob-bea-takes-us-deep-dive-through-his-dire-oroville-report] The SWP Oroville Dam Gated Flood Control Spillway Outlet was "Managed to Failure"2 3 [hyperlink:e.google.com/file/d/0Bz1I1mIutSEnbFJuVUJZWWNNVlU/view] PIA's article was confirmed by articles in The New York Times, [Footnote 11: The Coming California Megastorm - The New York Times] [hyperlink:w.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=07789f9f8c7b5d55JmltdHM9MTY2NTg3ODQwMCZpZ3VpZD0zNTVkODczNy0xYjI3LTY3MGItMGFlYy05Njg4MWE5NzY2N2QmaW5zaWQ9NTE3OA&ptn=3&	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	hsh=3&fclid=355d8737-1b27-670b-0aec-96881a97667d&psq=new+york+time+megaflood+california&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cubnl0aW1lcy5jb20vaW50ZXJhY3RpdmUvMjAyMi8wOC8xMi9jbGltYXRlL2NhbGlmb3JuaWEtcmFpbi1zdG9ybS5odG1s&ntb=1] Washington Post, [Footnote 12: California megadrought: Less water, hotter weather & dry climatew.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2022/08/12/megaflood-california-flood-rain-climate/] The Sacramento Bee, [Footnote 13: State at risk of flood due to global warmingw.sacbee.com/news/local/article264571831.html] CBS, and PBS. USGS report [hyperlink:s.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/of2010-1312_text.pdf] warns flood control system will not withstand floodwater resulting from an aRkStorm-Megaflood: Climate Change and aRkStorm forecast havoc on the Golden State's northeastern counties: Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Sacramento, and other counties, downstream from the SWP Oroville Dam and Reservoir facilities, within the Feather and Sacramento River watersheds. These counties are no stranger to catastrophic disasters, spurred by Climate Change, government-ineptitude, reactive policies, climaxing in devastating floods and fires. Unfortunately, billions of dollars in damages and loss of lives may only be the tip-of-the iceberg'; climaxing during "Perfect Storm." This past February marked the fifth anniversary of a near catastrophic flood disaster at the SWP's Oroville Dam and Reservoir. Cracks in the Oroville Dam Flood Control Spillway Outlet caused the concrete slab to lift requiring construction of a new $1.1 billion spillway. Shortly after it was completed	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	cracks were detected. A DWR spokesperson said, cracks were anticipated [https://www.mercurynews.com/2017/11/28/state-official-new-oroville-spillway-already-has-cracks/]. DWR's claim was promptly refuted by world-renown geotechnical forensic engineers [hyperlink:w.indeed.com/career-advice/finding-a-job/what-is-forensic-engineer] experts that conducted a series of reports regarding the spillway failure.4 As was publicized worldwide, the spillway failure resulted in lake water-levels rising and flowing over the dam's emergency spillway-- leading to massive erosion of the hillside adjacent to the Dam, creating fear of a catastrophic disaster. The Spillway failure, and lack of confidence in the performance of the emergency spillway, prompted the evacuation of 188,000 residents in several counties downstream, who were given several hours to evacuate. It is important to note, that during the spillway incident, the Feather River Watershed did not experience a Megaflood. A team of independent Forensic experts completed several reports [hyperlink:s.org/case-study/oroville-dam-california-2017/] that focused on factors that contributed to the spillway failure, documenting poor design, faulty construction, deferred maintenance, and mismanagement, by federal and state agencies, including the dam operator, the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), California Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE). [Footnote 14:s.org/case-study/oroville-dam-california-2017/] [Footnote 15: Independent Forensic Team Report Final, Summary, 5	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	January 2018, p. S-1w.ussdams.org/our-news/oroville-dam-spillway-incident-independent-forensic-team-finalreport/] While concern about Oroville Dam failure remains, a U.S. Geological Survey Report affirms catastrophic consequences of climate change and an aRkStorm, within these watersheds, will result in $725 billion in flood damages flooding the entire Central Valley, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, clear out to San Francisco Bay. The $725 billion figure comprises about $400 billion in property damage and $325 billion in business-interruption losses. An event like the aRkStorm could require the evacuation of 1,500,000 people. Because the flood depths in some areas could realistically be on the order of 10-20 feet, without effective evacuation there could be substantial loss of life. [Footnote 16: Open File Report 2010-1312 U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey USGS Open-File Report 2010-1312, text] [hyperlink:s.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/of2010-1312_text.pdf] It will also result in permanent relocation of 250,000 Californians, with the dam intact! Public record reveal DWR personnel's mismanagement of floodwater releases from the State Water Project's (SWP) Oroville Dam and failure to annually inspect downstream channel caused the disastrous February 1986 [Footnote 17: Legislative Analyst's Office, State of California, Analysis of the 2005-2006 Budget Bill, Financing Flood Lawsuit Settlement with a Judgment Bond, February 2005.w.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2005/resoures/res_13_3860_an10	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	5.htmo.ca.gov/analysis_2005/resources/res_13_3860_anl05.htm#_Toc95975089] and January 1997 floods in Butte, Sutter, and Yuba counties. DWR did not pay the more than $1 billion in property damages from those floods; payments came from the State's General Fund. [Footnote 18: Legislative Analyst's Office, State of California, Analysis of the 2005-2006 Budget Bill, Financing Flood Lawsuit Settlement with a Judgment Bond, February 2005.w.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2005/resoures/res_13_3860_an10 5.htmo.ca.gov/analysis_2005/resources/res_13_3860_anl05.htm#_Toc95975089] Impending Disaster Exist- Even if Dam remains Intact: While forensic engineering experts are concerned about the potential structural breach of the dam, PorgansIAssociates' (PIA) extensive knowledge and 40 years of active engagement monitoring the DWR's mismanagement of the Oroville Dam's flood control facilities focused on the consequences of Climate Change, aRkStorms [hyperlink:s.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/],5 and allowable floodwater releases that present a real and imminent danger to downstream residents, private property, and critical infrastructure. Extensive flooding results [hyperlink:s.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/]. In a number of events. Floodwaters in these watersheds the Sacramento River Flood Control System, which is typically designed to resist 100- to 200-year runoffs. The allowable floodwater releases from the Oroville Dam, range from 150,000 cfs to above 646,000 cfs; the spillway is designed to pass a flow of 250,000 cfs. Flood releases in excess of 250,000 cfs will trigger the impending	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	catastrophic disaster downstream, during a "Rainy Day" flood event, with the Dam intact. Floodwater releases of such magnitudes will exceed the downstream channels carrying capacities, cause massive levee failures, and overwhelm the entire Sacramento Flood Control System, designed to carry 600,000 cfs. The January 1997 New Year's Day floods exceeded the System's capacity. The February 1986 and the 1997 New Year's Day flood events involved weather conditions, rainfall and runoff characteristic of a mild version of an aRkStorm, previously described as a "Pineapple Express" [hyperlink:e.noaa.gov/facts/pineapple-express.html].8 1997 Record Flood [hyperlink:w.safca.org/about/history/]: The fifth record flood in 46 years occurs over the New Year's holiday. Unprecedented flows from rain and melted snow surge into the Feather and the San Joaquin. Sacramento is spared when the fury of the storm hits 40 miles north in the Feather River. Levee failures flood Olivehurst, Arboga, Wilton, Manteca, and Modesto. Sacramento experiences significant levee problems in the Sacramento area. Region's Flooding History – Sacramento's risk of flooding is the greatest of any major city in the country… [Footnote 19: Sacramento's risk of flooding is the greatest of any major city in the country . . . Region's Flooding History (saccounty.gov)] [hyperlink:s.saccounty.gov/stormready/Pages/Region's-Flooding-History.aspx] Over the past few decades, our area has experienced significant, sometimes devastating, flooding. The most notable	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	flooding occurred in 1986, 1995, 1997, 2006, and 2017. The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency identifies Sacramento as the nation's greatest metropolitan flood risk. [hyperlink:w.safca.org/assessments/] Recently, the DWR conducted a study to determine the consequences of allowable elevated floodwater releases from 250,000 cfs, via the recently constructed Oroville Dam's Flood Control Spillway Outlet Chute. Floodwater discharges via this spillway and the combined with floodwater discharges from the Emergency Spillway a total maximum release of 623,200 cfs. F Damages to Levees Downstream from Oroville Dam: The expert panel convened in Sacramento to discuss damages to levees for the aRkStorm scenario felt that urban levees might be threatened or overtopped at 60 to 75 critical sites, and that 15-20 breaches might realistically occur. The panel believed that 30 breaches of Delta levees were realistic, with 2-3 breaches occurring per island. The panel felt that a total of 50 levee breaches was realistic. [Footnote 20: USGS Open-File Report 2010-1312, text Page 59] [hyperlink:s.usgs.gov/of/2010/1312/of2010-1312_text.pdf] (Exhibit No. 8: USGS aRkStorm report) The State Legislature passed a law that requires dams, such as Oroville, to develop Dam Breach Inundation Maps, purportedly to depict the areas that would be flooded in the event of dam failure. The DWR opted to use the "Sunny Day Dam Breach Inundation" fair weather scenario, illustrating the area expected to be flooded. The other criterion available to the	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	DWR was to illustrate areas of inundation if the breach occurred during a "Rainy Season" flood event! Public records illustrate that major historical flood events, within the Feather River Watershed, occur during the rainy "wet" season, such as 1986 and 1997, with the dam intact! The two pictures below illustrate area inundated during a DWR "Sunny Day Dam Breach" and a USGS Rainy-Day aRkStorm with the dam intact.	
602-14	Comment No. 4: If PIA [PorgansIAssociates] had reason to believe that there was no other feasible alternative but to construct a tunnel, we would consider supporting it. However, as provided for in Porgans testimony and exhibits, prefaced entirely on government documents, before the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), during the so-called California Water Fix Hearing, the data submitted indicates that with several modifications to the operation of the SWP, and conversion of some Delta islands, on the western fringe of the Delta, it can increase the annual water supply (firm-yield) of SWP, from the delta, in most water-year types, by 300,000 to 500,000 acre-feet of water without the tunnel!	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, the basic objective of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries. The Delta Conveyance Project helps meet this by constructing and operating new water supply facilities within the Delta. See also Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues. Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding the process for identifying and screening alternatives. Additionally, Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, provides a discussion of the steps DWR followed to develop the alternatives brought forward for detailed analysis in the Draft EIR.
602-15	Conclusion: Neither time nor financial resources permit me the required opportunity to provide the type of attention and scrutiny necessary to address all of the unmitigated and potential socioeconomic and environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. Albeit, based on the DWR's past and present failures, which place the Bay-Delta estuary and all life forms dependent on its sustainability at an unreasonable level of risk. Furthermore, the manner in which it has "managed, operated and maintains" the SWP Oroville Dam and Reservoir, the major source of DWR's water supply, contributed to the 1986-1997 and 2017 flood disasters,	The EIR discloses potential impacts and, where necessary, provides mitigation to reduce those potential impacts in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. Although CEQA does not require a discussion of socioeconomic effects, except where they would result in reasonably foreseeable physical changes to the environment, the EIR does contain analyses normally reserved for NEPA in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. Please see responses to comments 602-10 through 602-12 regarding project costs, funding, and State Water Project management.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	resulting in billions of dollars of damages, and loss of lives, and neither it nor the SWP contractors paid for those damages, the taxpayers were left to pay the bill!	
602-16	Recommendation: Before the DWR is allowed to pursue this single-tunnel vision, it should be thoroughly investigated by the Legislature Analyst Office and the State Auditor, to undergo a comprehensive independent financial audit of the entire financing of the SWP, since its inception, to date, to do anything less would be a disservice to the people of California. PIA is prepared to assist anyone interested in pursuing these recommendations, and, more importantly, to hold the DWR accountable for its unlawful practices.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has followed all laws and regulations in planning, designing, and evaluating potentially significant environmental impacts under CEQA. An economic cost-benefit analysis is not required as part of the EIR. As described in Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, and Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, if a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required to be adopted for project approval, CEQA directs consideration of whether specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental effects. In addition, a cost-benefit analysis is part of DWR's overall planning process and will be completed as part of that process before moving forward with the project. Additional information regarding the cost-benefit study is provided in Common Response 7.
602-17	If you have any questions regarding the content of this e-mail, please advise me accordingly. Also please confirm receipt of this e-mail and enter our comments into the record. Thank you.	Please see response to comment 602-1 regarding the confirmation emails that were sent automatically upon receipt of emailed comment.
603-1	THE DEIR "ALTERNATIVES" ANALYSIS IS INCOMPLETE and LEGALLY INSUFFICIENT I. Introduction A. Summary of Concerns In January of 2020, Department of Water Resources (DWR) published a Notice of Proposal (NOP) for the Delta Conveyance	Please see response to comment 603-2 regarding why the Westside/Yolo Bypass alternative was not addressed in the Delta Conveyance Project EIR. As the commenter notes, the proposal was recognized in the Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report. The Scoping Summary Report was prepared following the scoping period for the Draft EIR, which was held from January 15, 2020, through April 17, 2020.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Project (DCP), including a "scoping" request for potentially feasible alternatives to the project. As a local citizen with a background in water issues, water rights and environmental law, I filed written comments on April 17, 2020. The comments urge DWR to evaluate a "Westside/Yolo Bypass" alternative (herein after the "Bypass Alternative") to the proposed eastside/tunnel project (Attachment A [ATT 1] to this document contains the proposed alternative submitted on April 17, 2022) [Footnote 1: The comments were catalogued as item #567 in Appendix D of the "Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report (July 2020)" (see Table D-13, Alternatives, Item #567 at pp. D 301-304.)] The proposed alternative is not mentioned or evaluated in either the DEIR or the preliminary "screening" process (see DEIR Appendix 3A) [Footnote 2: See DEIR, Chapter 3, Alternatives (pp. 3-1 to 3-165, July 2022), wherein DWR (a) explains how proposed alternatives were evaluated and selected for a full CEQA analysis in the DEIR; and (b) cross-references Appendix 3A where some, but not all, of proposed alternatives were described and screened. The proposed "Yolo Bypass/Abelson" alternative is not mentioned in either the DEIR Chapter 3 or DEIR Appendix 3A.]	The purpose and objective included in the Scoping Summary Report and referenced by the commenter are from the Notice of Preparation for the EIR, which was issued on January 15, 2020. The responses provided herein are provided from the perspective of the Draft EIR, which has been prepared in compliance with CEQA requirements. The assertions made by the commenter that their proposal was not included in the EIR or Appendix 3A does not mean that the issues raised were not considered or addressed in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding the EIR's approach to screening alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for additional information regarding the EIR's approach to alternatives screening. As described in Appendix 3A, project conveyance alternatives were combined into similar groups for first-level screening and screened against the project objectives to determine whether they would be carried forward to the next level of screening. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3 as to why western Delta alternatives did not meet project objectives.
603-2	B. A Written Analysis of the "Bypass Alternative" [Westside/Yolo Bypass alternative] is Required To comply with various provisions of CEQA, including 14 CCR § 15126.6, a written description and analysis of Bypass	The assertion that the EIR is deficient without an analysis of a Westside/Yolo Bypass Alternative is not consistent with information contained in the EIR. Evaluation of Westside/Yolo Bypass concept was eliminated from review due to conflicts with the habitat and flood control objectives of the Yolo Bypass. This concept would limit diversions to south Delta intakes only because of the potential infeasibility associated with a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Alternative is needed. Specifically, paragraph (a) of the regulation contains the following directives: (1) In order to foster "informed decision making and public participation" [DWR] must "describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives." (emphasis added.) (2) While [DWR] need not consider every conceivable alternative, it "shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would (i) feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would (ii) avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." (emphasis added.) Neither the DEIR nor the Initial Screening Analysis identify, describe or evaluate the proposed Bypass alternative DWR has provided neither a description nor evaluation of the Westside/Yolo Bypass in either the DEIR or the Screening Analysis. This omission is at odds with the "informed decision making and public participation" required by CEQA.	diversions structure located in the southern portion of the Yolo Bypass. Because of these issues, this suggested alternative would not meet the seismic and climate change resiliency objectives or the water supply resiliency objectives and was not evaluated in the EIR. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, lead agencies develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of feasible alternatives; an EIR should include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. The project's purpose and objectives are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR. While this alternative may have merit related to Yolo Bypass habitat, such an alternative would not meet the stated project objectives to improve seismic, climate change, and water supply resiliency and increase operational flexibility of SWP Delta facilities.
603-3	II. The Westside/Bypass Alternative Requires A Thorough Analysis Whether DWR staff inadvertently overlooked or simply did not fully understand the positive and synergistic elements of the Westside/Yolo Bypass alternative, this proposed alternative requires a written description and complete screening analysis for the all of the following reasons [comments 4-10]:	Please see response to comment 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, as to why western Delta alternatives do not meet project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	The Main Elements of the Bypass Alternative Are Synergistic and Unique The Bypass alternative combines 4 main components in a synergistic and unique way that is not captured in any of the various alternatives DWR identified and screened prior to its release of its DEIR in July 2022 (See Attachment A [ATT 1] to these comments.)	
603-4	To better understand the unique nature of the [Westside/Yolo] Bypass alternative, please consider these facts: A. Primary Means of Conveyance: A Renewed River Channel In The Bypass (i) Historic Sacramento River Channels: Since statehood, approximately 90% of California's native riparian forests and wetlands have been destroyed, including most of the lower Sacramento River/Delta watershed. To better understand the proposed conveyance system, please view this short 'virtual flyover' of the Bypass area as it would have appeared in 1800 (right click to open hyperlink.) Virtual Flyover - Lower Sacramento River c. 1800 [hyperlink: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nEFvbfChKOA] (ii) The Current Yolo/Sacramento Bypass: The bypass lies within the Sacramento River's historical floodplain and conveys floodwaters from major valley rivers including the Sacramento, Feather and American Rivers. The Bypass is approximately 3 miles wide and 40 miles long. It can carry up to four times [hyperlink: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/28j7r0hd#page-1] the flow of the river's main channel during large floods.	Please see response to comment 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, as to why western Delta alternatives do not meet the majority of project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	(iii) The Future Bypass: The proposed alternative would restore a perennial river channel that flows down the Bypass throughout the year. The picture above [Exhibit 1] demonstrates the approximate size and riparian forest of a restored river channel flowing through the Bypass during the summer.	
603-5	Exhibit 1: Photo of the Sacramento River above Colusa	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
603-6	To better understand the unique nature of the [Westside/Yolo] Bypass alternative, please consider these facts: B. Diversion Points: Water Flows Into the Bypass At Several Locations Several points of diversion allow for significant operational flexibility for the project. Below are two proposed points of diversion. (i) The Fremont Weir: This is the northern-most point of diversion [Exhibit 2], It would draw water into the Bypass from the Sacramento River, where significant habitat restoration is already underway. (ii) The Sacramento Weir: As pictured below [Exhibit 3], the Sacramento Weir would be another point of diversion, drawing water from by the Feather and Sacramento Rivers into the Bypass.	Please see response to comment 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, as to why western Delta alternatives do not meet the majority of project objectives.
603-7	[Exhibit 2: Photo of the Fremont Weir.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
603-8	The Yolo Bypass Salmonid Habitat Restoration and Fish Passage Project, or Big Notch Project, is a joint State and Federal project between the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). This project provides essential benefits to various native fish species, including threatened and endangered Chinook salmon, steelhead, and sturgeon. Since the construction of the Fremont Weir in the 1930's, the northern Yolo Bypass has been a literal dead end for many adult fish migrating upstream to their spawning grounds. The Big Notch Project provides a critical point of entry back into the Sacramento River, allowing these fish to continue their migration. Additionally, juvenile salmon and steelhead journeying downstream to the Pacific Ocean will have access to thousands of acres of Yolo Bypass floodplain rearing habitat through the operable Big Notch gates. Off-channel rearing habitat, such as floodplains, provides juvenile fish access to an abundant food supply not available in the mainstem river. Considering nearly 95% of historic off-channel salmon rearing habitat has been disconnected from the river by dams and levees, the Big Notch Project represents a significant recovery of this important ecosystem function.	The commenter provided this information for reference purposes in support of their comments. It is not a comment on the content of the EIR. The information refers to a location outside the study area. The EIR discusses project effects on salmonids in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources.
603-9	[Exhibit 3: Photo of the Sacramento Weir.]	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
603-10	To better understand the unique nature of the [Westside/Yolo] Bypass alternative, please consider these facts: C. The Southern Point(s) of Extraction From The Bypass Water flowing down the Yolo Bypass is currently drained through a southern riparian channel known simply as the "Toe	Please see response to comment 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives and why western Delta alternatives did not meet the majority of project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Drain." This is one way to extract water from the Bypass for transfer to the export facilities near Tracy. Another water extraction option might be similar to one in operation at Lake Berryessa. Located near the Monticello dam, this spillway consists of a single, vertical, bell-shaped extraction portal that drops water 200 feet down, for release into Putah Creek at the base of the dam. [Footnote 4: The pipe has an intake diameter of 72 feet, which shrinks down to about 28 feet at its base. This spillway has a maximum capacity of 48,000 cfs, and operates whenever there is excess water in the reservoir.] The last leg of the journey is a transport system that can move water to the export facilities near Tracy. This transport process can be accomplished in several different ways, including pressurized pipes and/or a relatively short tunnel structure underneath the delta.	
603-11	III. The [Westside/Yolo] Bypass Alternative Accomplishes The Goals of The Proposed Project The proposed Bypass alternative addresses the twin project goals of adequate water quality and adequate reliability of supplies for export from the Sacramento River to areas south of the Delta. (Please see Attachment A [ATT 1] for more detail.)	Please see response to comment 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives and how it relates to project objectives described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR. The project has four basic objectives, not two goals as the comment asserts. The Westside/Yolo Bypass alternative would not meet most of the stated project objectives to improve seismic, climate change, and water supply resiliency and increase operational flexibility of SWP Delta facilities.
603-12	IV. The [Westside/Yolo] Bypass Alternative Will Significantly Reduce Many Adverse Impacts The Bypass alternative will significantly reduce many of adverse impacts caused by DCP as now proposed. At the most basic level, relocating the project onto the west-side of the Sacramento River will eliminate most if not all of the many	Please see response to comment 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives. As explained in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, alternatives that would not meet most of the basic project objectives, such as the suggested Westside/Yolo Bypass Alternative were not carried forward for evaluation in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	adverse impacts on east-side communities, farmland and natural resources, ranging from the North Delta towns like Clarksburg and Hood, down to metropolitan cities as far south as Stockton and beyond. As detailed in the DEIR, categories where significant adverse impacts from the proposed project will be eliminated or significantly reduced include, but are not limited to: Land Use, Agricultural Resources, Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Recreation, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Noise and Vibration, Transportation and Socio-Economic Disruption.	
603-13	V. Summary and Conclusion - The proposed [Westside/] Yolo Bypass alternative has not been described or analyzed as required by CEQA. The proposal will meet the main project needs for reliable and high quality source of water. In addition, it will eliminate or mitigate many of the significant adverse impacts of the project as proposed. Finally, this alternative offers a unique opportunity to restore a significant amount of riparian habitat and wetlands, while ensuring adequate and clean supplies of fresh water for agriculture and millions of Californians as well. DWR needs to conduct a thorough review of this alternative and provide a written description of its findings in a its revised DEIR.	Please see response to comment 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives.
603-14	Thank you for your attention to these comments on the DEIR.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
603-15	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"]	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Re: DCP Scoping Comments - West-Side Alternative These comments are submitted pursuant to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP), issued by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) on January 15, 2020, as modified by the March 17th "Update" extending the comment period to April 17, 2020.	introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
603-16	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] I. The CEQA Scoping Process and Alternatives Mandate The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires project proponents to consider "a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation." In the "Alternatives" section of its NOP, DWR states that "the scoping process [for the DCP] will inform the preliminary locations, corridors, capacities and operations of new conveyance facilities to be evaluated in the EIR." The department also says that it will "make its final choice of potentially feasible alternatives to include in the Draft EIR after receipt of scoping comments." (See NOP at p. 9) In accordance with these statements, and the legal requirements pertaining to alternatives, it is imperative that DWR include in its Draft EIR an assessment of potentially feasible "westside" or "western route" locations and corridors, specifically the "Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass Alternative," described herein.	Please see response to comment 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives and adequacy for CEQA, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, as to why western Delta alternatives do not meet the majority of project objectives.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
603-17	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] II. Current Delta Conveyance Problems and DWR's Proposed "East-Side" Solution A. Current Delta Conveyance Problems The primary goal of the proposed DCP is to ensure that a reliable supply of high-quality fresh water is available for export to existing end-user south of the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta (delta). These exports provide water needed for irrigated agriculture, drinking water for millions of Californians, and numerous other beneficial uses. To achieve this goal, the DCP seeks to address a number of serious problems caused by the existing "through-delta" water conveyance system. Two of the most pressing problems are: (1) water supply risks associated with mandated south-delta pumping restrictions that are required by law to protect threatened or endangered species (e.g. delta smelt and pacific salmon); and (2) water quality risks associated with potential salinity intrusion caused by weak levees, rising sea levels and/or regional earthquakes.	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. DWR understands this comment to be asserting that the Delta Conveyance Project alternatives do not address risks to water supply associated with species-protection constraints on pumping at the South Delta Pumping Plant and water quality risks due to salinity intrusion; and that the comment's proposed western Delta alternative would better address these problems. These assertions are not consistent with the analyses in the EIR. Response to comment 603-1 addresses how scoping comments were evaluated for the draft EIR according to whether they met the majority of the basic project objectives. Response to comment 603-2 further explains the adequacy of the range of alternatives evaluated in the EIR and how west Delta alternatives do not meet project objectives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for further detail on the approach to alternatives screening and alternatives suggested by commenters, including western Delta alternatives and non-conveyance proposals to address salinity intrusion. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Integration of north Delta intakes with south Delta facilities regarding how Delta Conveyance Project will provide operational flexibility to change the point of diversion when necessary to meet regulatory requirements to protect fish.
603-18	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] B. The Proposed "East-Side" Solution	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-2 and 603-19 regarding project objectives and selection of alternatives that met the majority of the basic project objectives for evaluation in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Like numerous other proposals before it, the DCP seeks to address the twin concerns about water quality and water quantity by constructing an isolated conveyance system that skirts through or around the east-side of the Delta and then connects to the export facilities located near Tracy. As currently proposed the DCP would consist of up to three water diversion intakes and a single large conveyance tunnel sized to transport up to 7,000 cfs of water. The proposed intakes and entrance to the tunnel would be located on the Sacramento River, up-stream from the central delta, near the north delta town of Hood. The tunnel would extend for approximately 40 miles to the south, conveying water beneath farmlands and small communities lying east of the delta. The tunnel would terminate at the existing water export facilities located near the south delta city of Tracy. By removing and isolating the water transport system from the delta itself, the east-side project seeks to obtain a more reliable quantity of water for export. To achieve this goal, the proposed relocation may reduce some of the on-going damage to endangered fish specifies now caused by the existing pumps that are withdrawing large amounts of water directly from the south delta. In addition, by removing the water transfer system from the delta itself, the DCP seeks to reduce the risks to water quality now posed by a combination of weak levees, rising sea levels and a large regional earthquake. Constructing an isolated conveyance tunnel deep underground may be one way to address such water quality concerns, but it is certainly not the only way.	The comment's assertion that the current proposed project would involve three intakes and a diversion capacity of 7,000 cfs is incorrect. The proposed project, Alternative 5, Bethany Reservoir alternative, proposes two intakes and a maximum diversion capacity of 6,000 cfs. Other alternatives that would include CVP participation involve three intakes and 7,500 cfs capacity; however, the Bureau of Reclamation is not a participant in the Delta Conveyance Project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
603-19	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] III. Building A Better Mousetrap: The West-Side/Yolo Causeway Alternative A. Introduction Question: What should DWR do if it receives thoughtful scoping comments that identify one or more "potentially feasible" west-side alternatives to the proposed tunnel project, particularly if such alternatives could (1) achieve the twin goals of better water quality and more reliable water quantity; (2) provide far greater environmental benefits; and (3) cause far fewer adverse environmental and social impacts? Answer: To comply with CEQA's scoping and alternatives requirements, DWR should place such potentially feasible west-side alternatives into its draft EIR, thereby providing a meaningful opportunity for the thorough and thoughtful review needed to "foster informed decision making and public participation."	This comment refers to scoping comments submitted during the scoping period for the Draft EIR, which was held from January 15, 2020, through April 17, 2020. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. Common Response 3 explains how the screened-out alternatives do not meet project objectives or are not feasible alternatives to the proposed project, including western Delta alternatives. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding alternatives suggested during scoping and why western Delta alternatives did not meet project objectives.
603-20	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] B. The Proposed West-Side "Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass" Alternative	Please refer to response to comment 603-19 regarding why the "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative" was not included as an alternative in the EIR and how it did not meet most of the project objectives. Nature-based solutions such as the comment suggests would not provide operational flexibility or seismic or climate change resilience.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	These scoping comments request that DWR broaden the scope of its EIR to include a westside "Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass Alternative," as presented in further detail below. 1. Initial Assumptions and Goals Before describing the west-side Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass (FW/YB) alternative, it is important to emphasize that this proposal is not intended to answer the imponderably complex question of "how much fresh water can or should be diverted from one watershed to another?" Rather, this west-side alternative accepts the fact that some amount of water has been and will continue to be transferred from the Sacramento River watershed to regions south of delta. Thus, the relevant question becomes "how can such water transfers be accomplished in the most natural and least destructive way possible?" 2. Proposing Yet Another Highly-Engineered Concrete Channel Is Not The Right Answer It's been well over half a century since voters first approved the sale of bonds to build the State Water Project (1960). For the past six decades, water planners and engineers have proposed to build various types of physical structures designed to move fresh water from the Sacramento River in the north, through and/or around the Delta, and on to various destinations south of there. These physical structures have gone by many different names, including the "Delta Transfer Facility," the "Peripheral Canal,"	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the "Cal/Fed Project," the "Bay Conservation and Development Project (BDCP)," the "Water Fix," the "Twin Tunnels," and now the "Delta Conveyance Project (DCP)." What all of these proposals have in common is one important characteristic -- they each rely primarily on brick and mortar structures designed and engineered to mechanistically isolate, divert and then transfer Sacramento River water from its natural channels to other locations outside of the watershed. It has been said that the very definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over again, and expecting a different result. So what does DWR have to lose by seriously considering a very different kind of approach to the problem? Absolutely nothing! So please read on with an open mind. C. The Yolo Bypass -- An Outstanding Alternative Hiding In Plain Site The west-side Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass alternative asks everyone to step back from the mechanical engineering approach to solving the delta protection/water export conundrum. Remember, regardless of its various names, these mechanical engineering approaches have produced absolutely no positive results for more than half a century. Instead, try to envision what might happen if a natural river system were allowed to accomplish most of work needed to provide (1) a reliable quantity and quality of fresh water for export; (2) a return of the lower Sacramento Valley watershed to its more natural state; and (3) substantial mitigation for any significant adverse impacts that remain.	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
603-21	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] 1. Description of the West-Side Project's Key Features To achieve the water quality and quantity goals listed above, the west-side alternative would allow fresh water to flow naturally into and downstream through the Yolo Bypass, commencing at the Fremont Weir (near Knight's Landing) and exiting through an appropriately sized "toe drain" or "glory hole" (located near Rio Vista.) From there, the authorized amount of fresh water would be transferred southeast to the export facilities located near Tracy, via a relatively short tunnel and/or other conveyance structure. Here are the key features of this alternative: (a) Multiple Points of Entry Water intended for export would flow into the Yolo Bypass from multiple points of entry, beginning at the Fremont Weir and/or the Sacramento Bypass Wildlife Area, and perhaps including other downstream points of entry such as the Deep Water Ship Channel near West Sacramento [Exhibit 1 of ATT 1]. There are numerous potential benefits from such multiple points of entry, including the following: (i) Greater Operational Flexibility - First, multiple points of entry located far apart from each other, allow for much greater operational flexibility regarding when, where and how water enters the Bypass at any given location. Such operational	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-2 and 603-19 and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding why western Delta alternatives did not meet most project objectives and were not considered in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	flexibility will provide important environmental benefits, such as providing more options for ongoing salmonid restoration efforts [Exhibit 2 of ATT 1]. (ii) Better Water Quality Assurances - Enhanced water quality assurances are yet another major benefit of these upstream entry points. Two of the three locations are situated well above the urban and industrial development in Sacramento. Thus, there is little or no chance of these water supplies becoming directly contaminated by toxic waste, untreated sewage, or other dangerous discharges cause by a catastrophic urban event downstream (e.g. an industrial plant explosion, an inoperable sewage system, etc.) In addition, any adverse water quality impacts caused by poisonous discharges entering the Sacramento River below the upper two weirs, but above the third point of entry to the Bypass (e.g. the Deep Water Ship Channel), could be mitigated by simply closing-off the third entry point, thereby preventing the contaminated water from damaging the water quality of the other two fresh water sources. Finally, even water contamination occurring below the third point of entry would not degrade the other two sources of clean water, because these other sources would no longer be forced to commingle with the degraded water at a single point of export, such as the DCP's proposed tunnel near Hood. (iii) Safer Spawning Locations for Delta Smelt - Third, all of these proposed points of entry are located far enough upstream to eliminate any possible danger to smelt attempting	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	to spawn in the north delta, where the DCP now proposes to install three large water diversion intakes.	
603-22	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1: Photo of the Sacramento Weir releasing Flood waters into the Yolo Bypass (February 2017).	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-2 and 603-19 and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding why western Delta alternatives did not meet most project objectives and were not considered in the EIR.
603-23	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] Exhibit 2 of Attachment 1: YouTube link to 2019 video about the Fremont Weir Adult Fish Passage Project.	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in the responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-1, 603-2, and 603-19, regarding why western Delta alternatives did not meet most project objectives and were not considered in the EIR
603-24	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] 1. Description of the West-Side Project's Key Features To achieve the water quality and quantity goals listed above, the west-side alternative would allow fresh water to flow naturally into and downstream through the Yolo Bypass, commencing at the Fremont Weir (near Knight's Landing) and exiting through an appropriately sized "toe drain" or "glory hole" (located near Rio Vista.) From there, the authorized amount of fresh water would be transferred southeast to the export facilities located near Tracy, via a relatively short tunnel and/or other conveyance structure. Here are the key features of this alternative: (b) A Natural Riverine Transport Corridor	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please see responses to comments 603-1 and 603-2 regarding the screening and selection of alternatives and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, as to why this alternative does not meet most of the basic project objectives. While general factors that could influence cost were considered in selecting the proposed project, costs were not used to eliminate potentially feasible alternatives from analysis in the EIR. Cost was not a criterion for alternatives selection because of the scale of the project area and complexity of the Delta environment issues and water supply infrastructure. Cost is also not a requirement for CEQA analyses, which focus on the physical effects on the environment of a project. Costs and benefits, including financial considerations, will be considered by the decisionmaker in deciding whether to approve the proposed project or a project alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Upon entering the Yolo Bypass, water will be transported south via a natural, surface-level riverine corridor, propelled by gravity. As proposed, the water passing downstream along this surface corridor would not be hidden in a deeply buried underground tunnel, nor would it be confined to a man-made concrete canal or engineered "straight jacket" of narrow levees. Rather, it would be allowed to carve out a natural meandering streambed all the way down to the point of export near Rio Vista. This has numerous benefits, including the following: (i) Elimination of Virtually All Significant Adverse Impacts On The East-Side: The DCP proposes to build an enormous 40 mile tunnel along the east-side of the Sacramento River. The significant adverse environmental, social and economic impacts of this project on the small delta communities and rich farmlands located near this east-side corridor are incalculable. Moreover it is virtually certain that many of these adverse impacts cannot be mitigated to the level of insignificance, as required by CEQA. However, virtually all of these significant adverse impacts will be eliminated if the location of the water transport system is removed entirely from the east-side corridor and relocated to the west-side Yolo Bypass corridor instead. (ii) The Potential for Significant Environmental Enhancements and Restoration: Since the gold rush in 1849, California has lost more than 90% of its natural wetlands and native riparian habitat. The	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	proposed alternative of a west-side surface river transport system through the Yolo Bypass will cause little, if any, additional harm to the natural environment. To the contrary, this natural riverine system will significantly aid in restoring much of the riparian habitat that existed in the floodplain before the Sacramento River was narrowly channelized in the late 19th century (to scour out hydraulic mine tailings.) (iii) A Substantial Reduction in Total Project Costs and Construction Delays By relocating the DCP from the east-side corridor to the west-side corridor, and by relying more on a gravity-driven surface transport system rather than a concrete tunnel from beginning to end, the total capital and operational costs of this project should drop substantially. Why are these costs likely to drop? Here are four obvious reasons: (1) the capital costs of three large diversion intakes and related fish screens would be eliminated; (2) the capital costs of a much longer concrete tunnel will be reduced; (3) the operation and maintenance costs for a far smaller and simpler project will be lessened; (4) the extensive delays resulting from massive east-side community opposition and protracted litigation will be reduced; and (5) the probability of ultimately prevailing in the courts will be enhanced.	
603-25	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] 1. Description of the West-Side Project's Key Features	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-1, 603-2, and 603-19 regarding why western Delta alternatives were screened out from consideration in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	To achieve the water quality and quantity goals listed above, the west-side alternative would allow fresh water to flow naturally into and downstream through the Yolo Bypass, commencing at the Fremont Weir (near Knight's Landing) and exiting through an appropriately sized "toe drain" or "glory hole" (located near Rio Vista.) From there, the authorized amount of fresh water would be transferred southeast to the export facilities located near Tracy, via a relatively short tunnel and/or other conveyance structure. Here are the key features of this alternative: (c) Extraction Options At The Southern End of The Bypass Water flowing down the Yolo Bypass is currently drained through a southern riparian channel known quite simply as the "Toe Drain." This is one way to extract water from the Bypass for transfer to the export facilities near Tracy. Another stationary export option might be a so-called "glory hole," such as the one in operation at Lake Berryessa. Located near the Monticello dam, this spillway consists of a single, vertical, bell-shaped extraction portal that drops water 200 feet straight down, for release into Putah Creek at the base of the dam. The pipe has an intake diameter of 72 feet, which shrinks down to about 28 feet at its base. This spillway has a maximum capacity of 48,000 cfs, and operates whenever there is excess water in the reservoir. Below is a photo [Exhibit 3 of ATT 1] of the drain in operation following heavy rains that occurred in February 2017. (i) Environmental Benefits: Removing fresh water supplies from the Bypass via this kind of gravity-driven downward draining	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	device would eliminate the need for massive lateral drain intakes, which can cause extensive damage to aquatic eco-systems through entrainment and impingement of food-chain organisms and native fish. (ii) Economic Benefits: The capital costs of three large lateral intakes would be eliminated, along with the operational and maintenance costs of such intakes. In addition, electricity could actually be generated at the export site, helping to offset any costs associated with pumping the water to its final destination, described below [comment 27].	
603-26	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] Exhibit 3 of Attachment 1: Photo of the "Glory Hole" at Lake Berryessa, February 2017.	The commenter provided this exhibit for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter.
603-27	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] 1. Description of the West-Side Project's Key Features To achieve the water quality and quantity goals listed above, the west-side alternative would allow fresh water to flow naturally into and downstream through the Yolo Bypass, commencing at the Fremont Weir (near Knight's Landing) and exiting through an appropriately sized "toe drain" or "glory hole" (located near Rio Vista.) From there, the authorized amount of fresh water would be transferred southeast to the export facilities located near Tracy, via a relatively short tunnel and/or other conveyance structure. Here are the key features of this alternative:	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-1, 603-2, and 603-19 regarding why western Delta alternatives were screened out from consideration in the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	(d) A Transport System To Convey The Water to Export Facilities Near Tracy The last leg of the journey is a transport system that can move water to the export facilities near Tracy. This transport process can be accomplished in several different ways, including pressurized pipes and/or a relatively short tunnel structure underneath the delta.	
603-28	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] IV. Conclusion Any effort to modernize the Delta water system, as directed in the Governor Newsom's executive order, must include an honest and complete study of the west-side conveyance corridor. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, I urge you to thoroughly evaluate the pros and cons of one or more west-side alternatives in both the draft and final environmental impact reports for the DCP. Thank you.	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to the commenter's letter. Please refer to responses to comments 603-2 and 603-19 and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding why western Delta alternatives did not meet most project objectives and were not considered in the EIR.
603-29	[ATT 1: Project alternative suggestion proposed by commenter titled "Yolo Bypass/Fremont Weir Proposal - A Unique Water Conveyance Alternative"] See Also: 1. Congressman John Garamendi's West-Side Scoping Letters (dated 3-20-20 and 2-15-20): Attached. [Not attached to this pdf for Letter 0603] 2. Congressman John Garamendi's Public DCP Scoping Statement (dated 3-20-20): Link https://garamendi.house.gov/media/press-releases/garamendi-urges-california-consider-western-route-delta-conveyance	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter or clarification on the submittal of the comment letter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	3. Rep. Garamendi's West-Side Route Plan ("Water Plan for All of California," pp.7-10, 2015): Link https://garamendi.house.gov/sites/garamendi.house.gov/files/Little%20Sip%20Version%208_compressed.pdf	
606-1	In response to the draft EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project, I have read most of the EIR, but specifically I'm responding to Chapter 5 Surface Water and its effects in Chapters 9, 12, and 13. By diverting water into tunnel(s) at the north end of the Delta, and declaring that "changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not considered an impact of the project alternatives….." (Chapter 5 line 4-5), you are ignoring the scientific evidence. Removing water from the Delta before it travels through the Delta will irreparably harm this unique ecosystem that we depend on for survival.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding a discussion of Chapter 5, Surface Water, and Chapter 6, Water Supply, and the evaluation of water-dependent resources throughout the EIR. See Chapters 7–32 of the EIR regarding an analysis of environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures on multiple environmental resources related to surface water and water supply changes, including Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Please also refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project.
606-2	An example of the many scientific studies, The 2017 scientific study by NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, prepared for the USFWS Sacramento Valley Central Project Improvement Act titled "Chinook salmon smolt mortality zones and the influence of environmental factors on out-migration success in the Sacramento River Basin" delineates some of the damage these tunnels will create.	The study cited in the comment pertains to the Sacramento River upstream of the Delta, which is beyond the area that could be affected by proposed diversions into the single proposed conveyance tunnel. Please see the discussion of upstream aquatic species in Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues. Delta-specific literature and quantitative models are used in Chapter 12, wherein potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources are assessed.
606-3	Please do not approve this project. We must all learn to live within the boundaries of our natural resources or we will destroy ourselves and this planet.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
607-1	The town of Hood is the quintessential River town with more than 70 homes and 300 plus residents. The town is located on 192 acres in Southern Sacramento County. The slow-paced rural river front community also includes a market; a restaurant, bar and grill; a popular wedding venue (selected by Sacramento Magazine in 2022 as the "Best Wedding Venue");	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	several unique talented artisans; a firehouse; a mobile home park and a community park. The old growth trees that surround and divide the 24 space mobile home park make that area feel like its own community. Many residents have lived there for years, with vegetable gardens and distinctive amenities. The residents of Hood are able to walk to their favorite fishing hole and enjoy the slow pace of town with no stop lights and less than a half a dozen stop signs. The community park has both a basketball court for the athletic endeavors and a children's jungle gym's, for those active youngsters. The park has built in barbecues and picnics tables for day and evening enjoyment for the many friendly neighbors. A public restroom facility for the park has been funded but not built.	
607-2	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. For the last ten years the state of California Department of Water Resources has expended over $300 million to prepare a project that has not yet been fully defined or permitted. Without an accurate description of what, where and why, how can an intelligent discussion occur. Where in the Draft EIR is a detailed cost benefit analysis?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 34, Community Benefits Program Analysis, for a discussion of investments to improve Delta waterways. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding a cost benefit analysis.
607-3	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. Where are the approved Federal and State permits authorizing this project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding project approvals, permitting processes, and other required actions. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, for a discussion of agency roles and responsibilities.
607-4	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR.	The glossary provides definitions of terms that may not be commonly used. The term "feasible" is a commonly used term and therefore not included in the glossary. California Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Several valid alternatives exist that have not been considered and are dismissed by the DCA during the Stakeholder Engagement process as "not feasible". Where was an independent analysis considered? Where and who decided the definition of "feasible"?	feasible as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding CEQA requirements and the alternatives considered but eliminated. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for a discussion of the alternatives screening analysis and refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, regarding the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered.
607-5	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. The project proponents have estimated that this tunnel will cost $17 billion as a State run project, and just recently increased estimated cost to $19 billion. It is likely that the ultimate cost will be 3 to 5 times that figure. We should not embark upon $100 billion project without voter approval. The voters rejected the peripheral canal some 25 years ago and given the cost and the lack of water to be transported in these times, this project makes no economic sense. The informed public will reject this concept again.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the cost to water users and the costs to taxpayers. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, Chapter 1, section titled Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
607-6	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. The Federal government’s own report on wildlife shows this project would decimate the wild salmon population.	Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. As described in Chapters 12 and 13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
607-7	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. As of today, a project of this size cannot be bonded. Multiple contractors would be required to piece together some type of bond and any short fall would land in the laps of the taxpayers.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding the costs to taxpayers.
607-8	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. The impact to Delta communities would destroy one of the bread baskets of America and destroy fishing and recreational uses. The Draft EIR lacks current scientific basis for success. The sea level rise assumptions make the intake locations unworkable.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, for discussion of impacts on agricultural communities. Please refer to Chapter 16, Recreation, for discussion of impacts on recreation, including fishing. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for discussion of the scientific basis for the analysis presented in the EIR. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for discussion of sea-level rise. Also see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Design for Climate Change and Sea Level Rise.
607-9	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. Riparian water rights as well as Californians water rights are being ignored to satisfy the large demand by Southern California water users and some farmers in the desert.	The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for discussion of water rights. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding contracts and water rights. As stated in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Delta Conveyance Project would be operated in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
607-10	Summary of opposition to tunnel project and specific faults with the Draft EIR. Even one tunnel is a ridiculous concept as it produces zero water.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
607-11	TEST DRILLING FINDINGS ARE INCOMPLETE Five fifty-five-gallon drums taken from test site drilling contained dirt similar to the "tunnel muck". These five drums sat for over six months before they were taken to InStrat, Inc. in Rio Vista for analysis and testing. Where is the chain of custody log? What was tested for and why? What were the results and where are they in the Draft EIR. How does the Draft EIR propose to deal with toxic chemicals released by the massive drilling project?	Please refer to Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, for discussion of toxic chemicals, and particularly Impact HAZ-2, regarding the testing, storage, and reuse of the reusable tunnel material (RTM) in compliance with regulations.
607-12	INCOMPLETE MAPPING OF EXISTING AND ABANDON GAS WELLS Where did DWR base the conclusion, if that conclusion occurred, that the intakes and main tunnel shaft will not cross gas lines or gas pockets that could be explosive and deadly to the construction project?	Please refer to Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, for discussion of hazards associated with project construction, particularly Impact HAZ-2, regarding oil and gas facilities in the project area. As described in Chapter 25, the potential impacts analyzed would be no impact or less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives regarding field investigations and surveys that will be conducted to identify the locations of buried natural gas wells prior to construction.
607-13	INCOMPLETE COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS The cost of water has a specific value. The Tunnel produces no water yet is being sold as necessary to provide water to 25 million people in California. Please explain why over 20 Billion	While an economic cost benefit analysis is not a requirement of CEQA, the EIR addresses environmental costs and, generally, the benefits of the project. In addition, because it is a project with significant and unavoidable impacts, DWR would need to adopt a Statement of Overriding

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	dollars is proposed to be spent, when just improving and repairing the existing water conveyance system (the levees) would cost less than 10 percent of that figure?	Considerations to approve the project. The Statement of Overriding Considerations would include discussion of the balance of applicable economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs. Also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives.
607-14	INCOMPLETE TRAFFIC AND SAFETY ANALYSIS Adding several thousand workers to the Delta roadways each day may help local businesses sell coffee and sandwiches, but nearly all businesses' have parking systems that require crossing Highway 160 to pull in or back out onto the Highway. The delay and dangers have not been addressed. Add to this problem are limited size bridges and oversized farm equipment that essentially prevents two way traffic when equipment is moved. Despite setting up "haul roads" the workers must come and go home daily as there is no housing for an additional 2,000 workers. Fire safety will be compromised by the traffic delays and lack of personnel to support the increase daily population to the Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, for discussion of existing transportation facilities in the study area. Chapter 20 contains additional information on selected study areas and the analysis of potential transportation impacts. The project was developed to incorporate traffic restrictions and road improvements to limit effects to local and regional roadways including Interstate 5, SR 160, 99, 12, and 4; Twin Cities Road and Hood-Franklin Road, discussed in Chapter 20, section titled Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation. Please also refer to Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, particularly Impact UT-1, regarding the impact of the project on emergency services such as police and fire protection. Also, please see Common Response 14, Transportation, regarding the methodology and approach to the impact analysis.
607-15	INCOMPLETE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS AND ANALYSIS With dry hot summers and numerous 100-degree days, the Delta breeze may cool residents but it will surely spread dust, debris and contaminants across the region. Where was this considered and mitigated?	Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for discussion of project-related impacts and mitigation approaches related to dust and air quality contaminants.
607-16	INCOMPLETE NOISE ANALYSIS How is the pile driving impact over years mitigated?	Please refer to Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, for discussion of project-related impacts and mitigation approaches.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
607-17	LACK OF UPDATE SCIENCTIFIC ANALYSIS The earthquake in Napa a few years ago demonstrated the resilience of the Delta levee system and subverts the argument make that the levees are "unsustainable". Please explain why update science hasn't been included in this 20k page document. Why are the intakes located where alleged sea level rise will make them worthless?	In regard to commenter's concern related to the 2014 Napa earthquake, Chapter 7, Flood Protection, section titled Seismic Activity of the EIR, DWR acknowledges that recent investigations suggest that earthquake-induced ground shaking affecting Delta levees may be less severe, but it still considers the potential for a seismic event that poses a significant threat to Delta levees. Please refer to Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report, Part 1 of 2, Central and Eastern Options (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022), for a summary of the intake site selection process. Please refer to Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity, for discussion of methods for analysis. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for discussion of sea level rise. Also see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Design for Climate Change and Sea Level Rise. As discussed in Appendix 5A, Section F, Sea Level Rise and Delta Water Quality Modeling, the proposed intake locations would not be vulnerable to sea level rise under modeled conditions that assume 10.2 feet of sea level rise.
607-18	Please explain each alternatives viability and why rejected.	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for discussion of the alternatives development process and alternatives screening analysis as well as an overview of the alternatives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding CEQA requirements and the scope of the alternatives, as well as the alternatives considered but eliminated.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
607-19	Thank you for answering each question or inquire herein.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
608-1	The technical requirement of a 90 day comment period was not met. Despite adding 90 days, the document was modified and a new full 90 days should have been provided. Given the limited Wi-Fi access to the rural delta region, additional time should have been provided over and above the 90 days.	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, for discussion of the public review and comment period duration and requests for extension.
608-2	DWR refused to have any in person meeting on the Delta so that the most impacted citizens could provide their comments, many of whom have limited resources, and limited access to Wi-Fi and Internet. Most residents haven't received a physical copy of the draft environmental impact report to review and comment upon.	Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the public meetings and outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment. Please also refer to Common Response 2 regarding the availability of the Draft EIR to Delta communities, including the document being available via thumb drive at local libraries within Delta communities. As described in Chapter 35, DWR's public outreach and engagement efforts associated with the EIR were developed in compliance with CEQA requirements, consistent with CEQA guidance and based on best professional judgement and many years of experience conducting outreach for large infrastructure projects. The outreach strategies, tools, and tactics were also developed and tailored with the specific needs of the audience in mind.
608-3	The Draft environmental impact report is also confusing, and appears to be difficult if not impossible to find your particular community and the impact it will have upon them.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for discussion of the length and complexity of the EIR. As described in Common Response 1, in the discussion about the EIR's length and complexity, the EIR necessarily includes a considerable amount of information to adequately analyze potential impacts and was presented in a format with emphasis on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		information useful to the public. Furthermore, as described in Common Response 1, the EIR followed accepted practices for the preparation of such documents.
608-4	DWR refused to attend a noticed public meeting on Dec 6, 2022, from 4pm to 6pm to hear public comments yet DWR sent 7 or 8 DWR employees to meet privately with the Courtland Town Association the same day in an attempt to privately convince the Town Association about the possibility of community benefits.	Please see Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, for discussion of the public meetings held to accept comments on the Draft EIR. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
614-1	Comments on Delta Conveyance Project Draft Environmental Impact Report I moved to Discovery Bay six years ago with my two children and two dogs, and husband. We moved here for the boating and took over my father's boat after he died. So I am a relative newcomer to the Delta. We have a 39 foot Sea Ray and 22 foot Cobalt. We boat all around the Delta, to Mildred Island, to all the yacht clubs and restaurants. I have found it to be such a gift to live on the water somewhere this beautiful.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
614-2	I don't want to see the Delta drained and turned into a stinky mudflat and all the wildlife killed off. I object to the tunnel because it siphons off our supply of fresh water upstream of the Delta. It doesn't make sense to divert the fresh water source of the Delta before the fresh water flows through the Delta.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The EIR analyzes the impacts on environmental resources raised by the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project (refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources). The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, which discusses the reasonable representation of project operations in the model(s), particularly CalSim 3. Please also refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the EIR's methodology and approach to evaluating potential impacts on terrestrial biological resources and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the impact analysis on aquatic biological resources. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how the water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding operational criteria, real-time operational decision-making, and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding a comparison of flows by project alternative.
614-3	The three problems that the tunnel is supposed to solve, that an earthquake will collapse the levees, that sea level will rise, and that fish are chopped up in the pumps at Tracy can be solved much better by other means. Why is every alternative in the EIR a tunnel? Why can't you: l)fix the levees; 2) release more water through the Delt to push rising bay levels back; and 3) run the Tracy pumps better to protect the fish? With tens of billions being spent on this tunnel, the investment in reorganizing the way the pumps work at Tracy would be a small spend to fix the problem compared to the tunnel. You	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	could build a whole new forebay. You could try permeable levees that don't harm fish. You say the new intakes at hood will have magic fish screens. Why can't you invent magic fish screens for Tracy then? More to the point, Southern California wastes precious water on mile after mile after mile of decorative green lawns that nobody ever touches. Just conserving water on better landscaping would save more than enough water to eliminate exports from the Delta. And then there is desalination: it takes a lot less electric power to run desal plants that would produce more water than comes from the Delta. Pumping water over a mountain range does not make sense. It wastes electricity. Why is it that I have to pay $13 for a light bulb that used to cost 98 cents because we all have to conserve electricity, but you can supply water in the most energy intensive way possible? Why doesn't the state have to conserve electricity when all the rest of us have to?	in the EIR, and alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section No Project Alternative; and Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative and Cumulative Impact Conditions. As described in Chapter 22, Energy, the potential impacts analyzed would result in no impact and less than significant impacts.
614-4	I am not a scientist but I can see that the EIR is not a serious effort to examine the problem and come up with alternatives. It is an excuse to build a tunnel. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with some real alternatives-and maybe you will regain some public confidence and respect.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion of the identification of alternatives and screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR.
616-1	Dear California Department of Water Resources: I grew up in Pittsburg, CA.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
616-2	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 1. Requesting that Alternative 5 be amended to start with 4,500 CFS initially, or less (similar to the intakes of alternative	For the proposed project, the maximum allowable diversion for the intakes of Alternative 5 is 6,000 cfs. A range of potential diversions is based on NDD operational criteria; however, other operating constraints will likely limit diversions to less than the maximum allowable diversion. An Operations Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program will be used to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	4c), but have the capacity to increase to 6,000 CFS. That is, to build Intakes B and C to have a capacity of 3,000 CFS each but only run the system at 4,500 CFS or less for the first few years in order to assess the impact and also make sure that appropriate mitigation measures are completed.	evaluate and consider changes in operational criteria based on information gained before and after the new facilities become operational. This program will be used to consider and address scientific uncertainty regarding the Delta ecosystem and to inform project operations. Further detail can be found in the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, sections titled Delta Conveyance Project Preliminary Proposed Operations Criteria, Real-Time Operational Decision-Making Process, and Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program.
616-3	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 2. The impact of salinity continues to be a serious concern for the delta ecosystem, farmers, and drinking water supplies. It is not clear from the Draft EIR what the monitoring, operating, and emergency protocols and procedures are for the DWR and/or the California State Water Resources Control Board– especially if salinity targets are not met.	The EIR evaluates salinity in terms of aquatic habitat for fish, agriculture, and drinking water supplies in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 9, Water Quality. The Chapter 9 water quality impact analysis concludes that there could be some increases in electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-5) at some Delta locations in some months, but impacts would be less than significant. DWR will continue to operate the State Water Project with the proposed north Delta intakes in accordance with operational criteria set by federal and state permits, state water rights decisions, and other applicable regulatory requirements, including required salinity targets. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, for additional discussion regarding project operations.
616-4	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 3. I take issue with some of the representations communicated in the "Environmental Justice Community Survey Report". Specifically, the absurd emphasis of "I don’t know enough to have a strong opinion at this time" in response to the question, "what is your opinion about the proposed project?". It is clear from the overwhelming majority of responses to other questions ("no tunnel", "no benefits", etc.) that respondents had a negative opinion of the project. Instead, this seems to be	Please see Appendix 29A, Environmental Justice Community Survey Report, specifically the section titled Introduction, which provides the list of reply selections offered for questions of the Your Delta, Your Voice survey. The “I don’t know enough to have a strong opinion at this time” selection was one of four options available, including an “I think it could negatively affect my community” selection if the responder wanted to convey that response. The “I don’t know enough to have a strong opinion at this time” selection was helpful for DWR to understand the public’s understanding of the project and identify if there is a need for additional community education and engagement related to the potential effects and benefits of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	a product of confusing question language and should be described as such.	
616-5	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 4. Appendix 3F (Compensatory Mitigation Plan) is impressive. It would be great to understand the timeline of these measures relative to the construction timeline for the water conveyance tunnels.	Regarding the timeline of compensatory mitigation relative to project construction, please see Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, which describes how compensatory mitigation, either protection, creation, or enhancement, will stay ahead of cumulative, permanent suitable habitat loss by 10%.
616-6	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 5. Given the proximity of Sherman Island (popular windsurfing area) and Brannan Island (popular recreation area) to Emmaton and Three Mile slough, these two areas should be carefully monitored given the expected changes in electrical conductivity, among other impacts.	The constituents for which project operations would have the potential to change in the Delta would not affect the ability to recreate at Sherman Island and Brannan Island. The impact analysis in Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-17 found that project construction and operations would not adversely affect beneficial uses, which includes recreation uses, and would have a less than significant impact on water quality.
616-7	After reviewing the Draft EIR, including the proposed mitigation plans, my primary comments are: 6. Finally, I would like to emphasize that this is a non-natural diversion of water that will certainly have irreversible ecological impact. The continuation of projects such as these only exacerbate ecological damage and are not sustainable in the long-term. Water districts in the Central Valley and Southern California need to take drastic actions in order to limit non-essential water use.	The content of the EIR does not support the comment that un-mitigable ecological impacts would result from the proposed project or project alternatives. For example, Chapter 9, Water Quality, discloses that all of the water quality impacts that would result from the project are less than significant. Similarly, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that all of the potential impacts would either be less than significant or less than significant after mitigation are applied. Similar results are presented in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. This comment regarding limiting water use does not raise a significant environmental issue associated with the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
616-8	I am looking forward to the final EIR and your responses to my concerns and comments.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
617-1	I am concerned that the draft EIR fails to evaluate the impacts on surface water under CEQA, which is required under the law.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding a discussion of the CEQA process. Please also see Chapter 5, Surface Water, for discussion of surface water changes. Changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not considered an impact of the project alternatives under the California Environmental Quality Act.
618-1	The draft EIR fails to evaluate the impacts on surface water under CEQA, which is required under the law.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding a discussion of the CEQA process. Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, for discussion of surface water changes. Changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not considered an impact of the project alternatives under the California Environmental Quality Act.
619-1	Not one new drop. Just destroy degrade the delta. Spend the money on desalination which does make new water.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater.
619-2	The ditch around the delta was turned down by the voters years ago. A tunnel is just a covered ditch. What gives you the	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	right to override the people's will? Do you just think you are smarter? You know best!!	
619-3	Desalination is a better answer and again won't destroy an environment in the process.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater.
619-4	I am a native Californian 83 years young and have seen other areas destroyed by folks who thought their way was best!!!	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
620-1	The Delta Conveyance Project will not produce more water in an already failing infrastructure. The "tunnel" cannot be built without Sites reservoir which cannot be built without raising the Shasta Dam.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose and objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, which include among others protecting the ability of the SWP, and potentially the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts of water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law.
620-2	The effects on our watersheds above the Sacramento River will be devastating and the salmon and delta smelt will be extinct.	Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce impacts on salmon and Delta smelt to less than significant. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles. Please also see Appendix 3F regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration for delta smelt.
620-3	There is less and less water due to climate change and the effects of water extraction already and this will increase.	Please see Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
620-4	I have traveled on these water ways and reservoirs (you call "lakes") and seen how polluted and dried up the tributaries have become.	This comment does not address the proposed project or contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
620-5	Please do not build any more infrastructure and start dismantling the dams and canals. Industrial agriculture cannot continue to extract water resources anymore. We have to find another way.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
621-1	I am opposed to the new proposed river tunnel for a multitude of reasons, which I hope you take into consideration.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
621-2	Firstly, all alternatives result in the disturbance of cultural resources, including historic tribal villages and mounds from before European contact, which cannot be adequately mitigated once disturbed. The project would result in a substantial and cumulatively significant impact on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape (TCL) and Sacramento River TCL, toxic algae levels, and fish runs. However, despite the full acknowledgment of the importance of the Delta TCL to tribes, DWR still finds it reasonable to go ahead with the project. Tribes should not have to fight so hard to save their tribal	Although the analyses in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, concludes that impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please also refer to Chapter 32 regarding DWR's consideration of the Sacramento River Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	cultural resources, spiritual and ceremonial sites, and locations of creation stories from desecration by state projects.	Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact would be less than significant. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA. Please refer to Common Response 16 regarding the consideration of Tribal perspectives in DWR's decision on whether to approve the project.
621-3	As well as the cultural damage done by this new proposed project, DEIR does not adequately assess the impact on salmon and other fish species, and all alternatives result in far worse ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife.	The comment's assertion regarding impacts on salmon and other fish species is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce impacts on salmon to less than significant. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on Chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles. DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape, as described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, Impact TCR-1.
621-4	Some Northern Californian tribes' cultures and traditions deeply depend on the survival of the salmon. The destruction of their home and habitat would be hugely detrimental to them.	DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape, as described in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, Impact TCR-1.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The comment's assertion that the project would result in the destruction of the habitat for salmon is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce impacts on salmon to less than significant. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
621-5	All alternatives result in reduced survival of juvenile winter and spring-run salmon through the Delta. Less water in the Delta means less water for salmon and other endangered species.	Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for a detailed discussion of the proposed mitigation measures that would reduce impacts on salmon to less than significant. Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
622-1	The draft EIR fails to evaluate the impacts on surface water under CEQA which is required under the law.	Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, for the description of potential changes to surface water. Changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not an impact of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and thus, are not evaluated as impacts in Chapter 5. Impacts associated with changes to surface water are evaluated in Chapter 6, Water Supply, Chapter 7, Flood Protection, Chapter 8, Groundwater, and Chapter 9, Water Quality.
623-1	The draft EIR fails to evaluate the impact on surface water as required.	Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, for the description of potential changes to surface water. Changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not an impact of the project alternatives under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and thus, are not evaluated as impacts in Chapter 5. Impacts associated with changes to surface water are

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		evaluated in Chapter 6, Water Supply, Chapter 7, Flood Protection, Chapter 8, Groundwater, and Chapter 9, Water Quality.
624-1	Let's keep it simple -- look at the macro picture as far as the Bay / Delta region. Simply, the third paragraph under the Delta Smelt section is especially important and it involves DELTA OUTFLOW which the document itself defines as "the flow of freshwater leaving the Delta toward the ocean". The last paragraph of that section reads "While there is a large degree of uncertainty associated with these impacts to delta smelt as a result of Delta Outflow reduction, the potential project effects of are considered potentially significant given the status of the population".	The quoted text provided in the comment is not found in the impact analysis provided in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. It is paraphrasing and does not adequately capture the EIR analysis. As stated in Chapter 12, Impact AQUA-6, the somewhat less outflow anticipated during spring-fall could result in significant impacts on delta smelt due to potential changes in food availability, predation and recruitment. However, with implementation of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan (CMP-27) the increase in suitable habitat (including higher food availability) would reduce the CEQA impact to be less than significant with mitigation.
624-2	And soon thereafter, some measly mitigation is offered to try to mitigate for the damage caused by the action alternatives. In fact, it is two sets of "bait-and-switches"!! Remember the huge Bay/Delta Restoration Plan which would seek to restore a huge amount of acres to try to mitigate for damages related to the proposed tunnels? They largely disappeared, and what small percent remains is being treated as a magic cure to help threatened and endangered anadramous and semi-anadramous fish species.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix (BDCP/WaterFix). Delta Conveyance Project includes a Compensatory Mitigation Plan (CMP) with habitat restoration proposed in specific areas. This habitat restoration is different in scope, scale, and purpose as compared to the restoration identified by BDCP/WaterFix in response to differing impacts and resulting compensatory mitigation requirements. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California as well as the current and past planning efforts related to new Delta conveyance infrastructure. As described in Chapter 2, restoring habitat and species is not a purpose of the project. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on wildlife and aquatic species, respectively. As described in Chapter 12 and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		13, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation, specifically implementation of the CMP (Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources). Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding CEQA requirements for mitigation and the adequacy of mitigation measures included in the EIR. Please also refer to Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, regarding the efficacy of compensatory mitigation actions.
624-3	And soon thereafter, some measly mitigation is offered to try to mitigate for the damage caused by the action alternatives. In fact, it is two sets of "bait-and-switches"!! The other bait-and- switch was I thought the proposed tunnel intake from the North Delta was then supposed to result in the closure of the "southern pumps" -- yet surprise the proposed new intakes are additions to, rather than replacements for, the southern pumps.	Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the development and characteristics of the project alternatives.
624-4	I note that there is interest in turbidity during operations -- and they are entitled, but I see no indication in the documentation which does not address real solutions to how to keep winter-run chinook and delta smelt alive through the very turbidity-producing construction process for the delta tunnel (with some of it at a depth of I believe it was 160 feet or so).	The EIR provides an Impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, regarding the project's effects on aquatic species. As described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. In particular, please see Impacts AQUA-1 through AQUA-4, which would be less than significant with mitigation. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project on water quality. In particular, please see Impact WQ-13, related to turbidity and total suspended solids during project operation, which would be less than significant.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, regarding compensatory mitigation including tidal habitat restoration to mitigate north Delta hydrodynamic effects on chinook salmon juveniles and channel margin habitat restoration for operations impacts on Chinook salmon juveniles.
624-5	Please reject the action alternatives because the fragile nature of the aforementioned fish cannot be risked for a scheme to centralize water for several influential agribusiness operations.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
624-6	I shall also point out a key sentence in the Exec. Summary section on winter-run chinook "While diversions would generally occur during excess flow conditions to minimize potential effects, the north Delta intake facilities would increase travel-time for juvenile winter-run chinook salmon, potentially exposing them to predatory fish for longer periods"	Please see response to comment 624-4, regarding the EIR's evaluation of impacts on fish and aquatic resources.
624-7	Note "the tides" coming in is the salinity you claim the proposed project would keep out!	Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation.
625-1	Correction: Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) for Delta Conservation Plan (DCP).	This information describes the structure or organization of the comment letter, the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
625-2	As a residential stakeholder in the former [Bay] Delta Conservation Plan, which was led by the California Department of Water Resources, I wish to suggest that the DCP [Delta Conveyance Project] incorporate specifically as much as possible: both the scientific data and socioeconomic assessments which were shared, discussed extensively, locally by other governmental agencies and specialinterest experts with regards to restoring equally, proportionally the environmental health of the surrounding agricultural landscapes in a both a fair and impartial matter for both private and public owners.	The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022). In addition, as described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Community Benefits Program, DWR is developing a Community Benefits Program for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project, which, if the project is approved, will identify, and implement commitments to help protect and enhance the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for additional information on the Community Benefits Program.
625-3	Also, at the same time, I recommend that there be biologically investigative efforts to restore the encompassing waterways as essential habitats for native fishes and associate species (aquatic & terrestrial) impacted by the agricultural restoration within the DCP [Delta Conveyance Project] with regards to both short-term and long-term goals.	It is unclear which waterways are referred to in the comment, but Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, present an evaluation of impacts on aquatic and terrestrial species from the implementation of compensatory mitigation, including the restoration of temporary impacts and the protection and management of agricultural lands. As described in the Executive Summary, CEQA significance conclusions are provided for each of the numbered direct and indirect impacts on the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		physical environment based on substantial evidence provided in the project alternative analyses and judged against defined impact significance thresholds. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a discussion of general CEQA topics and Common Response 11, Terrestrial Biological Resources and Compensatory Mitigation Plan, for a discussion of CEQA analyses for terrestrial biological resources.
625-4	In addition, I recommend that DCP [Delta Conveyance Project] provide the least significant impacts to the migratory waterfowl within the DCP in close cooperation with existing NorCal Conservation Plan Partners (NCCPPs) both targeted and associate species with regards to Management & Monitoring Report Plans (MMRP) during 3-5 years duration; including but not limited with surrounding County governmental agencies.	The EIR fully evaluates potentially significant environmental impacts from construction and operation of the alternatives on multiple resources including migratory waterfowl as documented in numerous sections in Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The Delta Conveyance Project includes a Compensatory Mitigation Plan (CMP) with habitat restoration proposed in specific areas. Feasibility of CMP actions, including habitat restoration, is evaluated through the application of relevant and objective criteria and ecological restoration practices germane to the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta (Delta) ecosystem, and is inclusive of relevant information from multiple disciplines. The selection of potential mitigation sites described in the EIR was informed by USACE, EPA, SWRCB and USFWS mitigation policies and guidance documents and Delta Plan guidance as it relates to site selection and design criteria for special-status species. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding community engagement during project implementation including mitigation measures.
625-5	Furthermore, I support that all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements be implemented administratively with regards both Draft Environmental Impact Review (DEIR) for this important project.	The Delta Conveyance EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
625-6	Thank you very much for your assistance on this important matter.	This information is general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
626-1	This project doesn't evaluate the impacts on surface water under CEQA... if you did what you're supposed to do under the law, and evaluate the impacts of the project under CEQA, you would have to reach the obvious that, yes, the project does have adverse environmental impacts on Delta waters we 100% do not want this project to move forward.	Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water, for the description of potential changes to surface water. Changes to surface water resources, by themselves, are not an impact of the project alternatives under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and thus, are not evaluated as impacts in Chapter 5. Impacts associated with changes to surface water are evaluated in Chapter 6, Water Supply, Chapter 7, Flood Protection, Chapter 8, Groundwater, and Chapter 9, Water Quality.
627-1	The proposed delta conveyance project sits atop the Central Valley Aquifer, which is a huge reservoir of water. Unfortunately, the utility of this large reservoir of water as a repository, and the means of conveyance to serve the objectives of the proposed project has not been investigated. The fact is that the vast Central Valley Aquifer has the volume, geographic extent, and physical properties (transmissivity and storativity) to serve as the means of conveyance of the quantities of water involved in the proposed project, from the Sacramento River Basin down to Southern California, and geographic locations in between, namely the San Joaquin Valley.	Although groundwater banking is being pursued in California, groundwater storage is not a component of the proposed project and therefore is not analyzed in the EIR. Although improved use of the Central Valley Aquifer could be pursued as a separate, stand-alone project, using the aquifer for conveyance as an alternative was not analyzed in the EIR because it would not be consistent with the underlying purpose of the proposed project and is also not regulatorily or technically feasible. This comment-suggested alternative would not meet the stated underlying project purpose to develop new diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta to restore and protect the reliability of SWP deliveries because this purpose is directed toward improving and updating aging SWP diversion and conveyance facilities in the Delta. Use of the groundwater aquifer for conveyance would not address this purpose. This comment-suggested alternative also ignores past, present and future groundwater management practices which, historically, have been substantially different than the management of surface water resources. Forty groundwater basins in the Central Valley are managed under 62 groundwater sustainability plans (California Natural Resources Agency 2023). Given the multitude of agricultural and municipal groundwater users of the Central Valley Aquifer and the current regulatory framework for groundwater management (e.g., the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act), it would not be feasible from a regulatory standpoint to manage groundwater storage and transmissivity of SWP water supplies, as the comment suggests. There are also multiple groundwater basins in the Central Valley, not a single "Central Valley Groundwater Basin"; each is

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		managed based on its unique characteristics and groundwater users. Some of these basins are under significant stress; 12 of the 21 basins that are designated as critically overdrafted in the state are in the Central Valley (California Department of Water Resources 2023). Between 2007 and 2018, average annual reduction in groundwater storage in the Central Valley was between 900,000 AF and 2,100,000 AF (California Department of Water Resources 2021:6–16). It would also not be technologically feasible to manage SWP water stored and conveyed via groundwater basins in a reliable way that would be distinguished from current and future use of groundwater by other users. Because groundwater moves very slowly, it would take years for recharged groundwater to move from the Sacramento Valley to San Joaquin Valley. Conveyance across the Central Valley Aquifer from north to south would not occur at a rate that could reasonably compensate for or be considered a feasible alternative for the Delta Conveyance Project in a way that could restore and protect the reliability of SWP deliveries. For these reasons this proposed alternative was not evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies and Programs, regarding projects that may be undertaken by DWR or other agencies under the California Water Resilience Portfolio or other plans.
627-2	Instead of diverting water from the Sacramento River near the delta and conveying it by tunnels to the California Aqueduct, one could recharge the aquifer, particularly below Shasta and Oroville dams, by the same amount, and by means of recharge basins, orchards, and injections wells, during rainy season and thereby deposit (bank) the water in the aquifer. The practice would then give MWD permission to withdraw (pump) the same volume of water from the aquifer at locations	Please see response to comment 627-1 regarding ground water storage.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	downstream, which because of the extent and connectivity of the aquifer, could be near the Aqueduct (for pumping into and further distribution), and/or extent down to locations in the San Joaquin Valley, or even as far south as Southern California.	
627-3	It is likely that the water recharged [into the Central Valley aquifer] upstream in any given year is not the same water pumped out downstream in that year as the time scale of transmission and distribution within the aquifer can be much longer depending on the geographic variability of aquifer properties. However, this is not important. The overarching goal of the above-proposed water banking [water deposits into the Central Valley Aquifer] is to maintain a net zero outflow from the aquifer over the long-term such that there is no overdraft. The actual timescale of distribution within the aquifer is of secondary importance so long as there is not excessive mounding and drawdown in any particular location. The distribution time may be several years without any adverse impacts so long as the aquifer water balance is maintained. The details of the distribution for various scenarios of recharge and withdrawal require careful study, which can be done using the available hydrogeologic model of the Central Valley Aquifer developed by the USGS [hyperlink: https://ca.water.usgs.gov/projects/central-valley/cvhm-numerical-model.html]. Such a study would identify the utility and viability of this approach as an alternative to the preferred alternative in the EIR.	Please see response to comment 627-1 regarding ground water storage.
627-4	Therefore, this comment is to contend that a comprehensive study to determine the utility of the Central Valley Aquifer as alternative means of conveyance of the water quantities being considered in the Delta Conveyance Project is required before the proposed preferred alternative in the EIR is given the go-ahead. The resulting alternative approach of using the utilizing	This information summarizes the content of the comment. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. Additionally, please see response to comment 627-1 regarding ground water storage and the Central Valley Aquifer.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the Central Basin Aquifer has the potential to drastically reduce the design flow rate and hence the scope of the proposed project and could possibility result in the complete elimination of the need for the project.	
628-1	Stranded project assets unaddressed in Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR	This comment does not address the proposed project or contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
628-2	I met a traveller from an antique land Who said: "Two vast and trunkless legs of stone Stand in the desert . . . Near them, on the sand, Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose frown, And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold command, Tell that its sculptor well those passions read Which yet survive, stamped on these lifeless things, The hand that mocked them, and the heart that fed: And on the pedestal these words appear: 'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings: Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!' Nothing beside remains. Round the decay of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare The lone and level sands stretch far away." https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/world-of-change/AralSea	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
631-1	This will be one of the most destructive projects for the environment in California history. It is reminiscent of the Owens Valley project in the 1930's Please do not approve.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
632-1	I have rowed on the Deep Water Channel near Buckley Cove for the past 12 years during all seasons and at least 3 times a week. We row around Fourteen-mile slough, Turner Cut, and as far as Disappointment Slough, Headridge, Turner Cut, Empire Cut, Middle River, Calaveras River, Smith Canal, Mildred Island. One year we rowed from Antioch along False River to Franks Tract and to San Joaquin River.	This comment does not concern the proposed project or contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
632-2	The point being made is that we see the changes in the Delta over the past decade. During years of abundant rain, the wildlife of the Delta is healthy. We see River Otter, River Rats, Pelicans, Swans, Sea Lions, Sand Hill Cranes, Red Wing Black Birds, Marsh Wrens to name a few. During the Drought years, the wildlife and health of the river decreases. We have toxic algae, Hyacinth, and a underwater grass that take over the Delta. Many of these conditions are the effect of climate change and we anticipate that it will only get worse. Taking water out of the Sacramento River will cause a great deal of harm to all of the ecosystems downstream from takeout points. This Delta should be protected as a natural resource that is unlike any other in North American. It affects a whole range of ecosystems though out the Americas and Canada.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also explains the scope of the analysis and the CEQA environmental baseline. Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project related to electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and Cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for more details about how the Delta Conveyance project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, dryer future.
632-3	We should consider other alternatives for water usage in California than destroying this fragile system that supports the people, the wildlife, the farmers that live near it and the ecosystems that surround it.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR evaluates impacts on fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources.
632-4	I do not understand how this environmental report can say that this project will not affect the water quality. Climate is already affecting the water quality. We must not be short sighted about moving ahead with this proposed project especially with the current climate situation.	Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding the project's less-than-significant impacts on water quality. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for more details about how the Delta Conveyance project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, dryer future.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
633-1	My name is Isaac Kinney, I am from the villages of Weychpues, Pektuhl and Erhlerger. I currently live in the village of Weychpues. I have raised my family in my village since moving home from graduating from the University of California Davis.	This comment does not concern the proposed project or contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
633-2	I am very familiar with this area and this project back when it was projected for two tunnels. This scaling down of the bigger twin tunnels project should demonstrate the lack of viability of this current project. The short comings of the last project should also be included in this Environmental Impact Review.	This is a comment submitted on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. Thus, the comment does not directly address the Delta Conveyance Project or the Draft EIR and DWR is not required to respond to comments on projects that are no longer being pursued. However, DWR has reviewed the comments provided by the commenter and provided responses where comments may still be applicable to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Delta Conveyance Project is an independent and separate project from BDCP/WaterFix. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for a description of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project facilities and operations. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding prior Delta Conveyance planning efforts. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
633-3	The Delta Tunnel Conveyance project's EIR presents a plethora of adverse effects to the fisheries of Northern California as well as the natural and cultural resources in the Bay Delta, Sacramento, Klamath-Trinity Rivers Watersheds. With extinction looming for many fisheries species in these watersheds this project still presents adverse effects to the survival of fisheries and the economies that fuel the State of California, the West Coast of US, Mexico, and Canada. This project does not adequately mitigate the negative impacts	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the study area for resources analyzed in Chapters 5-32 of the EIR and areas upstream of the project. Please also see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding project impacts on aquatic and wildlife resources and proposed mitigation to avoid and reduce impacts. Furthermore, please see Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, for details on aquatic and wetland habitat restoration proposed as compensatory

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	from the drought over the last decade as well as relevant climate change research.	mitigation. Please also see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, regarding the evaluation of socioeconomics in the study area. As described in Chapter 17, the potential impacts analyzed are not expected to result in adverse effects. Please also refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for more details about how the Delta Conveyance project increases the resilience of the State Water Project to climate change, sea level rise, and a hotter, dryer future.
633-4	Based on this EIR, this project will also have detrimental ramifications for better clean water projects that promote local community resilience. However, based on this EIR this project promotes unstable and obsolete infrastructure that will need more upkeep and maintenance funding and other mitigation (i.e. training/ safety measures) than presented in the documents. This EIR needs to include the historical and current negative impacts from new construction or the modernization of large scale water projects (i.e. Oroville and Shasta Dams) like this one. It is not clear the project is still even viable with the current financial projections presented. The construction of this project will also bring many adverse effects to air quality, more large vehicle traffic (bigger strain on local transportations systems) that will have long lasting negative impacts on health and infrastructure.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also explains the scope of the analysis and the CEQA environmental baseline. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs to water users and taxpayers. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 20, Transportation, and Chapter 23, Air Quality, and Chapter 26, Public Health, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project.
633-5	As a Yurok Tribal Citizen and businessperson who relies on the watersheds of Northern California I do not support the adverse effects projected to come from this or other concurrent projects and recommend the project team elect the no build option moving forward.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see the evaluations of potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures for the project as discussed in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
634-1	For far too many years, California rivers and aquifers have been abused by rampant expansion. Adding more intakes in the Delta and sending the water South is an abuse of Nature. We need to live within our means. If that means farming less acreage and then so be it. The climate is changing and we need to work with that knowledge. We need to *not* kill or damage yet another waterway. The rivers need to be treated as the living entities that they are with the myriad of native species. Indigenous peoples have lived and thrived in these areas for millennia. They have a right to thrive and care for the land.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also explains the scope of the analysis and the CEQA environmental baseline. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs to water users and taxpayers. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. The comment assertions regarding impacts are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		20, Transportation, and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and Chapter 26, Public Health, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project (refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources). As shown in these chapters, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species analyzed would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, analyzes the project's impacts on Tribal cultural resources and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts where feasible. Chapter 32, section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes, describes DWR's good faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		resources. DWR is committed to continued understanding and incorporation of Tribal knowledge through close collaboration and engagement on mitigation measures as described in Chapter 32.
635-1	The Project would result in substantial cumulatively significant impact on the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape (TCL) and the Sacramento River TCL, toxic algae levels and fish runs. Dispute the full acknowledgment of the importance of the Delta TCL to Tribes, DWR still finds it reasonable to go ahead with this project. Tribes should not have to fight so hard to save their Tribal cultural resources, spiritual ceremonies and sites, and locations of creation stories from desecration by state projects.	Although the analysis in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, concludes that impacts on Tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please also refer to Chapter 32 regarding DWR's consideration of the Sacramento River Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources and the consideration of Tribal perspectives in DWR's decision on whether to approve the project. Chapter 9, Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact would be less than significant. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, concludes that potential impacts on fish and aquatic resources would be less than significant with mitigation. The EIR appropriately evaluates cumulative impacts on water quality, fish species, and Tribal cultural resources, in Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 32, respectively, and proposes mitigation measures for potentially significant environmental impacts, where appropriate. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
637-1	The Delta conveyance project is a dangerous and costly project that I and my folks have rejected since the 1980's. The stability of the land and depths of sloughs, some 80' deep or more will be impacted by the drilling. Moving more water south will further collapse the levies. This extreme flow also makes the deltas water stagnant and unhealthy for fish and people. As a home owner living in the delta and a tax payer, I strongly oppose this project.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please also see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, for a detailed discussion history of Delta water conveyance, the identification of alternatives, and the two-part screening process used to determine the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs to water users and taxpayers.
638-1	Resident of the north delta-supporter of a no tunnel alternative	Please see Common Response, 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
638-2	The people and ecosystems of California do not need a Delta tunnel. The single delta tunnel, otherwise known as Delta Conveyance, is a green washed infrastructure project that will be the nail in the coffin for threatened anadromous fish species, wildlife and delta communities. The state of California has a history of being racist, classist and anti environment. Continuing that legacy, this project will negatively impact historically disenfranchised delta communities in a direct way and will degrade the quality of life for humans and nature alike.	Please see Common Response, 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, for the analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources raised in the comment. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, for a discussion of environmental justice concerns and the potential effects of the project on environmental justice communities. Please also refer to Chapter 29 regarding state and federal policies for consideration of minority and low-income populations.
638-3	People in urban spaces such as Stockton and along the south delta will experience an increase in HABs (harmful algal blooms) and degraded water quality, while those of us in the north delta will see a reduction of Sacramento River outflow, rising salinity and the decimation of delta heritage communities and these unique and pristine connected ecosystems.	Chapter 9, Water Quality, describes the less-than-significant impacts of the project related to electrical conductivity (a measure of salinity) and Cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms. Please see Common Response 10, Surface Water Quality and Groundwater Resources, regarding the surface water quality impact analysis. The comment's assertion that the north Delta intakes would eliminate flows of the American and Feather Rivers is not consistent with the

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	By removing an additional 6,000 CFS through a tunnel, we will be wiping out the flows of the American and Feather rivers. Salt intrusion, rising water temps and less outflow will lead to a massively degraded and decimated California delta and ultimately the ecosystems and communities that connect to it through the bay and pacific.	analyses in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the study area for resources analyzed in Chapters 5-32 of the EIR and areas upstream of the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports.
638-4	Communities such as the towns of Hood, Courtland, Locke, Walnut Grove, Clarksburg, Isleton and Rio Vista will all experience the negative impacts on quality of rural existence. People do not need or desire tons of diesel exhaust, endless lines of truck traffic, massive tons of tunnel muck, nor the destruction of natural spaces along the proposed tunnel pumping station sites.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding impacts on the local communities. The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for the analysis of potentially significant environmental impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, regarding impacts on transportation stemming from project construction and mitigation to reduce those impacts. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
638-5	In regard to how nature will suffer, we already have seen how water agencies have handled the Sacramento River during this drought year. The Sacramento River temperature management plan and the earlier temporary urgency change petitions all contributed to death of returning fall run adult chinook	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	salmon, who swam into a Sacramento River only to die of gill rot, bacterial infections and low dissolved oxygen due to a 78 plus degree river. These fish were boiling to death and floating down the river during the late summer through mid fall. This is a harbinger of things to come if a delta tunnel project comes to be. This is an insult to these majestic animals and to all the people connected to them.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
638-6	Leave the California delta to be, it is not for us to exploit or profit from. Profit minded individuals have already caused nature and the people connected to it enough historical and current suffering.	Please see Common Response, 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant concern to the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
639-1	Climate change is here, and that change may outrun the completion and supposed benefits of the DCP. No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this Draft EIR. Given the harms described in the DEIR to the already endangered Winter run Chinook Salmon, other listed species and other forms of aquatic life, the No Project Alternative as the only correct choice for the DCP.	Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources. Please also see Chapter 9, Water Quality, Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and supporting appendices for these respective chapters, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies.
639-2	The status quo in the Delta already jeopardizes wildlife. The DCP will impact our air, water, land, human and animal communities, and tribal cultural resources in the Delta and far beyond. The Delta is the nexus for all waters draining from the Central Valley. It is also the gateway for most California Chinook Salmon to reach their spawning grounds. Winter-run Chinook salmon is listed as endangered and Spring-run Chinook salmon is listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Fall-run and Late Fall-run Chinook are Species of Concern under the Federal ESA. In the Draft EIR, state officials acknowledge that the DCP tunnel could harm endangered and threatened species, including the Delta Smelt, Winter Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. To offset this harm, the DWR says thousands of acres of other wetlands would have to be restored, but that will take years. Doug Obegi at the Natural Resources Defense Council doubts that the DCP will be permitted due to federal and state endangered species laws. In the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 2022, he predicts it will be challenged in court if permitting is allowed. "The status quo in the delta jeopardizes the continued existence of our native fish and wildlife, and for the thousands of fishing jobs and communities that depend on a healthy environment… This proposed system would be even worse for the environment than the degraded status quo."	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gases, which includes quantitative modeling and proposed mitigation measures. Although the analysis in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, concludes that impacts on Tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding project approvals and permitting processes. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	(https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-07-27/california-releases-plan-for-shrinking-delta-water-project-from-two-tunnels-to-one)	
640-1	Climate change is here, and that change may outrun the completion and supposed benefits of the DCP. No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this Draft EIR. Given the harms described in the DEIR to the already endangered Winter run Chinook Salmon, other listed species and other forms of aquatic life, the No Project Alternative as the only correct choice for the DCP. The status quo in the Delta already jeopardizes wildlife. The DCP will impact our air, water, land, human and animal communities, and tribal cultural resources in the Delta and far beyond.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gases, which includes quantitative modeling and proposed mitigation measures. Although the analysis in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, concludes that impacts on Tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding project approvals and permitting processes. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding the operational criteria, real-time operational decision making and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, for a summary of the various climate change analyses that are found in the EIR and the requirements of CEQA related to climate change. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies.
640-2	The Delta is the nexus for all waters draining from the Central Valley. It is also the gateway for most California Chinook Salmon to reach their spawning grounds. Winter-run Chinook salmon is listed as endangered and Spring-run Chinook salmon is listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Fall-run and Late Fall-run Chinook are Species of Concern under the Federal ESA.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
640-3	In the Draft EIR, state officials acknowledge that the DCP tunnel could harm endangered and threatened species, including the Delta Smelt, Winter Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. To offset this harm, the DWR says thousands of acres of other wetlands would have to be restored, but that will take years. Doug Obegi at the Natural Resources Defense Council doubts that the DCP will be permitted due to federal and state endangered species laws. In the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 2022, he predicts it will be challenged in court if permitting is allowed. "The status quo in the delta jeopardizes the continued existence of our native fish and wildlife, and for	Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Common Response 1 regarding the use of the appropriate CEQA baseline for the purposes of the impacts analysis. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and supporting appendices for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts. As described in Chapter 12, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the thousands of fishing jobs and communities that depend on a healthy environment... This proposed system would be even worse for the environment than the degraded status quo." (https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-07-27/california-releases-plan-for-shrinking-delta-water-project-from-two-tunnels-to-one)	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
641-1	Hello! This is not a EIR comment specifically. I have asked this 3 times but have never received a response. Why does this need to be a tunnel? Why not a pipeline, half buried in the surrounding dirt, running along highway 5? It would seem a much easier, less expensive, less destructive and overall faster to build alternative. It would be big, but with the cost savings, it could be double lined, to further mitigate leakage.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives considered but eliminated. A cut and cover pipeline was considered in a past planning effort (See Chapter 1, Introduction) but above ground disturbances results in far greater impacts than tunneling below ground where the surface and land owner impacts are avoided.
642-1	It is my understanding that the proposed project is incompatible with The Delta Protection Act of 1992 that declared "the Delta...a natural resource of statewide, national and international significance containing irreplaceable resources…..the policy of the state (is) to recognize, preserve and protect those resources for the use of enjoyment of current and future generations”" In March 2019, the California Legislature declared the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, consisting of 73,000 acres, a National Heritage Area.	The project is not inconsistent with the 1992 Delta Protection Act because, as described in Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, the project can be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, regarding applicable laws, regulations, and programs. As discussed in Chapter 4 as well as Chapters 5-32, applicable laws regulations, and programs are considered in the assessment of project impacts and are discussed in the Methods for Analysis sections. The Delta Protection Act of 1992 is discussed where relevant in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
642-2	This project will It will increase water salinity, bring construction traffic to the Delta for 14 years and destroy habitat as well as affect the quality of our lives.	Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a further discussion of road rehabilitation. As described in Chapter 3, Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates Consistency with Water Quality Control Plans under Impact WQ-17. For a more in-depth discussion of construction equipment and delivery trucks and their impact on greenhouse gases, please refer to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.
643-1	I stand in opposition to this project for the following reasons. In summary, the key concerns are: Disruption to navigable waters in the Delta for 14 years during construction Does not adequately address climate change and its impacts on decreased snow melt Unquantified Groundwater Impacts (for Example Table 8.0) non meaningful LTS - Less Than Significant Does not create any new sources of water Will wreak havoc on the aquatic species, wildlife, inhabitants, recreational users and supporting industries	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 20, Transportation, particularly Impact TRANS-5, regarding potential impacts of the project construction, operation, and maintenance on marine navigation, which would be less than significant. Please see Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding projected trends of climate impacts anticipated future temperature warming, sea level rise, snowpack decline, and increasing intensity of heavy precipitation events, frequency of drought, and acres burned by wildfire. Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, regarding discussion and analysis of potential impacts of the project on groundwater. As described in Chapter 8, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts before the application of mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Chapter 16, Recreation, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for discussion and analysis of the effects of the project on recreation and possible relatively minor economic effects of the project. Please refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, and supporting appendices for these respective chapters, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation.
644-1	This project couldn't be worse for the jewel of California-our irreplaceable Sacramento San Joaquin Delta. The Los Angeles basin already gets 85% of it's water from the Delta. Why is the state hell bent on ruining one of the only working deltas in the world to to water lawns, fill pools and grow high water use crops in the desert? The havoc this horrible proposal would wreck on farming, residents and tourism is far too costly. Please avoid the monument building mentality and respect our environment and home. Stop the tunnel!	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also contains a discussion on comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
645-1	By diverting a large amount of fresh water around the Delta The tunnel project will destroy the farms that surround the delta as the salinity will increase and they won't be able to	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	irrigate their crops those who own Marinas and other businesses that depend on the Delta will also be harmed and those of who are lucky enough to live along the Delta will lose the natural beauty of the Delta. The excessive cost of construction and the disruption of recreational activities and every day quality of life because of the pollution caused by construction equipment. This is a water grab by the Southern California corporate farms and land developers and the irony of this poorly devised system is that it won't add one drop of water to the system but it will destroy one part of the state to support another part of it.	Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Common Response 1 also contains a discussion on comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in Chapters 5–32 of the EIR evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. The comment lists a series of potential impacts that are addressed in the EIR. For most resources, the EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures for a list of impacts and their impact conclusions before and after the application of mitigation measures. Where the EIR analysis concludes that impacts from the project could be significant, DWR has proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
647-1	I appreciate the opportunity to submit public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
647-2	Moving forward with the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP) will initiate a set of water projects that will impact waters that eventually feed into the Delta, particularly waters in Northern California. Due to the perception of greater and more reliable transport capacity through the Delta, investments in increased north-state reservoir capacity and diversions will be more attractive to export customers and contractors. This will also be true regarding non-SWP/CVP reservoirs.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please also refer to Common Response 3 regarding Delta Conveyance Project proposed operations, which do not include modifications to State Water Project reservoir operations upstream of the project. DWR would not increase storage withdrawal for exports, except flood releases, even though the proposed Delta Conveyance Project may provide additional diversion capacity. The project would not include modifications to Central Valley Project reservoir operations upstream of the project because Reclamation is not a participant in the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
647-3	Land dedicated to reservoirs becomes denuded of natural vegetation and becomes a biological desert relative to historical ecology. Dams fragment ecosystems, block fish passage, and have major impacts on riparian habitat. Dam operations alter flows in natural channels and can cause temperature changes that negatively impact native fish species, riparian vegetation, and on-river recreation. These impacts are consequential and reasonably foreseeable results of the Tunnel.	As noted in response to comment 647-2, the Delta Conveyance Project does not include modification to reservoir operations upstream of the project, therefore would not result in the impacts the claimed in the comment.
647-4	Adding to this, the findings of the Environmental Justice Community Survey that was paid for by the Department of Water Resources reveals that there are many needs and issues that need attention in the region & communities; the DCP will not fix these issues. Please head the warning of myself and many others in not moving forward.	Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice regarding the requirements and methods for evaluation for the purposes of CEQA. described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Delta Community Fund could be used to fund actions to enhance water and air quality as well as actions to enhance the economic vitality of the Delta communities. As described in Appendix 3G, the community benefits program is not mitigation for project impacts under CEQA but seeks to address community concerns and impacts beyond what CEQA requires. The Community Benefits Program is part of the proposed project and alternatives, and would be implemented separately from, and in addition to, the mitigation required under CEQA and other environmental regulations. Specifics regarding implementation of the program would continue to be developed and finalized, with community input, after CEQA approval.
648-1	I urge you to NOT go further with this project. It is bad for so many reasons. It will destroy the quality of life for those that live in the Delta and will harm so many plants and animals It is a bad idea that has already been defeated at the ballot box a couple of times. Please do NOT proceed with this horrible project!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). The EIR also analyzes Alternative 5, on the Bethany Reservoir alignment, which eliminates the need for a forebay and significantly reduces the total acres affected by the project. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on plants are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, the potentially significant impacts on plants would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
649-1	I may have already made a comment but in case I didn't here is my comment. I don't think playing god with our water resources just to please more people moving into the southern part of the state is a prudent decision.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant concern to the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
649-2	Will the responsibility of paying for this system guarantee those in the South the needed water that they are asked to pay for without even more rationing of the water in the event less water is produced.	Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, for concerns about project costs, including taxpayer costs. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
649-3	What harm to the water courses in the north might develop later that haven't been understood today. Who will pay for the mistakes?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		This comment does not raise a significant concern to the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
649-4	Will growers in the valley's pay a greater share because they are business related and their products are sent far and wide using Calif. Water to make their profits that become deductible expenses for the quantity of water used and taken away in their growing of their products? I would say planning is necessary for water uses but not on a continuous basis taking it away from our water resources such as fish supplies and giving it to growers of plant life, disregarding aquatic life needs. There has to be a better balance determined before any project is allowed.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
650-1	Dear All, I have run over the draft as many times as I possibly can and I do not understand all the technical data nor will I ever. However, I do want you to know that I am 1000% against putting in even one waterline from the Sacramento River south. Our water solution here in Discovery Bay is not good . There are three new single-family home developments in the process of being built at the moment, and the state is trying to shove two or three new apartment buildings into our area as well. Bypassing the natural flow of the Sacramento River would only create problems and shortages no matter how you look at it.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR and comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
650-2	Please think in terms of desalination plants or some other Way rather than disrupting the natural flow of our water ways.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
651-1	100% against this project. The destruction of natural beauty, wildlife, and the Delta itself is NOT an option	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
652-1	Delta water belongs in the Delta. If you take Delta water away from the Delta, our wildlife will die, our rivers will turn brackish, and our community will be substantially impaired. Why would you want to do that? Please do not divert Delta water somewhere else.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The EIR also addresses water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and water quality are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be less-than-significant with mitigation.
652-2	Instead, those places should be helped to establish viable desalination plants.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives considered. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3 regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives.
653-1	This project is very very bad for the Bay and Delta water quality, flora and fauna.	The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The EIR also addresses water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and water quality are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
653-2	Best alternative is the NO PROJECT alternative	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
653-3	State should implement conservation measures instead. Fallow/convert thirsty crops, eliminate landscape watering for starters. Coordinate with Colorado river states UT, CO, AZ, NV NM to make sure enough water conservation is done so Hoover and Glen Canyon dams can still function by keeping water levels above the hydroelectric intakes and so we do not need to import water from the Sierras and NorCal to SoCal, saving electricity too by not moving water.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Chapter 22, Energy, regarding energy demands impacts and mitigation approaches. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
654-1	I grew up boating in the delta.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
654-2	The statement that there is no impact on boating is false. It will also disrupt the ecosystem in the water and on shore with more salt. The animals that fish will not be dragging the carcasses of fishes ashore to fertilize plant life on the shore as well. The study does not address this at all.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on the ecosystem are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which evaluates electrical conductivity, a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates Consistency with Water Quality Control Plans under Impact WQ-17.
655-1	To whom it may concern, please do not move forward with this project.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
655-2	Every alternative discussed in the Draft EIR will result in the disturbance of cultural resources, including historic Tribal villages and mounds from before European contact, which cannot be adequately mitigated. No matter what, this project would result in a significant impact on the Delta, and possibly the San Francisco Bay, Trinity and Sacramento Rivers Tribal Cultural Landscape, including toxic algae levels and fish runs, at a time when our waters are in crisis. Many CA Tribes' culture, diets and traditions depend on survival of the salmon. Tribes should not have to defend their resources from desecration from state projects.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resources raised by the comment. Please see Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which disclose the impacts on cultural resources and Tribal cultural resources, respectively, as a result of construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. As described in Chapter 19 and Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible. Based on extensive consultation with Tribes, DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes. DWR included salmon and other native fish species habitats as character-defining features of the Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape (Delta TCL) and has considered the impacts of the project on the Delta TCL, including its character-defining features, as described in Chapter 32, Impact TCR-1. Please also refer to Chapter 32 regarding DWR's consideration of the Sacramento River Tribal Cultural Landscape. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources and the consideration of Tribal perspectives in DWR's decision on whether to approve the project. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The EIR also addresses water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on fish runs and toxic algae blooms are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
655-3	Compared to the No Action alternative, all other alternatives will result in far worse ecological conditions for native fish and wildlife.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, specifically their impacts.
655-4	All Draft EIR alternatives will result in reduced survival of juvenile Winter and Spring-run salmon through the Delta and tributaries. Less water in the Delta means less water for salmon and other endangered species. The Delta Tunnel is linked to the proposed Sites Reservoir and together the projects would take much more water from our rivers, Bay and Delta. Fish Need Water. There is no scientific evidence to prove the claim that habitat restoration can mitigate adverse impacts caused by reduced flows.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, specifically their impacts. The Sites Reservoir Project is included on the cumulative project list in Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, in the cumulative analysis in each of the resources chapters as appropriate. The Sites Reservoir Project is an independent project, being pursued by an independent agency. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon and other species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see Chapter 5, Surface Water which discusses the results of the hydrologic modeling and concludes that long-term average monthly flows for the project alternatives would be similar to existing conditions. Please also see Chapter 12 regarding the scientific basis supporting the creation of habitat to mitigation for impacts on aquatic resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
655-5	The DEIR fails to consider any alternatives that reduce diversions from the Delta. All alternatives result in increased water exports.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
655-6	I believe this is a life and death situation, not only for Tribal cultures, but also for the Salmon and the waters in this state. This WILL accelerate the desertification of northern California and directly impact the ability for humans to live in this bioregion in the future.	Please refer to response to comment 655-2 regarding identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon and other species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
656-1	All the evidence points to the Delta Conveyance project being an ecological and cultural disaster. It would wreak havoc on Bay/Delta ecosystems and be the death knell of the fisheries here, especially salmon. Exporting water from this watershed to serve the deserts of southern California will merely accelerate the desertification of northern California, devastating the ecology of a region already in crisis. The DEIR contains no alternatives that do not include taking water from the Bay/Delta watershed, and is therefore incomplete. We the people of this landscape do not consent to our sacred water being disrespected in this way, and we will not let this happen.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon and other species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in these chapters, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all potentially significant impacts identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered, specifically their impacts.
657-1	I am opposed to the water tunnel. It will not create any new sources of water. Disrupting the navigable waters for 14 years is ridiculous. It will be bad for the fish, wildlife, the people who live in the delta and the recreational users who pay taxes to enjoy it. The project studies are incomplete and not necessarily factual.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on fish and wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, the potentially significant impacts on fish and wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation. Furthermore, as described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. The EIR also evaluates socioeconomics of the Delta community in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. As described in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, the potential impacts analyzed are not expected to result in adverse effects. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and use of best available science.
658-1	ENOUGH is a word the Central Valley farmers, State Water Contractors, and Metropolitan Water District will never embrace, hence the Delta Water Tunnel Project. This trio will always use their considerable political clout to push for more freshwater diversions from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers regardless of the impact on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Delta ecosystem, among other machinations,	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	will use their power to appoint scientists that can be swayed to issue reports that minimize diversion biological impacts.	
658-2	The Delta has already been seriously degraded by excessive diversion of fresh waters. It doesn't take an extensive EIR process to know that the tunnel project's diversion of additional waters from the Delta will further weaken the ecosystem with added salinity and pollution levels, especially in the light of projected sea level rise, impacts that have significant wildlife and human negative impacts. If we are to protect the environment from additional human caused degradation, we all need to understand that natural resources have innate, finite limits, limits that have already been exceeded in the Delta.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5: Effects on Electrical Conductivity Resulting from Facility Operations and Maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates Consistency with Water Quality Control Plans under Impact WQ-17. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how sea level rise was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
658-3	I implore you, the California Department of Water Resources, to recognize that there are finite limits, that enough is enough, to reject the greed and politically skewed Delta Water Tunnel Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
659-1	The Delta Tunnels are an Environmental Crime Story in progress. Stop the murder of the California Delta! Support Desalination Plants being built like the Doheny Plant in Southern California that will draw seawater from wells below the ocean floor to create a natural barrier protecting sea life from intake. California only has 12 Desalination Plants for our 840 miles of general coastline. Draining the Delta is stupid.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Smart water solution is desalination with brine byproduct industry creation.	
660-1	Politicians like Doug LaMalfa and Kevin McCarthy may think that draining down the Delta water and redirecting it to where "nature does not need it" to water California agriculture is harmless to the environment, but they are wrong. Not only will this disrupt water flow in the delta, but it will harm the environment. No mitigations will work since we will lose marsh lands and water quality due to transfer of soil and sediment and cave-ins along the Delta. We are headed into a 20 year long drought. Allowing more water to be moved artificially into the San Joaquin Valley will serve only large farming operations and not restore the wells and groundwater resources already lost to continued agricultural expansion.	The comment assertion that operation of the project would drain the Delta or otherwise disrupt the flow of the Delta is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 5, Surface Water, based on hydrologic modeling of proposed operations, long-term average monthly flow for all project alternatives is similar to existing conditions with minor differences. Furthermore, the assertion that the project will be harmful to the environment is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, conclude that potential environmental effects on fish and wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation. In addition, Appendix 3F, Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources, identifies and describes the types of mitigation that would be implemented to compensate for impacts. Water quality impacts are evaluated in Chapter 9, Water Quality, which concludes that impacts would be less than significant without mitigation. Regarding the export of water to the San Joaquin Valley, please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
661-1	In section 3CA you mention concerns about sea level rise. I read this as a concern with syphoning off fresh water before it gets mixed with salt? In other words you are sacrificing the	Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change and sea level rise were incorporated into the EIR's analyses. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	delta without looking at ways to preserve this valuable resource.	Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
661-2	You mention in the same section [Section 3CA] that you would take water if there was sufficient in the river. There is not sufficient water and hasn't been for many years.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
661-3	You mention mitigation but with your history of rapacious water use that is impossible to give credence.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
662-1	I favor the "No Action Alternative". After years of surplus funds in California's accounts, the state is projected for 2023 year, to have a 25 billion dollar deficit. With this projection, we need financial responsibility and fund projects that give the state	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	more bang for the buck. The state needs to create more sources of water and retain that water for later use.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
663-1	The draft EIR is way too long to actually read unless it is one's actual job to do so. Most of the rest of us have other obligations that take up most of our time. My chief concern is for the integrity of the Delta, its ecology, and its communities. The tunnel construction and implementation and the diversion of fresh water from the Sacramento River would be detrimental to the flora and fauna (including humans) of the Delta.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the length and complexity of the EIR. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on flora and fauna are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, the potentially significant impacts on flora and fauna would be less than significant with mitigation.
663-2	Salt water incursion into this fresh water habitat is already altering the land and waterscape.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
663-3	A salinity dam across False River impedes the flow of vessel traffic on this otherwise very navigable waterway and no doubt impedes the movement of marine mammals and fish. False River cuts short a long loop of the San Joaquin River; damming it makes emergency vessel response go the long way around.	The Delta Convenance Project does not include a dam across False River. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, for a detailed description of the proposed Delta Conveyance facilities. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding the proposed project's potential impacts on fish and terrestrial species. As shown in these chapters, the potentially significant impacts on fish and wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation. The EIR evaluates impacts on emergency access and marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation. Please refer to Chapter 20, Impact TRANS-4. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Please also refer to Chapter 20, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
663-4	With less fresh water flow, we can expect saltier water farther upstream. Delta farmers need the fresh water for irrigation. They can't irrigate crops with salt water. Did you think they were growing our food by watering it with drinking water? They are not.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding impacts and proposed mitigation measures for farmland. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
663-5	The economic devastation to the Delta community would be catastrophic. Don't sacrifice this historical National Heritage Area.	The EIR evaluates socioeconomics of the Delta community in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics. As described in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, the potential impacts analyzed are not expected to result in adverse effects.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, the project could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on cultural resources, and mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible.
664-1	This project is very costly and bad for the delta environment by reducing natural water flow into the delta and threating flora and fauna, many of which are endangered or threatened species.	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on flora and fauna are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, the significant impacts on flora and fauna would be less than significant with mitigation.
664-2	The state should look at the no project alterative and using the budget for water conservation measures statewide for agriculture and urban uses instead. Water conservation will also help keep reservoir levels up and reduce threat of loss of existing clean hydroelectric dam powerplants in CA as well as CO, NV, and AZ due to reservoir water levels dropping below power plant intakes.	Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and budget.
665-1	I oppose the Delta Conveyance Project that would negatively impact the ability of the recreational boating public to navigate in the waterways of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. As discussed in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts analyzed could be less-than-significant with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The EIR evaluates impacts on marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
665-2	The RBOC [Recreational Boaters of California] has commented previously and consistently as the state has considered the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, the California Water Fix and now the single Delta Conveyance Project.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
665-3	This project has several fatal flaws. Specific to recreation, the project would severely disrupt navigation, boating-related commerce and communities throughout the lengthy, fourteen years of construction. It is a false assumption that recreational activity would merely move to other areas. Please abandon this concept until such time as the many concerns can be addressed fully and successfully.	Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. As described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. The EIR evaluates impacts on marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
666-1	Don’t make franks tract a big island, it would just become a big homeless camp, just a thought	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
667-1	Every summer and sometimes during the winter months over the past eighteen years my family and I have travelled by boat from the San Francisco Bay to the waters of the San Francisco Bay.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
667-2	We are strongly opposed the the Delta Conveyance Project. Please stop working any measure that will attempt to divert any water at all from the San Joaquin or Sacramento Rivers.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
668-1	I am opposed to any more water from the delicate northern California delta being used to provide water to the desert area that is southern California.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
669-1	No to any new diversion of water from the Delta.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
669-2	Recommend to store water with more damns or other safe storage.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
670-1	Diverting flows from the Delta will result in higher water temperatures and saltwater intrusion due to less flushing related to reduced water flow through the Delta. This will permanently alter the sensible ecosystem in the Delta. Less water will increase the risk for wildfires, which can be difficult to extinguish in the peat areas and will have significant air quality issues for downwind residents all over the Central Valley. To call these impacts "LTS" or "NI" (less than significant; no impact) is irresponsible.	DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding best available science. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding water temperature and electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please also see Chapter 12, Aquatic Resources regarding water temperature effects on fish. Potential risks for wildfire are addressed in Chapter 25, Hazards, Hazardous Materials and Wildfire.
670-2	This project would have detrimental impacts on this and future generations. As an engineer and avid boater I urge the responsible parties to stop this project!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
671-1	Has anyone used the Bay Model to determine whether there will be any damage to Delta farmland with the encroachment of brackish water into the delta, when the flow from the Sacramento is diverted? Why not? When will that be done?	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available tools and science. Please refer to Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Analysis, regarding the appropriate use of modeling tools for the CEQA analysis. The Methods for Analysis subsection in each of the environmental resource chapters (Chapters 5–32) provides a description of the resource-specific methods and tools used in the analysis. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Project Requirements, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please also refer to Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-3, regarding impacts on the quality of irrigation water and agricultural resources. As described in Chapter 15, Impact AG-3 would be less than significant with mitigation.
672-1	Where are you getting the excess water you want to "convey"? We're in a climate change-caused drought that has completely changed the nature of the Delta's watershed, and that will not change. Be honest and realistic in your planning.	Please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding the project's ability to improve water supply reliability and adapt to changing hydrologic conditions as a result of climate change.
673-1	I do not believe that this project is the best to protect the Delta. The project is designed to again, help people change the natural environment	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
674-1	The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires all California state and local public agencies to study the potential significant environmental impacts of a proposed project prior to approval. Unless the proposed project is exempt from detailed environmental review, and where there is the potential for the proposed project to cause one or more significant environmental impacts, compliance with CEQA may require an agency to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that the public has an opportunity to review and comment on. Preparation of an EIR, including the structure and substance and must follow specific CEQA requirements.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The Delta Conveyance EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives.
675-1	what will happen to the water profile and our crops where you are going to dig these holes and are pumping the water out into the rivers. The environmental impact to our soil is not being looked at for farmers.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including soil in Chapter 11, Soils, and agriculture in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
676-1	This plan for the Delta Conveyance (i.e., tunnels) does not address the impact to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.	The comment assertions regarding the EIR's evaluation of impacts on the Delta are not consistent with the analysis provided in the EIR. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
676-2	Our rich agricultural area will be impacted by the lack of water or water that is too salty to use. A problem we are already having as the salt moves further up the Sacramento River.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
676-3	The impact on fish and wildlife has not been addressed properly and will harm species that are already on the road to extinction.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on fish and wildlife are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, the significant impacts on fish and wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation.
676-4	The traffic on our levees by big trucks hauling away millions of cubic feet of dirt will damage our levees, impact residents of small towns, impact the small towns themselves and create chaos.	The project has been designed to minimize roads on levees (including traffic on existing levee roads) and impacts on levees during construction. For example, during construction of the new intake facilities, a jurisdictional levee would be built at the intake sites east of the existing jurisdictional levee to reroute SR 160 and maintain continuous flood protection during and following construction (see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Temporary and Permanent Flood Control Levees and State Route 160). Nonstructural flood risk management measures would also be implemented to protect Delta levees (see the Chapter 7, Flood Protection,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		section titled Process and Methods of Review for Flood Protection). Finally, daily and periodic maintenance will be performed for all facilities, including inspecting levee side slopes and outside of the toe area to ensure they remain in full conformance with the CVFPB and USACE requirements.
676-5	All of this so that SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA corporate farmers/ranchers can use water on their drought ravaged fields. This tunnel does not solve a problem, but creates many. more that will impact people globally when the Delta farms and ranches are no longer able to produce much needed food. Not to mention the wine industry will be impacted as the vineyards will go dry just as the almond ranches do.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding conversion of agricultural land, which could result in significant and unavoidable impacts even after mitigation measures.
676-6	STOP this insanity once and for all! Find another way to get water for Southern California.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
676-7	Desalination is certainly an option that can be used in the long run. It's not too late to stop this project. Use some common sense and find another way.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
677-1	The delta conveyance project is and will always be detrimental to the health of the watershed, turning hundreds of miles of riparian and marsh land into brackish deserts. Loss of habit for fish, amphibians, birds and mammals. The damage is immeasurable. Please stop this water grab by wealthy farmers and growers.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include, if approved by DWR, the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
678-1	No on tunnel, delta already a mess let's not make it worse for already struggling biology	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
679-1	I wish to my strong opposition to the delta tunnel project in its new form as the conveyance project. Different name same problems.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
679-2	This is a water grab for the limited water resources of Northern California to Southern California with no real care regarding the San Joaquin delta. This doesn't create water it diverts it from where it already is and will be needed with climate change.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analyses. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.
680-1	Information does not support proposed positive outcome of resultant measures. Recreational used of waterways has been intact for years with minimal impact to waterways. Proposed changes, such as expanding freshwater access, presents a larger risk to the ecosystem of the water by moving the saltwater transition further inland, negatively impacting all species in and around the water source.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on recreation are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation. As described in Chapter 16, the potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife. Overall, the potential impacts on wildlife were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
681-1	I am opposed to this project because of its negative impact on the environment and our use of the boating waterways in California.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. Chapter 16, Recreation, demonstrates that the potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. The EIR evaluates impacts on marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
682-1	I oppose the Delta Conveyance Project that would negatively impact the ability of the recreational boating public to navigate in the waterways of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Just SAY NO	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on recreational boating are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including recreation in Chapter 16, Recreation. As described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts analyzed could result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. The EIR evaluates impacts on marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
683-1	I'm worried about the latest draft for the Delta Conveyance. It appears to be written on the basis of a desired outcome for some parties, while negating various impacts to the environment	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used and the use of best available science.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. As described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, Chapter 1, Section titled, Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32.
683-2	Specific to the interest of recreational boating, my key concerns are: - Disruption to navigable waters in the Delta for 14 years during construction	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on recreational boating and marine navigation are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As described in Chapter 16, Recreation, the potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding the evaluation of recreational opportunities. The EIR evaluates impacts on marine navigation in Chapter 20, Transportation, Impact TRANS-5, regarding marine navigation. As described in Chapter 20, this impact would be less than significant.
683-3	Specific to the interest of recreational boating, my key concerns are: - Does not adequately address climate change and its impacts on decreased snow melt.	Please see response to comment 683-2 regarding impacts on recreation. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analyses.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will protect the SWP from sea level rise.
683-4	Specific to the interest of recreational boating, my key concerns are: - Unquantified Groundwater Impacts (for Example Table 8.0) non meaningful LTS - Less Than Significant	Please see response to comment 683-2 regarding impacts on recreation. Please see Chapter 8, Groundwater, regarding potential impacts on groundwater resources, which were modeled and quantified for the purposes of the analysis.
683-5	Specific to the interest of recreational boating, my key concerns are: - Does not create any new sources of water	Please see response to comment 683-2 regarding impacts on recreation. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include, if approved by DWR, the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
683-6	Specific to the interest of recreational boating, my key concerns are: - Will wreak havoc on the aquatic species, wildlife, inhabitants, recreational users and supporting industries	Please see response to comment 683-2 regarding impacts on recreation. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species identified would be less than significant with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The EIR also analyzes socioeconomics of the Delta community in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics.
683-7	I request that you reconsider the draft document while make a sincere effort on a thorough environmental impact analysis. The aim should be for real solutions to the problem at hand, and not only fill one water hole by creating another water disaster.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project and the cumulative impact assessment. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
684-1	Hello, I oppose the Delta Conveyance project: simply stated, we are going to destroy wetlands, kill the freshwater delta, create quite a bit of local damage for very little water as with global warming, the availability of fresh water from the mountain snowfall will decline. All this damage, and in 25 years, little water will be coming from the conveyance. A waste of investment. That same money invested in Desal plants would actually produce water.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species identified would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change and sea level rise was incorporated into the EIR's analyses. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project and comments referencing water supply reliability and climate change. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
685-1	I am writing today to respond to the Delta Conveyance Project's Draft Environmental Impact Report and to express my sincere opposition to the project and its components. I am opposed to the project as both a lifelong resident of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and as someone who has studied and written about the hydropolitical, energy, and environmental histories of California. [Footnote 1: I received my doctorate in History from the University of California San Diego in 2021.]	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
685-2	After examining the DCP Draft EIR, I have noted several flaws in the report and its conclusions, including certain assumptions made regarding the availability of water and energy supplies for the project which do not reflect current environmental, economic, and political realities.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. Please refer to Chapter 6, Water Supply, regarding potential water supply availability under the project construction and operation. Please also see Chapter 22, Energy, for discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts related wasteful or inefficient use of energy as a result of construction and operation of the project. Chapter 22 uses information from utility providers including California Independent System Operator (CAISO) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) as appropriate and will coordinate with utility provider as needed and described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, in the section titled Electrical Facilities. For information relevant to specific comments made in Letter 685 about water and energy, please refer to detailed responses in this table.
685-3	I offer several suggestions regarding superior alternatives to the Delta Conveyance Project and how the California Department of Water Resources can best assist the Delta communities and residents whose interests would be adversely affected by the project's approval.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
685-4	Ultimately, the DCP is environmentally and economically unsound, unnecessary, contrary to state laws and recent state policies on water and energy, detrimental to the Delta, and not	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, which describes the reasonable range of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	in the best interests of Delta communities or California as a whole. A No Project Alternative is economically and environmentally superior to the Delta Conveyance Project and this project should not be approved.	feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding a description of the No Project Alternative and responses related to commenter preference for the No Project Alternative. Many of the reasonably foreseeable actions included in the No Project Alternative would not address the basic objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project, including the risks to the State Water Project supplies from the Delta presented by climate change, sea level rise, flooding, and earthquakes.
685-5	Environmental, Legal, and Economic Issues Associated with the DCP's Proposed Water Supply The stated purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project, as presented in the California Department of Water Resources' Draft EIR, is to "restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta… in a cost-effective manner." The project objectives focus on "the SWP's ability to respond to sea level rise and climate change, minimize disruption of SWP from earthquakes in and around the Delta, improve water supply reliability, and provide operational flexibility." [Footnote 2: Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR, Chapter 1, 1-1.] In other words, the project is intended to exclusively benefit SWP water contractors, located outside of the Legal Delta in the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California. The project's tunnel will bypass Delta channels and their potential risks entirely to deliver additional high value freshwater supplies from the Sacramento River to southern water contractors, regardless of conditions in the central and southern Delta below the DCP's point of diversion in the northern Delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include, if approved by DWR, the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The EIR chapters 7-32 evaluate and disclose potentially significant physical environmental impacts in the central and southern Delta downstream of the proposed intakes and provide potential mitigation measures to reduce impacts where applicable. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, Impact WQ-5, which

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		analyzes the effects on electrical conductivity resulting from facility operations and maintenance. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Based on the analysis contained in Impact WQ-5, the project alternatives would not cause additional exceedance of applicable EC water quality criteria/objectives by frequency, magnitude, and geographic extent that would result in adverse effects on any beneficial uses of study area waterbodies. Impacts would be less than significant for all project alternatives with respect to EC. The Delta Conveyance Project includes a Community Benefits Program specifically because the majority of benefits from the project would not be within the local communities. The Community Benefits Program would be implemented separately from, and in addition to, the mitigation required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other environmental regulations. As described in Appendix 3G, the Community Benefits Program Framework identifies the goals, objectives, and potential components of the Delta Conveyance Project Community Benefits Program. The Framework also details the steps the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) will undertake in development of the Community Benefits Program, including ensuring opportunities for meaningful community participation. The Framework was informed by public input received through interested parties from within local Delta communities, interviews, workshops, and public comments. Specifics regarding implementation of the program would continue to be developed and finalized, with community input, after that approval.
685-6	The degradation and destruction of fisheries and aquatic life, increased salinity of Delta water supplies through saltwater intrusion and freshwater flow reductions, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, growth of harmful algal blooms, and other negative ecological consequences resulting from the Delta Conveyance Project's increased export and removal of freshwater supplies from the Delta, particularly from points of	The EIR provides an impact analysis of environmental resources raised by the comment. For discussion and analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of construction and operation of the project, please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, including the analysis of harmful algal blooms and salinity; Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, including habitat and flow modifications; Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	diversion in the northern Delta, are well-documented and covered more effectively by other project opponents.	Resources, including wildlife habitat. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife habitat, the loss of fish, and growth of harmful algal blooms are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapters 12 and 13, the analysis in the EIR concludes that all significant impacts on wildlife and aquatic species identified in the comment would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As shown in Chapter 9, impacts on water quality would also be either less than significant, or mitigated to a less than significant level. Please refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms, to locate the letter numbers of comments provided by other entities that are of interest. Responses to all comment letters are provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Response to Comments Tables.
685-7	In addition to the negative environmental impacts the DCP would have on the Delta and its ecological communities, the project violates certain legal obligations related to water quality in the Delta and freshwater flows into and through the region. The Delta Reform Act of 2009 declares that the basic goals of the state government for the Delta are to "Achieve the two coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem." These coequal goals are to be achieved "in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." [Footnote 3: "Text of the Delta Reform Act of 2009," http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sbx7_1_bill_20091112_chaptered.html.] The DCP, by focusing only on ensuring the reliability and quality of water supplies delivered to SWP water contractors located outside of	As described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, in the section titled Project Purpose and Objectives, the fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries to all SWP water users, including irrigation, municipal, and industrial water users and to minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts from reduced quality and quality of SWP water deliveries. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include, if approved by DWR, the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, discusses the Delta Reform Act's coequal goals and details how the practical effect of many of the proposed mitigation measures and environmental commitments cited in the EIR would protect Delta values. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, for information on the relationship of the project to the Delta Reform Act's coequal goals and policy to reduce reliance on the Delta, and federal and state antidegradation policies.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	the Delta, fails to account for the needs of the Delta and therefore does not achieve the coequal goals required by the Delta Reform Act. If the project is built, the degradation of irrigation, municipal, and industrial water supplies in the Delta for the benefit of state water contractors hundreds of miles to the south would not conflict with the project's stated purpose, but such an outcome would run counter to the intent and provisions of the Delta Reform Act.	
685-8	In addition to violating the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act, the DCP would conflict with established area-of-origin legislation and court decisions designed to protect the quality and quantity of freshwater flows through the Delta. The Legal Delta is recognized as an "area of origin" with certain rights to waters within the area that must be protected.[Footnote 4: CA Water Code section 1215.5.] The enactment of the Delta Protection Act of 1959, an area of origin law, was "tied" to the passage of legislation authorizing the State Water Project. [Footnote 5: Craig M. Wilson, "California's Area of Origin Laws," 2013, https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_info/agendas/2013/oct/100813_7origin.pdf, 5.] The Act's provisions include the requirement that the DWR and its State Water Project must provide "salinity control and an adequate water supply for the users of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta." The Act also declares that "no person, corporation or public or private agency or the State or the United States should divert water from the channels of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to which the users within said Delta are entitled." [Footnote 6: CA Water Code section 12202, 12203.] The Delta Reform Act of 2009 references and incorporates the area of origin laws (the County of Origin Law of 1931, The Watershed Protection Statute of 1933, and the Delta Protection Act of 1959). Court	Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding water rights and the Delta Reform Act. As described in these two Common Responses and elsewhere throughout the EIR, DWR and the operation of the Delta Conveyance Project, if approved, will comply with existing water rights. For example, as identified in the Executive Summary section titled Chapter 6, Water Supply, the project alternatives do not include any actions that would modify water deliveries to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights holders, including in-Delta water rights holders. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in adverse impacts on surface and groundwater quality and quantity within the Delta and other areas of origin during the construction and operation because water rights of other entities would not be modified. The project is consistent with the 1959 Delta Protection Act and the Watershed Protection Statutes. DWR is required to respect senior water rights when operating the SWP. The project would not change current regulatory requirements that protect the beneficial use of water. When exporting water from the Delta, DWR must comply with all applicable state and federal regulatory requirements, including environmental standards, laws, and regulations relating to Delta inflow and outflow, Delta water quality, fish protection, environmental needs, and water rights, including in-Delta water right holders. The State Water Board has also established water quality and flow requirements and limits on the rate of export of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	cases involving the area of origin laws have established that these laws "unquestionably apply to the major state and federal projects in the Delta watershed." [Footnote 7: Wilson, "California's Area of Origin Laws," 4, 14.]	water that can be pumped by the state and federal pumping plants and is currently reviewing those requirements in its Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan to ensure beneficial uses are protected. Furthermore, the State Water Board considered consistency with the Delta Protection Act in adopting D-1641 and, if approved, the project will be operated in accordance with D-1641 unless a new water rights decision is adopted by the State Water Board in the future. The project is also consistent with the 1992 Delta Protection Act and 12980 et seq. because, as described in Common Response 8, the project can be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place. Please see Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations, for a discussion of the Act's coequal goals and how the practical effect of many of the proposed mitigation measures in the EIR and environmental commitments in the EIR would protect Delta values. Please also see Common Response 8 for information on the relationship of the project to the Delta Reform Act.
685-9	Accordingly, a tunnel project that diverts and exports hundreds of thousands of acre feet from points north of the central Delta to benefit water users outside of the Delta would violate the Delta Reform Act and Delta Protection Act by reducing the quantity of freshwater flows through the region and degrading the quality of water in this legally protected area of origin. The construction of the DCP will not remove the state's current legal obligations to guarantee a certain level of water quality and freshwater flows to the Delta, even in the event of levee failures due to earthquakes, sea level rise, flooding, or other causes which do not affect the structural integrity of the project tunnel.	As explained in multiple parts of the EIR (Chapter 1, Introduction; Appendix 3E, Delta Reform Act Considerations; and Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs) the Delta Reform Act includes a state policy to reduce reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs through a statewide strategy of investing in improved regional supplies, conservation, and water use efficiency (Wat. Code § 85021). Under California Water Code Section 85021, it is the obligation of each region that relies on water from the Delta watershed, not the obligation of DWR, to determine the best ways to meet this goal by improving regional self-reliance. Please see Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 8 regarding water rights and the Delta Reform Act. Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an analysis of potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
685-10	In addition to reducing the quality and quantity of freshwater in the Delta, the Delta Conveyance Project's massive new diversions from the Sacramento River would also degrade and reduce freshwater flows in other protected rivers connected to the Sacramento such as the Trinity. The DCP's plan to annually divert between 200,000 and 500,000 acre-feet from the Sacramento River would put additional stress on the Trinity River, a stream which already has half of its water diverted to the Sacramento for the benefit of downstream consumers. The Trinity County Fish and Game Advisory Commission declared in its opposition to the project that the river's salmon and trout populations, under existing pressures, have already "drastically dropped to the point that their survival is threatened." [Footnote 8: Dan Bacher, "Trinity County votes to oppose Delta Tunnel, citing impacts to already stressed Trinity River," Daily Kos, December 10, 2022, https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2022/12/10/2141136/-Trinity-County-votes-to-oppose-Delta-Tunnel-citing-impacts-to-already-stressed-Trinity-River.] The Draft EIR has insufficiently analyzed the effects of the project's diversions on both the Sacramento River and the legally protected rivers connected to it.	Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for information about the analysis of upstream aquatic species and DWR's commitment to not alter operational criteria on the Trinity River. It is important to note that the Delta Conveyance Project is a State Water Project (SWP) project and not a Central Valley Project (CVP) project, and the SWP does not divert water upstream of the Feather River.
685-11	In light of continued extreme drought conditions, it is questionable whether the 500,000 acre-feet intended to supply the project will be available to divert into the conveyance tunnel. In recent years, Lake Oroville, the largest reservoir on the State Water Project system and the main source of supply for state water contractors in the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California, has experienced record low water levels. In 2021, water levels in the reservoir were so low that Oroville Dam's power plant had to be taken offline.[Footnote 9: Matt Hamilton, "Amid worsening drought,	Please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project even in potentially drier future conditions. The project would allow the State Water Project to capture high flows during the shorter periods they are available in the future, which would help adapt to a changing climate. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water supply in Chapter 6, Water Supply, and climate change in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Lake Oroville's record-low water level forces shutdown of hydroelectric power plant," Los Angeles Times, August 5, 2021, https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2021-08- 05/amid-worsening-drought-lake-orovilles-record-low-water-level-forces-shutdown-of-hydroelectric-power-plant.] Drought-induced declines in mountain snowpack levels have left many reservoirs across northern California, including the Central Valley Project's Lake Shasta, drastically short of water and less likely to receive snowmelt runoff. A project tunnel with an intake on the Sacramento River near Hood or Clarksburg will not produce more snowpack in the mountains or additional supplies of water behind Oroville Dam and other reservoirs. The ambitious estimates of additional water supply to be exported south via the DCP, in light of recent climatic trends and state and federal policy decisions on rivers such as the Klamath, are not sound. The project does not create any additional water but merely facilitates the increased export of freshwater to points south of the Delta. By increasing the amount of water exported from the northern Delta to the San Joaquin Valley and points further south, the project will both reduce the amount of freshwater flows through the Delta and increase the reliance on uncertain water supplies in southern California.	Chapter 30, Climate Change. Chapter 30 discusses changes in snowpack and precipitation (and runoff and drought). As described in this chapter's analysis in the EIR, the Delta faces long-term progressive risks of supply reliability from sea level rise and changes in Delta inflow hydrology driven by climate change (Delta Stewardship Council 2021:2-9, 5-46, 5-55–5-59). Continuation of existing management and operation of the Delta will increasingly expose Delta water users and those that depend on water exported from the Delta to risks of water supply interruption and diminishing water supply reliability over time. Common Response 6 provides detail on the approach to analyses presented in the EIR regarding snowpack and water supply. Chapter 6 describes the approach to analysis and results of water supply changes related to the project. It notes that "alternative water resources improve water supply reliability and the state's ability to withstand drought conditions." Project alternatives aim to provide operational flexibility and increases in SWP deliveries during dry years. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Common Response 3 also discusses the reasonable range of feasible alternatives considered in the EIR. As described in Chapter 6, there is variability in the amount of water the project is expected to export based on alternative and based on water year type. The 500,000 acre-feet referenced in the comment is only one of multiple potential export amounts. The assumptions used in the hydrologic modeling to estimate water supply changes that might result from the proposed project and its alternatives are provided in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. Please also refer to Common Response 9,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Hydrologic Modeling and Approach, for additional discussion regarding the adequacy and appropriateness of the modeling used in the EIR analysis.
685-12	Not only is the project's water supply in doubt, the necessity of the project's infrastructure to provide for the needs of state water contractors and other water users in the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California is also dubious. The Draft EIR acknowledges that "there is more than sufficient available export capacity for water transfers in all water year types with the current facilities." [Footnote 10: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 6, 6-33.]	Chapter 1, Introduction, provides a summary of the expected hydrologic conditions resulting from climate change. As noted in this chapter, restrictive operational requirements and the forecasted effects of drought and climate change are the dominant factors affecting water supply reliability. Additionally, Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, states that the purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is not to create additional water transfer capacity, but to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio. The Delta Conveyance Project's potential to result in increased water transfers are discussed in Chapter 6, Water Supply.
685-13	The EIR also notes of state water contractor service areas that "there is no discernable link between the amount of water exported to the study area by the SWP (or the CVP) and population growth." Rather than inducing population growth, the DCP would merely "provide improved supply reliability and restore amounts that agencies have previously received that have been reduced due to regulatory requirements." [Footnote 11: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 31-3, 31-10.] These statements indicate that there is not a dire or urgent need for the DCP in order to provide for the needs of populations in Southern California and the San Joaquin Valley.	The comment mischaracterizes information from Chapter 31 to suggest that if water supply is not related or does not drive an increase in population, then Delta Conveyance Project is not needed. Chapter 31 presents evidence using the existing water supply portfolios of project proponents, population growth trends, a description of other factors affecting growth within the study area, and the modest change in water supply under the project alternatives to conclude the project alternatives would not be a substantial factor in fostering growth within the study area. The need for the project is described in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, is beyond that of serving a particular population and includes addressing anticipated rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events, and to provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta and better manage risks of further regulatory constraints on project operations.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
685-14	Providing for improved water supply reliability could be provided to service areas by other means than the DCP, including improved conservation measures and desalination. Improvements to levees and existing conveyance channels in the Delta region would also be a non-project alternative that improves water supply reliability for the entire SWP system.	Water supply strategies that include conservation measures, desalination, and levee and channel improvements are being considered, in addition to the project, as part of statewide planning efforts by DWR or other entities and as detailed in the California Water Portfolio. Such reasonably foreseeable projects are also considered in analyses of the No Project Alternative in each resource chapter. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. The section discussing alternatives suggested in comments or considered but eliminated explains how the screened-out alternatives do not meet project objectives or are not potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project. The purposes and project objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR.
685-15	It is not clear how the DCP would be able to bypass the regulatory requirements which currently govern State Water Project operations.	The Delta Conveyance Project would not bypass the regulatory requirements which currently govern State Water Project operations. Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, provides a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		complete description of the operations of the project, including section titled Integration of North Delta Intakes with South Delta Facilities. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
685-16	The DCP is similarly unnecessary to subsidize corporate farmers in the San Joaquin Valley, who have continued to unsustainably expand the amount of irrigated acreage devoted to export-oriented fruit and nut crops despite over a decade of drought conditions and reduced deliveries from the SWP.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the EIR. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding crop choices. As discussed in Common Response 12, current and future crops choices by agricultural operators are largely driven by market forces which can be highly dynamic; crop choices in the San Joaquin Valley are effectively private business decisions which are not under DWR's authority and hence outside the scope of this EIR analysis.
685-17	Recent statements by state representatives and voices located within the SWP service area reflect a turn away from reliance on imported water supplies and interbasin transfers to meet water needs. Earlier this month, DWR announced an initial SWP allocation of 5 percent of requested supplies for 2023. In response to this allocation, DWR Director Karla Nemeth declared, "We are in the dawn of a new era of State Water Project management as a changing climate disrupts the timing of California's hydrology, and hotter and drier conditions absorb more water into the atmosphere and ground. We all need to adapt and redouble our efforts to conserve this precious resource."[Footnote 12: California Department of Water Resources, "DWR Announces Initial State Water Project	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. For information on how the Delta Conveyance Project considered climate change and future changes in temperature, precipitation, and salinity, please see Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation. For information on the hydrologic modeling of future conditions, please see Common Response 9, Hydrologic Modeling and Approach.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Allocation of 5 percent, Outlines Actions for a Possible Fourth Dry Year," December 1, 2022, https://water.ca.gov/News/News-Releases/2022/Dec-22/DWR-Announces-Initial-State-Water-Project-Allocation-of-5-percent.] Adel Hagekhalil, the Director of the Metropolitan Water District, the largest contractor for SWP water, similarly warned that "the tough reality is, we must be prepared for this historic drought to continue." Hagekhalil urged Southern Californians to reduce their dependence on imported water supplies. [Footnote 13: Hayley Smith, "California set for more brown lawns and water restrictions as state issues 5% allocation," Los Angeles Times, December 1, 2022, https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-12-01/california-to-see morebrown-lawns-and-water-restrictions.] Representatives of relevant state and local water agencies are increasingly questioning the wisdom of the Delta Conveyance Project and similar transfer schemes in the face of rapidly changing water realities. As a recent editorial by the Los Angeles Times argues, "More 20th century infrastructure, lawmaking and emergency declarations won't get us through this drought—because this is no drought." The Times concludes that, "The years of steady and predictable water flow are over, and there is no sign of them coming back in our lifetimes. This is it. We have to build, and grow, and legislate, and consume for the world as it is, not as we may remember it."[Footnote 14: Times Editorial Board, "Editorial: There is no drought," Los Angeles Times, May 6, 2021, https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-05-06/editorial-there-is-no-drought.]	
685-18	In addition to the above mentioned issues related to the dubious necessity and viability of the Delta Conveyance Project, the DCP also faces popular opposition both within the	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Delta and across the state. The DCP, with an estimated cost of between $16 to 40 billion, is a variation on the old Peripheral Canal which voters decisively rejected in 1982. The construction of a new project to convey water around the Delta remains unpopular four decades later; one recent survey suggests that a majority of the California electorate would oppose a "Delta Tunnel" project if a referendum vote was held. [Footnote 15: Goodwin Simon Strategic Research, "California Voter Attitudes on the Delta Tunnel," January 26, 2021, https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/default/files/sce/sierra-clubcalifornia/PDFs/Memo%20Sierra%20Club%20Delta%20Tunnel%20Survey_v012621.pdf.] The "Stop the Delta Tunnels Act," legislation recently introduced in Congress and co-sponsored by Congressman John Garamendi and Josh Harder, would prohibit the Army Corps of Engineers from issuing a federal permit required to build the DCP. The bill reflects the sentiments of their constituents. [Footnote 16: Dan Bacher, "Harder introduces bill in Congress to stop the Delta Tunnel Project," Sacramento News & Review, October 5, 2022, https://sacramento.newsreview.com/2022/10/05/harder-introduces-bill-in-congress-to-stop-thedelta-tunnel-project/.]	The assertion that the necessity of the Delta Conveyance Project is dubious is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see the section in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, titled Overview, for a description of the need of the project. Furthermore, the EIR does not support the assertion that the Delta Conveyance Project is a variation of the Peripheral Canal project. Please see the section in Chapter 1, Introduction, titled Consideration of a Peripheral Canal for a description of this past effort, which is wholly different from the current proposed Delta Conveyance Project, as also described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, section titled Peripheral Canal. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs.
685-19	In the face of the significant challenges to the proposed Delta Conveyance Project, a No Project Alternative would be the more sound and viable course of action for the state to take.	Please see response to comment 685-4, which references Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding commenter preferences for the No Project Alternative.
685-20	The coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act, “providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem,” could be better met through continued funding of local water and infrastructure projects now proposed and underway in the Delta and the SWP service areas. Such programs and projects include the CALFED	Chapter 7, Flood Protection, in the section titled State Plan of Flood Control, discusses how state and federal governments manage and maintain the flood control levee system in the Delta. Please also see information in Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, describing DWR's relationship to the Delta Reform Act as well as DWR programs that fund levee maintenance efforts to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Levee System Integrity Program, the Delta Flood Protection Fund, the South Delta Temporary Barriers Project, and other measures designed to improve the integrity and resiliency of Delta infrastructures, including existing water conveyance channels. [Footnote 17: DCP Draft EIR, Appendix 3C]	protect and improve critical levees in many areas of the Delta. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR does not include local water and infrastructure projects (e.g., levees) because these types of projects did not meet the basic project objectives.
685-21	The potential negative impacts of climate change on the Delta—including extreme droughts and floods, sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and habitat degradation—must be addressed by the state rather than ignored in favor of an export-oriented tunnel project which treats the Delta as a sacrifice zone and only seeks to protect the interests of outside water contractors.	Proactively addressing climate change has been a priority for the state of California and Governor Newsom. The Delta Conveyance Project is one small component of the overall approach that spans multiple agencies and many plans and projects. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project. As identified in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-10-19 aims to develop a comprehensive strategy to build a climate-resilient water system. Newsom's strategy document, "California's Water Supply Strategy, Adapting to a Hotter, Drier Future," identifies the modernization of water conveyance through the Delta to capture and move water when it is available as an opportunity for increasing resilience. Chapter 30, Climate Change, evaluates observed trends and projected future conditions of climate change and the need for the project, as well as how climate change could influence the project's ability to fulfill its intended purpose.
685-22	Concerted efforts on the part of DWR and other state agencies to improve Delta infrastructures and water quality will make the DCP unnecessary and will effectively fulfill the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act.	Please see response to comment 685-20 regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please also see Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding the project's relationship to other plans and policies such as Delta Reform Act.
685-23	Additional Energy Demands of DCP Not Economically or Environmentally Justifiable The Draft EIR's comments and conclusions regarding the long-term effects of the Delta Conveyance Project on California's	Draft EIR Chapter 22, Energy, section titled Potential for New Energy Resources provides a discussion on statewide energy loads, and indicates that Alternative 5, which represents the highest net electrical use for all of the alternatives, would represent less than 1% of the state's annual electricity load, based on a daily load of about 35,000 megawatts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	energy footprint downplay and underestimate the project's impact and its incompatibility with state energy and emissions goals. Under existing conditions, the State Water Project is already the largest single consumer of electrical energy in the state, with a pump load that ranges between 6,000 GWh and 9,500 GWh annually. The amount of energy annually consumed by the SWP's pumping facilities is roughly double the amount of energy that is generated by the Project's hydropower facilities (3,925 GWh).[Footnote 18: California Department of Water Resources, "What We Do: Power," 2022, https://water.ca.gov/What-We-Do/Power; DCP Draft EIR, "Appendix 22A," Table 22A-1.] Adding to the massive amounts of energy already required to operate the State Water Project, the Delta Conveyance Project, if completed and operational, will increase the total net SWP energy consumption by at least 22 (Alternative 4b, 624 GWh) to 35 (Alternative 5, 993 GWh) percent over existing conditions. According to Table 22A-1, if Alternative 5 is approved, the long-term energy use of SWP pumping facilities will increase from the current 6,744 GWh to 7,989 GWh, or an increase of 1,245 GWh over existing conditions.[Footnote 19: Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR, Chapter 22, 22-28; "Appendix 22A," Table 22A-1.] The Delta Conveyance Project, if approved, will thus permanently increase the State Water Project's net energy consumption by between one-fourth and one-third over existing conditions and a No Project Alternative.	As the commenter notes, the energy chapter provides an estimated amount of energy that each project alternative would consume on an annual basis. All project alternatives are expected to result in an increase of energy consumption. With regard to the expected increase in energy consumption being incompatible with state energy and emissions goals, the Delta Conveyance Project would be supplied by the same power portfolio as is used for current SWP operations. SWP's power portfolio currently consists of 65% renewable energy. As noted in Chapter 22 and Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, DWR's Climate Action Plan Phase 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan–Update 2020 (Update 2020) includes measures to increase operational efficiencies. Update 2020 specifies aggressive 2030 and 2045 emissions reduction goals and identifies a list of GHG emissions reduction measures that DWR will undertake to achieve these goals. DWR has committed to incorporation of efficiencies (including transportation routing efficiencies, installation of solar panels, and using commercially available electric or hybrid vehicles) during construction of the project, and project operation would be consistent with the commitments established in DWR's Update 2020. Additionally, by the time the project is completed and operational, the CAISO market will be supplied with 100% renewable or zero-carbon resources, meaning any additional purchases by the SWP on the open market would be from renewable/zero carbon resources.
685-24	In light of the massive increase in energy consumption associated with the project, the claim in Chapter 22 of the Draft EIR, that the project "would not conflict with any state/local plan, goal, objective, or policy for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and there would be no impact" from the increased energy use, is dubious and not reflective of the	EIR Chapter 22, Energy, section titled Potential for New Energy Resources provides a discussion on statewide energy loads, and indicates that Alternative 5, which represents the highest net electrical use for all of the alternatives, would represent less than 1% of the state's annual electricity load, based on a daily load of about 35,000 megawatts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	energy realities California is currently facing.[Footnote 20: This claim is a response to "Impact ENG-2." DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 22, 22-32] The claim that "implementation of the project alternatives would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy" is similarly problematic.[Footnote 21: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 22, 22-29.] A report referenced in making these claims, DWR's "Update 2020," does not discuss the Delta Conveyance Project or its energy impacts and is therefore inadequate to justify these assertions. Further analysis of the project's impact on energy consumption and emissions within the state is necessary. Recent events in California's energy sector - including drought-induced decreases in SWP hydropower generation and increased reliance on non-renewable energy to make up for the hydropower shortfalls - undermine the conclusions made in the Draft EIR regarding the impact of the Delta Conveyance Project's energy requirements. In July 2021, the SWP Power and Risk Office asserted that "Given the historical and existing trajectory of GHG emissions reductions associated with the SWP operations, the increase in energy demands associated with operation of the Project after construction is not expected to prevent DWR from achieving its GGERP goals and objectives." [Footnote 22: DCP Draft EIR, Appendix 23E.] The following month, in an "unprecedented action," DWR shut down the SWP's 750 MW Hyatt hydro plant at Lake Oroville after the reservoir's water levels reached record lows. Officials estimate that drought-induced reservoir declines reduced California's hydro capacity by around 1,000 MW during the summer of 2021; that year, hydro production in the state was 48% below the 10-year average. [Footnote 23: Matt Hamilton, "Amid worsening drought, Lake Oroville's record-low water	The California Department of Water Resources Climate Action Plan Phase 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan Update 2020 (Update 2020) that the commenter is referring to was developed by DWR to review its greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions from the previous update and update strategies for further reduction consistent with legislative changes, including the GHG emissions reduction targets established in Senate Bill (SB) 32 (2016), SB 100 (2018), Executive Order B-18-12 (2012), Executive Order B-30-15 (2015), and Executive Order B-55-18 (2018). As noted in Update 2020, California's wholesale electricity market has seen a significant increase in renewable resources, and the report outlines several GHG emissions reductions strategies, which include the implementation of several measures related to increases in energy efficiency that are not reliant on hydropower (e.g., purchase renewable energy from local utilities' retail energy programs, improve building and equipment energy efficiencies). As the commenter notes, the energy chapter provides an estimated amount of energy that each project alternative would consume on an annual basis. All project alternatives are expected to result in an increase of energy consumption. As noted in Chapter 22, the Delta Conveyance Project would be supplied by the same power portfolio as is used for current SWP operations. SWP's power portfolio currently consists of 65% renewable energy from its own carbon-free hydroelectric generation and from renewable energy purchases. Additionally, by 2045 the CAISO market will be supplied with 100% renewable or zero-carbon resources, meaning any additional purchases by the SWP on the open market would be from renewable/zero carbon resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	level forces shutdown of hydroelectric power plant," Los Angeles Times, August 5, 2021, https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2021-08-05/amid-worsening-drought-lake-orovilles-record-low-water-level-forces-shutdown-of-hydroelectric-power-plant; Dale Kassler, "California drought squeezes power supplies: Hydro plant at Lake Oroville shuts down," Sacramento Bee, August 5, 2021, https://www.sacbee.com/news/california/water-and-drought/article253298613.html; Chase DiFeliciantonio, "Unprecedented action: State shuts down big hydroelectric plant as Lake Oroville drops to historic lows," San Francisco Chronicle, August 5, 2021, https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Unprecedentedaction-State-shuts-down-big-16368290.php; U.S. Energy Information Administration, "Drought effects on hydroelectricity generation in western U.S. differed by region in 2021," March 30, 2022, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=51839.] Governor Newsom declared a state of emergency for California's power grid. In August 2021, in response to the power shortfall, DWR received five-year licenses to install five "temporary" gas-fueled generators, each with a capacity for 30 MW.[Footnote 24: Darrell Proctor, "California Will Add Gas-Fired Units to Increase Power Supply," Power, August 20, 2021, https://www.powermag.com/california-will-add-gas-fired-units-to-increase-power-supply/.]	
685-25	The drought-induced hydropower shortages California experienced in 2021 have continued into the present year, which has resulted in an increased reliance on natural gas to carry the load. During the week of September 4, natural gas accounted for between 30 and 60 percent of the generation mix required to meet electricity demand during an extreme	The table titled Total System Electric Generation in Gigawatt Hours for 2020 in Chapter 22, Energy, provides breakdown of sources for electric power generation in the state for the year 2020. As indicated, about 67 percent of the supplies come from non-renewables and unspecified supplies (including large hydropower). While hydropower energy generation is a major project purpose for the SWP and CVP, large

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	heat wave. The natural gas generators operated during that week included four of the "temporary" generators (120 MW) licensed for use by DWR the previous year. An analysis by the U.S. Energy Information Administration projected that energy-related carbon dioxide emissions in California would be 6% higher in the summer of 2022 due to the drought conditions. Record low water levels in reservoirs across the American West, from the Pacific Northwest to the Colorado River basin, have thus placed greater strain on the state's power grid and continue to undermine efforts to transition away from fossil-fueled power generation. [Footnote 25: U.S. Energy Information Administration, "California fuel mix changes in response to September heat wave," September 21, 2022, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=53939; U.S. EIA, "California drought could reduce hydroelectric generation to half of normal levels," June 1, 2022, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=52578; CA DWR, "Temporary Emergency Power Generators Used for First Time to Support Statewide Energy Grid During Heat Wave," September 5, 2022, https://water.ca.gov/News/News-Releases/2022/Sep-22/Temporary-Emergency-Power-Generators-Used.] The inability of the State Water Project to maintain established levels of hydroelectric production at its major generating plants in recent years, and the increased reliance on fossil-fuel generation to sustain current SWP operations, seriously jeopardizes claims that the additional energy requirements of the Delta Conveyance Project "would not conflict with any state/local plan, goal, objective, or policy for renewable energy or energy efficiency." The potential addition via the DCP of 1,245 GWh to the State Water Project's annual energy	hydropower accounts for about 12 percent and small hydro accounts for only about 1.4 percent of the overall electric generation for the state. Chapter 22 also acknowledges that severe droughts have caused reservoir levels to drop, causing reductions to or complete cessations of California's hydropower generation. Energy operations were analyzed for each alternative using the CalSim 3 model (see Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix) and the LTGen and SWP post-processing power models in sequence. LTGen uses the appropriate operations at each CVP reservoir, pumping plant, and powerhouse from the CalSim 3 model to calculate energy use and generation at these facilities. The SWP power model performs similar computations for SWP facilities. CalSim 3 presents results based on volumes of water on a monthly basis. The water budget input for CalSim assumes average values of SWP and CVP water deliveries based on several factors, as described in Appendix 5A, Section B1, Modeling Technical Appendix - Hydrology and System Operations Modeling. The CalSim output data was then used to evaluate the effects of the Delta Conveyance Project on power and energy use and power generation at SWP facilities based on the averaged deliveries in CalSim (see the section titled Power and Energy Modeling in Appendix 5A, Section A, Modeling Technical Appendix - Modeling Overview). Energy use for operation of the Delta Conveyance Project may fluctuate based on increases or reductions in water deliveries. Existing hydropower facilities account for a small amount of renewable supplies of electricity in the state. Additionally, Senate Bill 100 has established a goal of powering all retail electricity sold in California and state agency electricity needs with renewable and zero-carbon resources (e.g., solar, wind, geothermal) by the year 2045. As stated in Chapter 22, DWR has contracts with the California Independent System Operator, PG&E, and Southern California Edison for transmission interconnection and transmission service for SWP power resources and pumping loads, all of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	footprint, if recent trends of drought-induced power reductions at SWP and CVP hydro facilities continue, would certainly negatively impact the ability of California's energy grid to meet the demands of SB 100 - which requires that "zero-carbon resources comprise 100% of electric retail sales to end-use customers by 2045."[Footnote 26: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 23, 23-161.] Changing energy and environmental realities across California and the broader American West thus undermine the conclusions made in the sections of the DCP Draft EIR dealing with Impact AQ-9, Impact ENG-1, and Impact ENG-2. The additional energy requirements associated with the operation of the Delta Conveyance Project are an economic and environmental burden on California which will increase the state's reliance on non-renewable energy and increase the amount of carbon dioxide emissions produced within the state. In an era of drought-induced scarcity and state policies promoting a transition to zero-carbon energy resources, this project is a burden that is not justifiable in the face of environmentally and economically superior alternatives, including a No Project Alternative.	whom are subject to requirements of SB 100. Given DWR will continue to generate power using existing hydroelectric facilities as well as receive power from these same entities to operate the Delta Conveyance Project, the project would not result in an increased reliance on non-renewable energy resources.
685-26	Diablo Canyon-Powered Desalination as a Viable Alternative to the DCP In contrast to the significant and permanent increases in energy consumption that will accompany the Delta Conveyance Project's operation, a recent study has highlighted an alternative to the project not covered by the Draft EIR: the use of the already extant and operational Diablo Canyon nuclear energy facility to power large-scale water desalination. Diablo Canyon, with a generating capacity of 2.2 GW, is California's large single source of electricity. In 2021, Diablo Canyon supplied over 8 percent of California's electricity and	A desalination facility was screened out as a project alternative because it would not meet a majority of the basic project objectives as discussed in Appendix 3A, table titled Alternatives Eliminated at First-Level Screening. Additionally, the EIR alternatives evaluation was undertaken without consideration of the energy source that may be used for a potential future desalination plant. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA requires lead agencies to develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	generated 16,477 GWh. [Footnote 27: U.S. Energy Information Administration, "Nuclear power provided about 10% of California's total electricity supply in 2021," September 19, 2022, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=53899.] In November 2021, a team of energy researchers from Stanford and MIT released a report that, among other things, investigated repurposing Diablo Canyon as a source of desalinated water. Significantly, the study concluded that "Using Diablo Canyon as a power source for desalination could substantially augment fresh water supplies to the state as a whole and to critically overdrafted basins regions such as the Central Valley, producing fresh water volumes equal to or substantially exceeding those of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project—but at significantly lower investment cost." [Footnote 28: Justin Aborn et al., "An Assessment of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant for Zero-Carbon Electricity, Desalination, and Hydrogen Production," November 2021, https://web.archive.org/web/20221108193710/https://energy.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj9971/f/diablocanyonnuclearplant_report_11.19.21.pdf, 3,4,] Given that new desalination projects are already underway and are encouraged by California's 2020 Water Resiliency Portfolio as a means to supply water when and where it is "cost effective and environmentally appropriate," the use of Diablo Canyon power for desalination purposes would be a viable alternative to the construction and operation of the DCP. [Footnote 29: "In general, it is reasonable to expect that, as traditional sources are further exploited, the cost of additional water supply will increase, both in terms of financial costs and environmental costs, making alternatives, such as carbon-free	alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. It explains how the screened-out alternatives such as desalination would not meet most of the basic project objectives or are not feasible alternatives to the proposed project. The purposes and project objectives of the Delta Conveyance Project are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR. Regarding Diablo Canyon not closing in 2025, this statement is from Chapter 22, Energy, in a footnote to the table titled Total System Electric Generation in Gigawatt Hours for 2020. The table identifies all sources of California in-state energy generation in 2020 based on CEC data. PG&E is scheduled to discontinue operations at Diablo Canyon when Unit 1 and 2 operating licenses expire in November 2024 and August 2025, respectively. It is pursuing relicensing but also continuing to plan for decommissioning (Pacific Gas and Electric Company 2023). Therefore, its availability as an energy source and location for a desalination facility into the future is highly uncertain. The bill (SB 846) extending the Diablo Canyon Power Plant's license was enacted after the Delta Conveyance Project NOP was issued. Further, it is conditioned on the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission extending the powerplant's operating licenses, which has not occurred. Therefore, it is not clear whether Diablo will remain in operation until 2030 or beyond as suggested by the commenter. Moreover, the EIR's energy analysis does not rely on the availability, or lack thereof, of nuclear energy to evaluate the project's energy impacts. The proposed Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities. Various desalination projects are considered in either the No Project or Cumulative effects scenarios, or both.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	desalination, much more attractive," researchers concluded. Ibid., 42, 84.] Diablo canyon-powered desalination has the potential to "produce significantly more fresh water than the highest estimate of the net yield from the proposed Delta Conveyance Project at less than half of the investment cost." Thus, the authors of the study argue, "The potential output of Diablo Canyon-powered desalination could make a substantial contribution to offsetting chronic water delivery shortfalls from federal and state water projects." [Footnote 30: Ibid., 33.] The Draft EIR's assumptions regarding the Diablo Canyon Power Plant need to be revised in response to recent events that have extended the operational life of the nuclear power facility beyond 2025. [Footnote 31: Despite Diablo Canyon's importance to California's energy landscape, the facility is mentioned only once in the DCP Draft EIR's Chapter 22 on energy, in a footnote remarking that the power plant "is expected to be decommissioned in 2025." DCP Draft EIR, "Chapter 22 Energy," 22-4.] In September of this year, Governor Newsom signed a measure passed by the state legislature which authorizes a further conditional extension of Diablo Canyon's license through 2030. This November, Governor Newsom endorsed an award of $1.1 billion from the U.S. Department of Energy to fund Diablo Canyon's operational extension. "Amid intensifying climate impacts in the West and across the country, California is focused on meeting our bold climate and clean energy goals while tackling the challenges of extreme weather that puts lives at risk and strains our grid," Governor Newsom stated in his justification of the funding and extension. [Footnote 32: Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, "Governor Newsom Statement on Federal Funding for Diablo Canyon Extension," November 21, 2022,	

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	https://www.gov.ca.gov/2022/11/21/governor-newsom-statement-on-federalfunding-for-diablo-canyon-extension/; Nadia Lopez, "Diablo Canyon: Nuke plant a step closer to staying open longer," Cal Matters, September 1, 2022, https://calmatters.org/environment/2022/09/diablo-canyon-legislaturecalifornia/.] Indeed, reliable nuclear power has become increasingly important to California's energy mix in the face of drought-induced declines in hydropower output. With Diablo Canyon now set to operate through 2030 and likely longer, the EIR's assumption that the plant will go offline in 2025 is outdated; this new reality needs to be incorporated into the Delta Conveyance Project's Final EIR. [Footnote 33: California is reportedly considering a further extension of Diablo Canyon's life through 2035. U.S. Energy Information Administration, "Nuclear power provided about 10% of California's total electricity supply in 2021," September 19, 2022, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=53899.] As the authors of the above referenced Diablo Canyon desalination study conclude, "with Diablo Canyon's continued operation, building a large-scale desalination plant on-site is feasible and economically attractive. Further, this plant would help to secure California's water and energy supplies in a carbon-free manner." [Footnote 34: Aborn et al., "An Assessment of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant," 84.]	
685-27	A No Project Alternative Best Serves the Interests of Delta Communities: In addition to the issues related to project water and energy supplies already addressed in this letter, claims in the Draft EIR regarding the negative impacts of the Delta Conveyance Project on the Delta's diverse communities, including	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a description of the CEQA requirements associated with the potential approval of a project with significant and unavoidable impacts. Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, which analyzes the potential effects of the No Project Alternative and the water supply

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	environmental justice, ethnic minority, and tribal communities, also warrant comment. Regarding the Delta's cultural resources, the report acknowledges that "All project alternatives have the potential to cause a significant and unavoidable impact on cultural resources." The report further states that "Significant impacts on resources that are associated with the heritage of Native Americans or other ethnic minority groups present in high proportions could potentially result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect on these populations in the study area." [Footnote 35: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 19, 19-81; Chapter 29, 29-45.] The Draft EIR acknowledges significant project impacts on environmental justice communities and notes that "visual effects from the construction and operation of the project would have a disproportionately adverse effect on environmental justice communities." [Footnote 36: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 29, 29-43.] The Draft EIR similarly admits that the project's negative effects on noise levels and air quality during construction "would occur in areas with meaningfully greater minority and low-income populations," and would therefore represent "a disproportionately adverse effect on environmental justice." [Footnote 37: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 29, 29-49.] Chapter 32 of the Draft EIR concludes that the project "could result in a substantial cumulatively significant impact on Tribal cultural resources." [Footnote 38: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 32, 32-68.] At least 2,400 acres of valuable riparian Delta farmland would be removed from cultivation for the benefit of a project intended to transfer water southward to corporate farmers and other contractors hundreds of miles from the source of supply. [Footnote 39: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 15, 15-55.]	projects that are anticipated to be implemented in the absence of approving the Delta Conveyance Project. As described in Chapter 29, the construction impacts of other water supply projects under the No Project Alternative could result in disproportionate effects on low-income or minority communities from construction noise and traffic; air quality effects; damage to or destruction of archaeological resources or traditional use sites; obstruction or loss of recreational resources; and significant impacts on agricultural land and biological resources used for food, income-generating activities, or traditional uses. Please see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding commenter preference for the No Project Alternative and DWR process for considering approval of the proposed project or a project alternative.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	These and other negative project impacts on the character, culture, and environment of the Delta would go against the wishes of the region's environmental justice communities and other residents. Appendix 29E contains the results of the Your Delta, Your Voice online environmental justice survey conducted in 2020. In it, nearly 70% of Delta-region respondents saw "no benefits" to be derived from the project for their disadvantaged communities, and many respondents expressed a strong "no tunnel" sentiment in their comments. [Footnote 40 : DCP Draft EIR, Appendix 29E.] Chapter 29 of the Draft EIR acknowledges, "Low-income and minority respondents… indicated that the region's beauty, ambience, and small-town feel were very important to them. Comments from the survey expressed concern to preserve the Delta's quality of life and scenic beauty." [Footnote 41: DCP Draft EIR, Chapter 29, 29-43.] Ultimately, however, the most just and equitable way to provide benefits to Delta communities is to not build the project in the first place. This solution would better reflect the interests and desires of Delta communities than constructing a project that the vast majority of residents oppose, which provides no local benefits, and which degrades the environment, quality of life, culture, and resiliency of the region.	
685-28	In light of the Delta Conveyance Project's many acknowledged negative impacts on Delta communities, and the continued strong opposition to the project by many Delta voices, the proposed "Community Benefits Program" is inadequate and insufficient as compensation for the potential losses to the region associated with the project. An adequate "Community Benefits Program" should at minimum include substantive and	As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Delta Community Fund could be used to fund a wide array of actions and projects to enhance the economy, including education and workforce development. No decisions will be made regarding specific actions to be included in the Community Benefits Program until after CEQA approval of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project and after continued engagement with the community. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	ongoing impact payments distributed to the Delta's local government agencies, communities, and residents for the duration of the project's operation. Such payments could be derived from a fair and equitable proportion of the revenues generated from the sales of Delta waters exported by the DCP—waters which the Delta is legally entitled to as an "area of origin."	Considerations, regarding the property acquisition process and compensation for direct loss of property.
685-29	Conclusion On December 8, Governor Newsom participated in a press conference celebrating the planned removal of four dams on the Klamath River in order to restore the Klamath's flows, water quality, aquatic ecosystems, and depleted fisheries. "Today we celebrate a historic victory for the health of the Klamath River and the well-being of all the communities, livelihoods and ecosystems that depend on this vital waterway," Governor Newsom declared. In his speech, Newsom argued "Our time is a hell of a lot too short to win fleeting victories at other people's expenses." The Governor also noted the "powerful and potent moral authority" of local tribal communities and environmental activists who successfully led the decades-long dam removal movement. [Footnote 42: California Governor Gavin Newsom, "Gov. Newsom, Federal, Tribal Leaders Celebrate Largest River Restoration Project in U.S. History," https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dPmGwP0kc_A, 22:00-25:00; Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, "Largest River Restoration Project in American History Set to Begin," December 8, 2022, https://www.gov.ca.gov/2022/12/08/75829/.] The Klamath River restoration project serves as a significant illustration of how state and federal water policies have	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The commenter compares the Klamath River Restoration Project to the Delta Conveyance Project, however the two are not comparable as they are different projects with different objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project is a water conveyance infrastructure project with a fundamental purpose of protecting the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio, in a cost-effective manner. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, as well as Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a description of the purpose and objectives of the project. Please refer to Chapters 7-32 of the EIR for analyses of potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures. Refer to Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for an analysis of the effects of the project on socioeconomic conditions. Socioeconomic conditions encompass economic conditions, community character, and demographic characteristics of the study area that may be affected by construction or operation of water conveyance facilities. Please also refer to Chapter 29,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	changed significantly since the twentieth century's era of big dams and massive interbasin transfers of water and power. The Central Valley and State Water Projects embody this previous era, just as the Klamath River embodies a new era of river restoration and more sustainable water management policies. The Delta Conveyance Project represents an outdated and obsolete way of thinking about water resources and is a departure from present trends as illustrated by the Klamath River restoration project. Governor Newsom's words and actions regarding the Klamath River should apply equally to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Just as the moral authority is with dam removal advocates in the Klamath River case, the moral authority is with the Delta communities, residents, and environmental justice activists who oppose the approval of the Delta Conveyance Project. Their voices and informed concerns should be central to determining whether this project is approved. The Delta will receive neither freshwater nor revenue from the DCP, while bearing all of the environmental, social, and economic costs associated with the project. The Delta Conveyance Project is not economically, ecologically, politically, or morally viable and should not be approved. The state's rejection and withdrawal of the Delta Conveyance Project would represent a positive movement away from California's bitter legacies of interbasin transfers and towards more equitable, environmentally sustainable water solutions for California in the twenty-first century.	Environmental Justice, for an analysis of the effects of the project on minority and low-income populations. The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). DWR would also implement three distinct but complementary processes to address the effects on local communities from the project, including regulatory mitigation, an Ombudsman Program, and a Community Benefits Program. As discussed in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, through the Community Benefits Program, DWR would establish the Delta Community Fund and work collaboratively with Delta communities to identify and build in additional aspects of the Delta Conveyance Project that can provide benefits directly to Delta communities. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process to provide public information and encourage public participation and comment, including to Delta communities, residents, and environmental justice communities.
687-1	Where is the definition of feasible?	The glossary provides definitions of terms that may not be commonly used. The term "feasible" is a commonly used term and therefore not included in the glossary. California Public Resources Code 21061.1 defines feasible as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors."
687-2	How can you say all the alternatives are "not feasible" when you are the only one who makes the decision on what is feasible?	Please see response to comment 687-1 for the definition of "feasible." Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
687-3	Where are the updated science information on earthquakes? Old science makes for inaccurate assumptions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use of best available science. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including earthquakes in Chapter 10, Geology and Seismicity. Please see Common Response 1 for a discussion of the performance of the project's objectives related to seismic resilience.
687-4	What is the estimated number of workers who will die in constructing this highly dangerous project?	The project would be constructed in accordance with state and federal construction worker safety requirements to prevent accidental deaths. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, the project would be constructed consistent with existing safety requirements, best practices, and regulations in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements.
687-5	Where is the cost/benefit analysis by an independent source?	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and the community benefits framework and implementation.
687-6	I grew up on Sutter Island please don't destroy the Delta [sic].	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
688-1	I am writing to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) actively pursues an unsustainable isolated water conveyance infrastructure that would divert freshwater flows from the Delta. The benefits of this diversion accrue only to south-of-the-Delta consumers. The Delta Conveyance is the latest iteration of past diversion proposals, however, this DEIR addresses none of the devastating environmental impacts or takes into account the extensive cumulative impacts which would stress Delta communities and ecosystems.	The comment assertions regarding the lack of impact analysis are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's cumulative impact assessment, purpose, and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32.
688-2	The DEIR is fundamentally inadequate and fails to inform the public of the true extent of the cumulative environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). By any measure, the Delta Conveyance project sacrifices the Delta region in favor of an unsustainable multi-billion-dollar environmental disaster.	Please see response to comment 688-1 regarding the comment's assertion that the EIR lacks impact analysis. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used and the cumulative impact assessment.
688-3	The DEIR fails to analyze the significant impacts associated with building and operating a system capable of diverting 6,000 cubic feet-per-second of water from the Sacramento / River. Diverting about one-third to one-half of the average river flow would increase salinity and increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms. Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts would magically be less than significant.	Please see response to comment 688-1 regarding the comment's assertion that the EIR lacks impact analysis. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts, including salinity and harmful algal blooms, could result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation.
688-4	The DEIR does not adequately analyze and propose mitigation measures for impacts on Delta communities. The project would destroy nearly 3,800 acres of highly productive Delta farmland, which feeds the people of California. A Community Benefits Program cannot address the real impacts to Delta residents during and after construction. The DEIR provides no significant mitigation measures to address extensive and lasting project impacts on the region's quality of life	The comment assertions regarding lack of mitigation measure analysis are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use and incorporation of mitigation measures. Further, please see Chapters 5-32 regarding significant and unavoidable impacts: adequacy of mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding impacts and proposed mitigation measures for farmland. Although the analysis in Chapter 15 concludes that conversion of agricultural land could result in significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding community benefits framework and implementation. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
688-5	As a result of project construction, toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, endangering the health of Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts regarding the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, most of the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. However, Impacts AQ-5 and AQ-6 may remain significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation.
688-6	There is no comfort in DWR's weak assurances that construction noise would be mitigated to ensure an ongoing quality of life enjoyed by Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including noise in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration. As described in Chapter 24, some impacts may result in significant and unavoidable impacts even with the implementation of mitigation measures.
688-7	I urge DWR to abandon the Delta Conveyance project in favor of sustainable projects that meet water quality and supply needs without destroying the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation.
688-8	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	All commenters on the Draft EIR were added to the project mailing list for future notifications.
688-9	-Fishing will be impacted -Who controls water? -Noise? -Malfunction?	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Chapter 1, Section titled Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities, describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. The comment lists a series of potential impacts that are addressed in the EIR. For most resources, the EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant. Please refer to the Executive Summary table titled Summary of Delta Conveyance Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, for a list of impacts and their impact conclusions before and after the application of mitigation measures. Where the EIR analysis concludes that impacts from the project could be significant, DWR has proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts. Please also refer to Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources; Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources; Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources; Chapter 16, Recreation; and Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, for the analyses of the resource areas raised by the comment. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. The comment “Malfunction?” is unclear and does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
689-1	I am writing to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) actively pursues an unsustainable isolated water conveyance infrastructure that would divert freshwater flows from the Delta. The benefits of this diversion accrue only to south-of-the-Delta consumers. The Delta Conveyance is the latest iteration of past diversion proposals, however, this DEIR addresses none of the devastating environmental impacts or takes into account the extensive cumulative impacts which would stress Delta communities and ecosystems.	The comment assertions regarding the lack of impact analysis are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's cumulative impact assessment, purpose, and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32.
689-2	The DEIR is fundamentally inadequate and fails to inform the public of the true extent of the cumulative environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). By any measure, the Delta Conveyance project sacrifices the Delta region in favor of an unsustainable multi-billion-dollar environmental disaster.	Please see response to comment 689-1 regarding the comment's assertion that the EIR lacks impact analysis. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used and the cumulative impact assessment.
689-3	The DEIR fails to analyze the significant impacts associated with building and operating a system capable of diverting 6,000 cubic feet-per-second of water from the Sacramento River. Diverting about one-third to one-half of the average river flow would increase salinity and increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms. Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts would magically be less than significant.	Please see response to comment 689-1 regarding the comment's assertion that the EIR lacks impact analysis. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts, including salinity and harmful algal blooms, could result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation.
689-4	The DEIR does not adequately analyze and propose mitigation measures for impacts on Delta communities. The project would destroy nearly 3,800 acres of highly productive Delta farmland, which feeds the people of California. A Community Benefits Program cannot address the real impacts to Delta residents during and after construction. The DEIR provides no significant mitigation measures to address extensive and lasting project impacts on the region's quality of life.	The comment assertions regarding lack of mitigation measure analysis are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the use and incorporation of mitigation measures. Further, please see Chapters 5–32 regarding significant and unavoidable impacts and the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding impacts and proposed mitigation measures for farmland. Although the analysis in Chapter 15 concludes that conversion of agricultural land could result in significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding community benefits framework and implementation. As described in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, the Community Benefits Program would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
689-5	As a result of project construction, toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, endangering the health of Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts regarding the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases As described in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, most of the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. However, Impacts AQ-5 and AQ-6 may remain significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation.
689-6	There is no comfort in DWR's weak assurances that construction noise would be mitigated to ensure an ongoing quality of life enjoyed by Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including noise in Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration. As described in Chapter 24, some impacts may result in significant and unavoidable impacts even with the implementation of mitigation measures.
689-7	I urge DWR to abandon the Delta Conveyance project in favor of sustainable projects that meet water quality and supply needs without destroying the Delta.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As described in Chapter 9, all potential impacts analyzed could result in less-than-significant impacts before the application of mitigation.
689-8	Thank you for the opportunity to provide video comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	All commenters on the Draft EIR were added to the project mailing list for future notifications.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
689-9	Big No! Hood is Historic! Bad for farming! Bad for fishing!	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
690-1	The draft EIR is inadequate because it's lacking information about the most basic, fundamental, and indisputable facts about the Delta Tunnel's unmitigatable significant negative impacts to our environment.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR was written to comply with CEQA requirements and makes a good-faith effort to disclose potential impacts to decision makers and the public. The comment assertions regarding a lack of information are not supported by the analyses contained in the EIR. The analyses provided in Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed operations for all alternatives. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used and the use of best available science. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the use of mitigation to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts in accordance with CEQA Guidelines.
690-2	(And our economy due to the direct costs of construction and ecological collapse) This project removes more water from our delta and estuary complex at a time when too much water is already being removed. The delta and Bay estuary must get more fresh water than they currently get to remain ecologically healthy, especially during the rainy season. The extra fresh water removed by this proposed tunnel will cause significant and catastrophic impacts on the delta and SF Bay ecosystems, and the marine ecosystems of the offshore waters of California and the Pacific Ocean, since the SF Bay Estuary and Delta is the primary and most important breeding and nursery grounds for many marine species of animals. Also lack of fresh water flows is causing more toxic algae in the delta and Estuary which is poisoning animals in the water and on the land and air.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). Potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, respectively. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species identified would be less than significant with mitigation. Chapter 9,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Please address these concerns and figure out how to increase fresh water flows over current flows through conservation of water and stopping the unsustainable growth of agriculture, housing, and industry that all require more fresh water. Conservation and use of reclaimed water, and living within the carrying capacity of our resources is the answer, not this tunnel, nor any other draining scheme.	Water Quality, addresses harmful algal blooms under Impact WQ-14, which concludes that the impact would be less than significant. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3 regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
690-3	Various species are already going extinct due to water diversion projects that diminish water flows from entering our delta and estuary.	Please refer to response to comment 690-2 regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives, as well as regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species.
690-4	This draft EIR is fatally flawed.	Please see response to comment 690-1 regarding DWR's good faith effort to write the EIR in compliance with CEQA and to disclose potential impacts of the project to the public. The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
691-1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels project and think there should be no such project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
691-2	The environmental impact and expense is too great. Our Delta environment will be destroyed and Southern California needs to decrease its population or find alternate sources of water without demanding more of ours.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		less-than-significant level. Please refer to Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
691-3	Our water does not need to be used to support expensive almond orchards. we do not need to mess up the salt/freshwater balance in the San Francisco Bay habitat.	Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Please refer to response to comment 691-2 regarding existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
691-4	I say no on this proposal, or any very end of this project. None have been appropriate thus far.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please also see Chapter 1, Introduction, for background on the project including prior and current Delta conveyance planning efforts.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
692-1	This is a waste of money of public funds and will destroy the delta region.	The comment assertions regarding impacts on the Delta are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As described these chapters, all potentially significant impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs and funding.
694-1	California should be helping to lead the country in environmentally friendly practices. This is the opposite of that in so many ways. Please work on local solutions for SoCal that will help with their water issues instead of devastate NorCal's already limited water supply, farmer's livelihoods, as well as the environment.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
697-1	I am opposed to the current Delta Tunnel Conveyance project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
697-2	It will do irreparable harm to the environment and to quality of life in this very important area.	The assertion that the project will do irreparable harm to the environment and to quality of life in the Delta is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR.
697-3	It will also do major damage to the roads that carry important traffic.	Please refer to Common Response 14, Transportation, for a discussion of road rehabilitation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
698-1	Salmon are critically endangered, climate change is here, and that change will surely outrun the completion and supposed benefits of the DCP. No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this Draft EIR.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the No Project Alternative. Please also refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, all potentially significant impacts on salmon would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analyses. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project.
698-2	I support the Winnemem Wintu Tribe's opposition to any Delta Tunnel proposal. All life of and in the water that runs into the Delta, including those already ESA listed, all runs of salmon (all species in second bullet below) and the Tribe's cultural resources will be harmed by the DCP. Given the harms described in the DEIR to the already endangered Winter run Chinook Salmon, other listed species and other forms of aquatic life, the Tribe considers the No Project Alternative as the only correct choice for the DCP. The status quo in the Delta already jeopardizes wildlife.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Although the analysis in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, concludes that impacts on Tribal cultural resources could be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. The EIR also evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		these chapters, all potentially significant impacts identified in the comment would be less than significant with mitigation.
698-3	The DCP will impact our air, water, land, human and animal communities, and tribal cultural resources in the Delta and far beyond. The Delta is the nexus for all waters draining from the Central Valley. It is also the largest estuary on the West Coast, home to many unique and rare endemic fish species and the gateway for most California Chinook Salmon and other anadromous species to reach their spawning grounds.	Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potential impacts analyzed could result in less than significant impacts. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all potential impacts analyzed could result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. Please see Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, for an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gases, which includes quantitative modeling and proposed mitigation measures. Please refer to response to comment 698-2 regarding the EIR's analysis of Tribal cultural resources and Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources as well as the analysis of aquatic and terrestrial species impacts.
698-4	Winterrun Chinook salmon is listed as endangered and Spring-run Chinook salmon is listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Fall-run and Late Fallrun Chinook are Species of Concern under the Federal ESA. This past summer, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)/ National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) invited WWT to co-steward with these agencies the return of Winter-run Chinook to the McCloud River. According to these agencies, the Winter-run Chinook could become extinct if conditions in the Sacramento River again cause an almost 100% failure of in-stream reproduction as happened in the two previous years. With the margins of survival so perilously slim, any further stressors caused by the DCP, even if slight, could push the Winter-run over the edge of existence. Chief Caleen Sisk has said, "whatever happens to the salmon happens to us." History proves this to be true.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species, including salmon, would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to response to comment 698-2 regarding the EIR's analysis of Tribal cultural resources and Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
698-5	In the Draft EIR, state officials acknowledge that the DCP tunnel could harm endangered and threatened species, including the Delta Smelt, Winter Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. To offset this harm, the DWR says thousands of acres of other wetlands would have to be restored, but that will take years. Doug Obegi at the Natural Resources Defense Council doubts that the DCP will be permitted due to federal and state endangered species laws. In the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 2022, he predicts it will be challenged in court if permitting is allowed. The status quo in the delta jeopardizes the continued existence of our native fish and wildlife, and for the thousands of fishing jobs and communities that depend on a healthy environment... This proposed system would be even worse for the environment than the degraded status quo.(https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-07-27/california-releases-plan-for-shrinking-delta-water-project-from-two-tunnels-to-one) The DWRs own explainer document, a companion to the full report, describes potentially significant impacts due to changes in flow at and downstream of the intakes that have the potential to decrease migration rates, alter migration routing, reduce availability of rearing habitat, and increase exposure to predation for winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, and Central Valley steelhead.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species, including salmon, smelt, and trout, would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives.
698-6	In the DEIR, the document itself states that the No Project Alternative takes into account the effects of climate change and sea level rise. This choice also considers the actions water agencies that receive SWP supplies would need to take to address local shortages if the Delta Conveyance Project was not constructed and the resulting environmental effects of those actions, beyond what water agencies are currently planning. What is obvious and what the DEIR does not state:	The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	with or without the DCP, the state of California will still have to address ongoing water related issues such as: increases in water conservation programs; water recycling; groundwater recovery, source water stream restoration and environmental storage; sustainable agricultural water allocation; water prioritized urban planning; groundwater contamination; and other climate related issues. The DCP is not a panacea that will fix all the political and technical mistakes of the past or the failed economic paradigms of the present. Without the DCP the State of California will still have to address endangered native fish and wildlife, endangered communities and jobs. Climate change is here and that change can and most likely will outrun the completion and supposed benefits of the DCP. The State needs to reject Big Projects, Big Money, Big Political Influence. Therefore, the No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this DEIR.	Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. The Delta Conveyance Project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies that would assist in meeting California's water management needs and would not preclude other measures that may be taken by DWR or other entities.
699-1	Please do not continue with the Delta Tunnel project. It's not worth the damage it will cause the environment and Northern California residents. Water is becoming more and more scarce as our climate changes. Wells are drying up, and the floor of the Central Valley is SINKING due to groundwater depletion. We're currently losing somewhere between 25 - 150 animals and plants to extinction EVERY DAY. This project will only contribute to the destruction. Find a better way.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, for an explanation regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species would be less than significant with mitigation.
700-1	The Delta Tunnel must be stopped. This project will significantly disturb the Sacramento River and Delta Tribal Cultural Landscape by desecrating spiritual, cultural, and ceremonial sites of Tribes, this is unacceptable. Further, the impact to wild Salmon and other fish species is severe. Salmon are a keystone species that are vital to the ecological resilience in CA and of deep spiritual and cultural significance to Tribes.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species, including salmon, would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which identifies Tribal cultural resources and evaluates potential impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts where feasible. DWR understands and recognizes that salmon are a key species for Tribes, and it has consulted with Tribes and considered the impacts on salmon and other native fish species habitats as a character-defining feature of the Delta as a Tribal Cultural Landscape. DWR is committed to continuing consultation and engagement with Tribes as part of the project's mitigation measures, and DWR will continue to consult with affiliated Tribes regarding mitigation measures to minimize and mitigate the project's potentially significant impacts. Please refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources. -
700-2	This project further exacerbates threats faced by winter and spring-run Salmon that run through the Delta, including but not limited to low water levels, unhabitable water temperatures, and toxic algae blooms.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding the ecosystem in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. As shown in these chapters, all potentially significant impacts on terrestrial and aquatic species, including salmon, would be less than significant with mitigation.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		As shown in Chapter 9, Water Quality, all potentially significant impacts on water quality from low water levels, toxic algae blooms, and water temperatures would be less than significant.
700-3	Increasing water diversion also poses risks to habitat through salt water intrusion in the delta. Stop diverting, keep the waters flowing in the rivers and Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 5, Surface Water, including the table titled Comparison of Surface Water Resources by Project Alternative, regarding the magnitude of anticipated changes to Sacramento River Basin flows and SWP/CVP reservoir storages that are expected to result from the project alternatives. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). Please also refer to Chapter 9, Impact WQ-5, regarding electrical conductivity, which is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates the project's consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. Please also see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife, including sensitive habitats. Overall, the potential impacts on wildlife were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
701-1	As a resident of Sacramento I am opposed to this water grab for Southern California. We already struggle to provide enough water to our northern communities, and this will only exacerbate things. Not to mention the environmental damage this will do to the delta wildlife and indigenous people that still live along the delta. Our native plants and wildlife continue to be further and further threatened every day with climate change and the other environmental failures we humans have created. This may be the final straw that leads to a mass extinction of our local flora and fauna that rely on the delta.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding how the project would be operated to shift diversions from the south Delta to the north Delta (during the summer and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		fall) or divert water in the north Delta during excess flow conditions while meeting regulatory requirements (during the winter and spring). The analyses provided in the EIR Chapters 5-32 evaluate the potential impacts. Please see Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources, which identifies Tribal cultural resources and evaluates potential impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the project and provides mitigation measures to reduce the effects of potentially significant impacts where feasible. Additionally, please refer to Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Also, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. As described in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, potential impacts related to aquatic species and wildlife would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
701-2	A great example of California's water mismanagement is the so called Owens Valley. You all drained the lake and created a desolate wasteland that continues to injure and poison people to this day. We don't need another man made disaster in California. How many more lakes, rivers, and streams must we watch run dry before this destruction stops? How about we go after corporations who abuse, waste and steal our water before we destroy more of our environment? Why don't we kick Nestle out of California and stop allowing wealthy landowners to waste water to grow crops that have no business being grown in California? Within my lifetime my family, my neighbors, and our wildlife will all suffer because of the selfish, greed driven decisions made by a few. What will you do when someday soon your pipeline runs dry and no water is left in the state?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of the proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
702-1	I am providing my comments in opposition to the Delta Tunnels Water Project. The DEIR is inadequate and flawed and fails to address the preservation of the water quality of the Delta Region.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on water quality identified in the comment would be less than significant with mitigation.
702-2	The removal of outward flows will increase the salinity of the Delta System.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including salinity in Chapter 9, Water Quality, particularly Impact WQ-5. Electrical conductivity is a measure of salinity. Chapter 9 also evaluates consistency with water quality control plans under Impact WQ-17. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on water quality identified in the comment would be less than significant with mitigation. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements, specifically State Water Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).
702-3	The unmitigable losses of farmland in the proposed project area is unacceptable.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including farmland in Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources. Please see Chapter 15, regarding impacts and proposed mitigation measures for farmland. Although the analysis in Chapter 15 concludes that conversion of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		agricultural land could result in significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or minimize impacts where feasible. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, for a description of the CEQA requirements associated with the potential approval of a project with significant and unavoidable impacts
702-4	The project proposal regarding traffic impacts to delayed traffic passage will increase the Nox emissions for the area of construction to unacceptable levels of pollution.	As described in Chapter 20, Transportation, most potential impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The commenter is referred to Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impacts AQ-1 through AQ-4, for a full summary of construction and operational NOx emissions, including those that would be generated by project traffic. As disclosed in these impacts, with mitigation, project construction would not contribute a significant level of NOx such that regional air quality in the plan area would be degraded. Impact AQ-5 quantifies nitrogen dioxide (NO2) concentrations for all alternatives and analyzes whether those concentrations would exceed the health-protective ambient air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected violation. As summarized in Impact AQ-5, Alternatives 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, and 5 would lead to new violations of the NO2 ambient air quality standards at certain locations and during certain construction years.
702-5	The complete disruption to the habitat of the fish and fowl in the area of the proposal is in complete violation of wildlife protections that have been hard won for nearly a Century of efforts.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on fish and fowl are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, the significant impacts on fish and fowl would be less than significant with mitigation. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
702-6	The devastation to regional businesses who have thrived in the Delta will face loss of income due to the disruption in community access on the travel ways.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including transportation and local businesses. As described in Chapter 20, Transportation, most potential impacts on transportation could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As described in Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, the potential effects analyzed are not expected to be adverse effects.
702-7	The evening light pollution from night work and the noise from same night work will have detrimental impacts of the health of residents in the proposed project area. Loss of sleep and increased levels of stress are clearly linked to serious health impacts.	The concerns raised in the comment are addressed in chapters 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration and Chapter 26, Public Health. Where potentially significant impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce impacts. Significant impacts on public health from construction would be less than significant with mitigation.
702-8	The Delta has become a premier place in history and as such deserves to be preserved and protected from the egregious acts of devastation proposed in the Delta Tunnels Project. I and my family are opposed to this project and request to reject and abandon the Delta Tunnels Project. The best practicable option is NO Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the development and analysis of the No Project Alternative and comments related to commenter preference for the No Project Alternative.
703-1	Climate change is here, and the DCP is counter-productive in positively addressing it. And, fundamentally, we have an obligation to cease policies and programs that ignore the rights of negatively-impacted Indigenous populations. No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this Draft EIR. Given the harms described in the DEIR to the already endangered Winter run Chinook Salmon, other listed species and other forms of aquatic life, the No Project Alternative as the only correct choice for the DCP. The status quo in the Delta	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Tribal cultural resources in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. The Chapter 32 section titled Consultation and Engagement with Tribes describes DWR's good faith effort to foster meaningful consultation that recognizes Tribal expertise in the identification and consideration of Tribal cultural resources. Please also refer to Common Response 16, Tribal Cultural Resources, regarding Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	already jeopardizes wildlife. I strongly urge that we pursue the No Project Alternative.	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on wildlife and fish species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, all significant impacts on wildlife, plant species, and aquatic species, including salmon, would be less than significant with mitigation. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding the development and analysis of the No Project Alternative and comments related to commenter preference for the No Project Alternative.
703-2	The DCP will impact our air, water, land, human and animal communities, and tribal cultural resources in the Delta and far beyond.	Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. Please refer to response to comment 703-1 regarding the EIR's analysis of Tribal cultural resources and Tribal consultation efforts aimed at identification, impacts, and mitigation for Tribal cultural resources.
703-3	The Delta is the nexus for all waters draining from the Central Valley. It is also the gateway for most California Chinook Salmon to reach their spawning grounds. Winter-run Chinook salmon is listed as endangered and Spring-run Chinook salmon is listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Fall-run and Late Fall-run Chinook are Species of Concern under the Federal ESA. In the Draft EIR, state officials acknowledge that the DCP tunnel could harm endangered and threatened species, including the Delta Smelt, Winter Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. To offset this harm, the DWR says thousands of acres of other wetlands would have to be restored, but that will take years. Doug Obegi at the Natural Resources Defense Council doubts that the DCP will be permitted due to federal and state endangered species laws. In the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 2022, he predicts it will be challenged in court if	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including fish and fish populations in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon, trout, and other fish species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, impacts on salmon and trout would be less than significant with mitigation; in particular, refer to the discussion of Impacts AQUA-2, AQUA-3, and AQUA-4 and related mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section Key Existing Delta Operations Criteria, for information about how the project would be operated consistent with regulatory requirements and to protect fish. Please see Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for an analysis of potential socioeconomic effects of the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	permitting is allowed. "The status quo in the delta jeopardizes the continued existence of our native fish and wildlife, and for the thousands of fishing jobs and communities that depend on a healthy environment... This proposed system would be even worse for the environment than the degraded status quo." (https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-07-27/california-releases-plan-for-shrinking-delta-water-project-from-two-tunnels-to-one)	
704-1	As an outdoor educator I take students to sample river health on the American river every week. Needless to say the health of rivers is important to me both spiritually and for my livelihood.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please refer to Chapter 16, Recreation, and Chapter 17, Socioeconomics, for discussion of impacts and mitigation related to recreational opportunities and recreational economics. As shown in Chapter 16, all significant impacts on recreation would be less than significant with mitigation. Please also see Common Response 13, Recreation and Recreational Opportunities, regarding comments related to the evaluation of recreational opportunities.
704-2	I firmly oppose the delta conveyance project. There is no scenario under which we can justify yet another diversion from the Delta.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
704-3	The salmon fisheries cannot handle it.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including fish and fish populations in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, significant impacts on salmon would be less than significant with mitigation.
704-4	The project will destroy sites sacred to indigenous people.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including Tribal cultural resources in Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources and cultural resources in Chapter 19, Cultural Resources. Although the analyses concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible.
704-5	The ecosystems built on these rivers and floodplains and springs will perish if we remove more water, and as such we as people will perish right along with them.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. As described in Chapter 5, Surface Water, long-term average monthly flows for the project alternatives are similar to existing conditions, with some minor differences.
704-6	Once I again, I strongly oppose the delta conveyance project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
705-1	I strongly oppose this and am furious that corporate media has dropped the ball when it comes to honest and responsible reporting: "After California voters got their only chance to vote on the project in its earlier, open-canal form in 1982, they overwhelmingly rejected it from one side of the state to the other. The mainstream media took notice of that reaction. As state officials spent the next 35 years working closely with powerful special interest groups to make various changes on the same basic concept, they were watch-dogged closely by The San Francisco Chronicle, The San Jose Mercury News, The Contra Costa Times and The Sacramento Bee, not to mention regional television. However, in the last few years, as tunnel-visioned bureaucrats and billionaire almond and pasticcio barons have come ever-closer to finally getting their way, the only consistent, meaningful coverage has been from The Stockton Record – and Sacramento News & Review. December 16th is the formal deadline for every Californian to make their voice heard about the new, highly criticized Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Tunnel." We know who will benefit and it is not the land or the average Joe. The State and the Media get an F.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please also refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. Additionally, as described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it owns and operates the State Water Project (SWP) and would be responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new SWP conveyance facilities if DWR approves the proposed project or a project alternative. CEQA does not require voter approval of projects; however, the section titled Intended Uses of this EIR and Agency Roles and Responsibilities describes the relevant review, approval, and consultation requirements that may be necessary to implement the project.
706-1	Staff of the CA Dept of Water Resources,This is my comment on the published draft of your EIR for the delta conveyance project:	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
706-2	The EIR's scope is too narrow and optimistically focuses on the logistics of maintaining the status quo of our cities', towns', industries', and farms' current development trajectories. By creating a massive new infrastructure investment, the State of	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	CA government would enable the status quo to proceed; in fact, this new infrastructure would incentivize these unwise and climate reality-blind trajectories to happen. The status quo for these development trajectories is neither sustainable nor advisable in terms of land stewardship. It is neither sustainable nor advisable for a truly thriving California.	information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Issues related to climate change are addressed in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases and Chapter 30, Climate Change.
706-3	Rather than focusing on a technical fix with how to maintain our current water delivery system as drought conditions worsen, the people of the state of California must reckon with making an adaptive change. We need to not only move away from the current growth trajectories and plans, we need to undo some of the harms of poor past decisions. To the DWR and the Office of the Governor: ignoring the true, adaptive challenges of today and those on the horizon is not an effective way to protect, steward, and honour your lands, water, and fellow Californians. Please let go of this project so that you can turn your capable minds and formidable resources to strategize a more meaningful plan for our climate and for climate justice in our state	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives development process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please also see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
706-4	For example, I grew up in the Los Angeles area. When I attended college there, my geology professor taught us that our region could naturally sustain just under 500,000 people,	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	with its historic fresh water capacity. Ever since, I have taken a more mature and land stewardship-oriented view of my beloved home state.	reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
706-5	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project's Draft EIR. I compliment you on the organized and accessible nature of the website.	This information describes general closing text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
707-1	My name is [commenter name], and I am a homeowner in Elk Grove. I have lived in this community for most of my life and I have been an educator in this community for over 20 years.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
707-2	I am reaching out to you today to urge the committee preserve the Hood community and stop the tunnel.	Please see response to comment 707-3 regarding impacts and mitigation measures related to the community. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
707-3	The tunnel project is reminiscent of racist attacks on Black and Brown communities throughout California history. The displacement of hundreds of Hood community members mirrors the 1969 building of the crosstown freeway in Stockton, CA. The crosstown freeway destroyed Little Manila, Chinatown, Japantown, El Barrio Del Chivo, and historically Black neighborhoods in spite of community resistance. Currently in Palm Springs, there are advocates fighting for reparations for families who were literally bulldozed out of their homes in the 50s and 60s in order to develop tourism in Palm Springs. The decision to build a tunnel that will obliterate the neighborhoods of the Hood community is shortsighted and as I community member, I am requesting that the committee look to alternative solutions that will not be a repeat of California's racist history.	Please refer to Chapter 29, Environmental Justice, regarding how potential impacts and mitigation measures could affect an environmental justice community, including a discussion of state and federal policies for consideration of minority and low-income populations. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in the EIR. The comment assertion that the Delta Conveyance Project would obliterate the neighborhoods of the Hood community is not consistent with the analysis in the EIR. While significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated for some resources such as in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Chapter 18, Aesthetics and Visual Resources and Chapter 20, Transportation, other resources evaluated found no impacts or less than significant impacts for the town of Hood and vicinity. Examples include Chapter 8, Groundwater; Chapter 9, Water Quality; Chapter 14, Land Use; Chapter 16, Recreation; Chapter 21, Public Services and Utilities, and Chapter 26, Public Health. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of the proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
707-4	In addition, I am concerned that the current plan does not address the effects that the tunnel will have on the environment. In particular, I am concerned about the effect that the tunnel will have on the surrounding areas. It is my understanding that the decision to build the tunnel will destroy the Delta, the largest freshwater estuary in the western hemisphere. The effects of this are unknown. Why hasn't a study been done to assess the repercussions of the tunnel? Why hasn't the committee addressed the harm to pants and wildlife, many of which are already Endangered or close to being Endangered? Why hasn't the committee addressed the repercussions of the affects that it will have on water quality?	The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on the ecosystem are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. The EIR evaluates fish and wildlife in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Additionally, the EIR also addresses water quality in Chapter 9, Water Quality. As shown in these chapters, all significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. As described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview, identification of the proposed project for the Draft EIR does not indicate

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		that DWR has decided to move forward with the Delta Conveyance Project or that, if DWR does determine to move forward, the Bethany Reservoir alignment will be the project that DWR approves. DWR will not make a decision on the project until after addressing public comments on the Draft EIR, certifying the Final EIR, making all necessary findings, and taking any other actions required to comply with CEQA.
707-5	As a homeowner in Elk Grove, I am concerned that a decision is being made in a neighboring town that will cause a chain reaction harming people all over the state.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
707-6	Thank you for your time.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
708-1	Hello DCP, I strongly OPPOSE the Delta Tunnel project. Not only will this be devastating to the environment and very unfair to those of which your will seek eminent domain. Secondly, why are you going to build a "straw" when the glass is typically "empty". We are in a drought. Please STOP this from going forward. Thank you.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1 regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws.
709-1	This [DCP] is rapacious, contemptible. Obviously this has insufficient regard for the environment, would serve the agribusiness billionaires -- who make lots and lots of political campaign/PAC contributions.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process,

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7–32 of the EIR. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
710-1	For some years now I have observed the changes in attitude about water in California. It seems to have progressed from various parties wanting to protect their "rights" with a focus on business and jobs (all kinds of business including agriculture, fracking, fishing, urban development, and so many others) all affected by water or the lack of it, to a more collaborative approach including other interests, communities and people with valid concerns. Water is no longer the exclusive property or concern of a few special interests or of powerful or influential parties; concern for water and about it has resulted in more transparency and collaboration than ever. Many people have worked long and hard hours to be inclusive and resolve issues and have been doing their best to take everyone's concerns into consideration. This is a remarkable achievement. Have the problems all been resolved? I'm afraid that I have neither the engineering degrees, the scientific expertise nor the business or ecological knowledge to evaluate this project. I know everyone has done his and her best. Congratulations all. Is it fair? I know people have done their best. Is it right? I don't know.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
710-2	Despite everyone's best efforts, I have a gnawing doubt that I must express. It doesn't have to do with the efforts of all who contributed or their abilities. I have great confidence in honest intentions and diligence. I would like to ask everyone to consider one thing: Can we replace Nature? We cannot even Control Nature. There is evidence now that humanity has caused some of the climate warming, caused species' extinction, and irreparably harmed habitats even habitats for ourselves. I wish everyone would stop considering the State Water Project for a few moments and think about California's natural resources, including water. Could we recreate them? I submit that the State Water Project was the wrong thing to do from its inception, has damaged forests, dried rivers and lakes, and contributed to changing California's natural riches for personal enrichment. Resources are not just things to use. They may not be infinite. I'm asking that we stop looking at the business side of things for a moment. Step away, step back and look at the geography, the ecology, the species, at Nature. Can we destroy Nature? If so, can we replace it? This is not as much about jobs and profit as survival. Even satellites monitoring water from space may not be able to replace what we lose – what we have already lost. Can we stop doing what we've been doing all long, depleting Nature? Can we focus on more of a balance between us, as part of Nature, and Nature as a whole? Maybe a step back to look at Nature itself, will enable us to see it differently, like seeing the earth from space. Can we rethink the entire project before we implement something that will continue to alter, drain or devastate Nature?	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR.
710-3	Much gratitude to all who have been working so hard, so long, trying to ensure that everything man has made succeed while considering habitats and communities. I couldn't be more proud of your efforts, your intentions, and your patience.	The comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
711-1	It is time to prioritize ecological health over water delivery to farmers in desert landscapes. Climate change is here, and that change will outrun both the completion and the supposed benefits of the Delta Conveyance Project. No Project Alternative is the best and only preferred alternative for this Draft EIR.	Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project. Please also see Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.
714-1	For the record, based on the facts we face, the No Project Alternative is the only reasonable alternative for this Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR. The status quo in the Delta already jeopardizes wildlife and the DCP will only magnify those harms, while providing a benefit that may shortly be outrun by the impact of climate change.	Please refer to Chapter 4, Framework for the Environmental Analysis, and Chapter 30, Climate Change, regarding how climate change was incorporated into the EIR's analysis. Additionally, please refer to Common Response 6, Climate Resilience and Adaptation, regarding how the project will provide climate change resilience to the State Water Project and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding comments related to selecting the No Project Alternative.
714-2	The DCP will impact our air, water, land, human and animal communities, and tribal cultural resources in the Delta and far beyond. The Delta is the nexus for all waters draining from the Central Valley. It is also the gateway for most California Chinook Salmon to reach their spawning grounds. The Winter-run Chinook salmon is listed as endangered and the Spring-run Chinook salmon is listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and the Federal Endangered Species Act. Fall-run and Late Fall-run Chinook are Species of Concern under the Federal ESA. In the Draft EIR, state officials acknowledge that the DCP tunnel could harm endangered and threatened species, including the Delta Smelt, Winter Run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout. To offset this harm, the DWR says thousands of acres of other wetlands would have to be restored, but that will take years. Doug Obegi at the Natural Resources Defense	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Chapter 5, Surface Water; Chapter 6, Water Supply; Chapter 14, Land Use; Chapter 17, Socioeconomics; Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources; Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources; and Chapter 32, Tribal Cultural Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon, trout, and other fish species are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown in Chapter 12, impacts on salmon and trout would be less than significant with mitigation; in particular, refer to the discussion of Impacts AQUA-2, AQUA-3, and AQUA-4 and related mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 32, although the analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, mitigation measures have been identified to avoid and reduce effects where feasible.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	Council doubts that the DCP will be permitted due to federal and state endangered species laws. In the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 2022, he predicts such permitting would be challenged in court. "The status quo in the delta jeopardizes the continued existence of our native fish and wildlife, and the thousands of fishing jobs and communities that depend on a healthy environment… This proposed system would be even worse for the environment than the degraded status quo”" (https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-07-27/california-releases-plan-for-shrinking-delta-water-project-from-two-tunnels-to-one)	
715-1	Stop this project! California is already stealing too much water from the rivers, Delta and SF Bay. Stop using taxpayer money to subsidize unsustainable non staple agriculture whose almonds and pistachios are mostly exported. You have destroyed the ecosystem and its species.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding alternatives suggesting demand management and reducing or eliminating exports. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project. Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California’s water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably. Please also see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding project costs, including taxpayer costs.
715-2	Make SoCal use desalination, local storage and recycling of water.	This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered.
716-1	We, the principal signers of this Declaration of Protest, inform you, the Governor of California, that we object, condemn, and oppose the environmental racism being visited upon our community, the majority Latino town of Hood, by your engineers, lawyers, and consultants in the planning of the Delta Conveyance Project.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts on environmental justice communities, including low-income and minority populations in the community of Hood, CA, in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice. As part of the environmental review process, DWR developed and executed a robust outreach program to help ensure participation of disadvantaged communities and environmental justice organizations in the scoping process. In addition to these outreach strategies, DWR conducted the Your Delta, Your Voice environmental justice community survey from September 20 to December 18, 2020, to gather insights on the priorities, preferences, activities, and concerns of Delta-area environmental justice communities. The Your Delta, Your Voice survey is summarized in Chapter 29, in the section titled Environmental Justice Survey Findings, and the full report is provided as Appendix 29A, Environmental Justice Community Survey Report. Survey results included concerns raised by respondents for the community of Hood, CA, particularly regarding construction impacts. Findings from the survey illuminated a sample of the priorities and concerns of a subset of the Delta environmental justice community that helped inform the environmental justice analysis. In addition, Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		its intersection with Corky Lane. As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE.
716-2	In 2019, your Department of Water Resources pledged "to avoid and minimize the impacts that concern Delta communities the most" in the planning of the Delta Conveyance Project, and to take heed of environmental justice. We inform you that your Department of Water Resources has failed to uphold their pledge. Your engineers ignore the plight of our community and insist on locating two gigantic intakes a few hundred yards from the heart of our tiny town. Our pleas to your engineers to move the intakes to anywhere else among hundreds of miles of riverbank fall on deaf ears; they insist we must suffer the impacts of six or more years of heavy construction activity, the daily invasion of thousands of construction workers, that we must breathe the pollution of tons of diesel exhaust from thousands of trucks, the noise, the dust, the blockage of our roads --- we cannot survive this onslaught and our town will become a ghost town. We inform you that your "environment al justice" consultants are but a tool to perpetuate environmental racism. "We have reached out far and wide to minority communities and conducted oh so many meetings and surveys, yes we have" your consultants refrain. But we cannot discuss with you moving the intakes that destroy your town, "they must be here," say your engineers. Then "all is well," say your consultants because we have done so much outreach and held	DWR worked diligently in identifying, evaluating, and incorporating ways to avoid or minimize effects of the project, including construction effects, on communities in the Delta. DWR specifically tasked the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) with 10 engineering and design objectives at the outset of the environmental planning process to help in this effort. These 10 objectives included: 1. Avoid increasing demand for existing emergency services in the Delta. 2. Manage flood risks to the project facilities and existing land use. 3. Manage seismic risks to people and property. 4. Minimize activities that produce noise, dust, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic, and land use disturbances. 5. Minimize construction effects to existing infrastructure or other community resources. 6. Minimize construction traffic and associated effects. 7. Minimize disturbance to existing land uses, including agricultural land, residences, and wildlife habitat. 8. Minimize disturbance to sensitive wildlife and protected habitat areas. 9. Minimize effects on Delta water-based recreation and navigation. 10. Minimize noise during construction and operations. The DCA approached this task in part by getting input through its Stakeholder Engagement Committee. Their efforts resulted in numerous

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	so many meeting[s]. And on it goes, the charade of justice. We demand real justice: do not obliterate our poor brown community; move the intakes.	changes to the conceptual designs that reduce, or avoid altogether, numerous effects of concern to the community. For example, the DCA was able to avoid the need for new forebays and barge landings; reduce the number of launch shafts; reduce local traffic by adding haul roads; and add state-of-the-art fish screens to minimize the footprint of the intakes. These are just a few examples of ways that local construction effects were avoided or minimized through the design process and demonstrate that DWR took community requests to respond to concerns about impacts seriously. Please see the fact sheet titled "Preliminary Design and Engineering Objectives" from July 2022 on the project website. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Regarding intake siting, the DCA carefully assessed all possible siting locations along a 26-mile stretch of the Sacramento River. Evaluation of these potential sites included consideration of existing land uses, cultural and historic resources, river depth and geometry, and suitable geotechnical conditions. The sites must also allow for water flows that facilitate better fish passage and appropriate diversion operations. Re-examination of the riverbed and other physical settings of the Sacramento River between the Town of Freeport and the confluence with Sutter Slough affirmed the selection of the candidate sites based solely on technical and scientific siting criteria. It should also be noted that the potential intake site closest to Hood was screened out for further consideration. For more information about the intake location screening process and criteria, please refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c). Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, specifically the discussion of Intake Location, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible alternatives evaluated in

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		the EIR. Alternatives, including those with alternate intake locations, were initially identified and screened through a two-level filtering process to determine if the alternative could (1) meet the project purpose and most objectives and (2) avoid or lessen environmental impacts compared to the proposed project. Details on how the intake sites were considered and screened out are available in the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c), which is cited in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, of the EIR. Regarding project construction impacts, the EIR discloses impacts on air quality, noise, transportation, and environmental justice communities from construction of the project and its alternatives. Please see the analyses in Chapter 20, Transportation; Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; and Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, which conclude that significant transportation, air quality, and noise impacts would result from construction of the proposed project and its alternatives. Please also see Chapter 29, which analyzes transportation, air quality, and noise impacts from construction of the project and its alternatives on environmental justice communities. The environmental justice analysis concludes that even with mitigation implemented, significant air quality and noise effects from construction of the project and its alternatives (e.g., Impact AQ-5, Impact NOI-1) could occur in areas with meaningfully greater minority and low-income populations and therefore represent a disproportionately high and adverse effect on environmental justice. For transportation, the environmental justice analysis concludes that transportation impacts during construction would not be greater for environmental justice communities than the general public because implementation of site-specific traffic demand management plans and traffic management plans as part of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would reduce traffic-related impacts, and equal access to information (e.g., notifications of road construction and high-volume construction traffic events) for minority and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		low-income residents with limited English proficiency or limited internet access would be provided (e.g., Impacts TRANS-1, TRANS-3, and TRANS-4). Please see Chapter 29 section titled Project Alternatives, subsections Transportation, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and Noise. Further, DWR has worked diligently to address Delta residents' concerns about environmental and community effects of the project and acknowledges that even extraordinary levels of outreach and engagement will not necessarily result in agreement about the project or in all concerns being assuaged. People working in good faith will nonetheless continue to disagree. The effort to hear and understand and engage with environmental justice communities and community members was attentive to and conscientious of best practices as recommended by numerous recognized state experts. It was also responsive to criticisms made previously by Delta environmental justice advocates. As a result, DWR implemented a robust program with goals to: 1. Help ensure disadvantaged and environmental justice communities know about and understand the Delta Conveyance Project and its timeline. 2. Help ensure disadvantaged and environmental justice communities understand how to find information about the Delta Conveyance Project's effects on their priorities and interests. 3. Increase the disadvantaged and environmental justice network and mailing list to existing and new hard-to-reach and underrepresented communities. 4. Help ensure disadvantaged and environmental justice communities understand and know how to engage in public input opportunities. 5. Provide access to information and input opportunities that are culturally attentive using creative methods to reach people where they are. Outreach related to the release of the Draft EIR included numerous interviews of statewide and local environmental justice experts; a community survey with more than 2,000 respondents; numerous

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		community briefings; attendance at numerous community events and meetings reaching about 1,500 people; development of partnerships with 12 community-based organizations to aid in outreach; numerous e-blasts and PSAs that ran in English, Spanish, and Hmong on radio stations with Delta listenership; workshops and materials in English, Spanish, and Chinese; flyers in locations likely to reach underrepresented communities; and numerous calls and emails throughout the community.
716-3	A third intake was to be located just downstream of the Town of Clarksburg, a few miles from us. But the Clarksburg intake was eliminated because your engineers "found increased potential for construction related effects to sensitive receptors in Clarksburg." Clarksburg is majority non-Hispanic and more prosperous. We are majority Hispanic and more low income. Sensitive receptors? Why are we not "sensitive receptors" deserving of respect? It has been said that racism is the result of bad policies not bad people. The policy of locating the intakes on top of us and sparing Clarksburg visits a grossly disproportionate impact on a poor brown community. We do not know what was in the heart of your engineers when they made this decision but we know the result.	Please see the response to comment 716-2 regarding intake locations. Sensitive receptors, including environmental justice communities, were considered when siting project facilities. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project on environmental justice communities (i.e., minority and low-income communities) are evaluated in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice. Low-income and minority populations residing within the study area were considered to be sensitive receptors for the purposes of the environmental impact analysis for resource topics such as noise, air quality, land use, aesthetics and visual quality.
716-4	We demand, Governor Newsom, that you intervene and direct your engineers and lawyers to move these intakes away from our town. Nothing short of relocating the intakes will be of any value.	This comment opposes locating intakes near the town of Hood. Please see the response to comment 716-2 regarding intake locations. Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project.
716-5	We wish for you to know who we are before we affix our signatures. We are the kind of people who for generations have been disproportionately harmed by siting everything from toxic dumps to freeways to industrial facilities in poor disadvantaged communities throughout this country. President Biden has finally taken steps to stop this practice at the federal level. Now is the time for you to stop it in California. Here is a	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project on environmental justice communities (i.e., minority and low-income communities) are evaluated in Chapter 29, Environmental Justice.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	little about us and our history with our community: The Montano, Cruz, Lujan, Chacon, and Chavez families migrated to Hood from Colorado in the 1940s. The 104 households that now comprise Hood are largely descended from these families. Many of us are in some degree related to one and other. We value our family, our community, and our heritage. We are a majority Latino community and of modest incomes.	
716-6	We do not intend to stand idly by and see our way of life destroyed by this project. We, the undersigned, OBJECT, PROTEST, AND DEMAND that the location of the intakes for the Delta Conveyance Project BE MOVED away from the Town of Hood:	The comment opposes the location of project facilities near the town of Hood and does not concern the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process. The commenter's opposition includes social and/or economic concerns that are beyond the scope of CEQA. DWR recognizes, however, the importance of working with the local community to address social and economic concerns where feasible and has developed the Community Benefits Program to do so. The Community Benefits Program is described in Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Community Benefits Program, and in Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework. The Department of Water Resources followed CEQA requirements when identifying alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the EIR. As described in Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, CEQA lead agencies develop project objectives to inform the identification of the project and a reasonable range of feasible alternatives. CEQA requires an EIR to include a reasonable range of alternatives that meet most of the basic project objectives, are potentially feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project. As demonstrated in the EIR and Common Response 3, the EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives. Common Response 3 provides an explanation of the alternatives screening process and how project objectives are used to identify potential alternatives to the proposed project. The project's purpose and objectives are presented in Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, of the EIR.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Appendix 3A, which describes how DWR considered alternatives that proposed different intake locations. Those alternatives were not found to meet two or more project objectives and therefore were not carried forward for detailed review. Please also refer to the Intake Site Identification and Evaluation technical memorandum in the Engineering Project Report (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022c) for a summary of the intake site selection process. Candidate sites were evaluated and ranked against a set of siting criteria that included, among others, the following. • Property Impacts • Built Environment Impacts • Proximity to Existing Development • Environmental and Habitat Disruption • Roads and Traffic Impacts. Common Response 3 also explains how alternate intake locations were evaluated, the reasons for moving the intake location farther north of the town of Hood, and the reasons other intake locations were found to not meet siting requirements or meet most of the basic project objectives.
718-1	Thank you for your consideration.	This information describes the background of the organization or individual commenter, clarification on the submittal of the comment letter, or general introductory text. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
718-2	We are AGAINST the Delta Tunnel Project for the following reasons. (1) The location of the intakes on the Sacramento River is at Hood, CA, a small legacy community the Delta Plan says to protect. This project will destroy Hood and surrounding bird refuge.	The EIR provides an impact analysis of the environmental resource raised by the comment and potential impacts from construction to the town of Hood. The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and fully evaluates the range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. DWR's analysis meets the CEQA requirement to make a good-faith effort at full disclosure, and every effort has been made to base the analyses on up-to-date and accurate information.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		The Delta Conveyance Project has been designed to minimize impacts where possible. Please refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). Chapter 19, Cultural Resources, section titled Area of Potential Impact for Built Environment Resources, describes the methods used for setting the area of impact for CEQA historical resources that are part of the built environment (AI-BE). The project does not propose demolition within the town of Hood. The project calls for widening of an existing bridge and roadway, as well as tunneling in the vicinity of Hood Franklin Road east of its intersection with Corky Lane, As shown in the figure titled Built Environment Resources Evaluation Results in Appendix 19A, Historical Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, small sections of the periphery of Hood are within the AI-BE, but the town center of Hood does not fall within the AI-BE as neither the intake structures nor other above-grade project facilities are proposed within the one parcel buffer that defines the AI-BE. Please see Chapter 13, Terrestrial Biological Resources, regarding potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife, including sensitive habitats and birds. Overall, the potential impacts on wildlife were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.
718-3	We are AGAINST the Delta Tunnel Project for the following reasons. (2) As before, taking the freshest water out north on the Sacramento River and around the estuary will worsen water quality within our fragile Delta.	Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, regarding analysis of environmental impacts on surface water quality from the project alternatives. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on water quality would be less than significant with mitigation.
718-4	We are AGAINST the Delta Tunnel Project for the following reasons. (3) They'll still be leaving muck on our islands and farmland. They spell it "RTM" (reusable tunnel material) but it isn't reusable per their own experts and it is muck.	Please also see the Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled Reusable Tunnel Material, regarding the testing, drying, reuse, and storage of excavated material. RTM that may be deemed unsuitable for reuse would be disposed of at a site approved for disposal of such material and is expected to be approximately 1% to 5% of the total volume of excavated material.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
718-5	We are AGAINST the Delta Tunnel Project for the following reasons. (4) This expensive project creates no new water, like alternatives would. (Desalination, recycling, etc.) The EIR doesn't study any real alternatives. Just tunnel or no tunnel.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies.
718-6	We are AGAINST the Delta Tunnel Project for the following reasons. (5) The energy costs to pump all this water around the delta is extremely high. We don't need any more strain on PG&E. We don't want our rates to go up.	Please refer to Chapter 22, Energy, regarding comments related to energy impacts and mitigation approaches. As shown in this chapter, significant impacts on energy identified in the comment would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments related to project costs, including taxpayer costs.
718-7	Northern California will get the construction impacts, energy drain, and lose fresh water. More toxic blue-green algae. There's no positive value for Northern California. Instead, we need the State to invest in our levees, make improvements to the narrow highway 4 bridges (not add construction truck traffic), and let more water flow through the Delta to keep the salt water out, not less.	Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives, including DWR's continuing commitment to operate the State Water Project as modified to include the Delta Conveyance Project in compliance with all state and federal water quality and environmental laws. Please see Chapter 9, Water Quality, for an analysis of potential project impacts on water quality constituents, including cyanobacteria harmful algal blooms (Impact WQ-14).

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered. Please refer to Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding DWRs levee management efforts in the Delta.
719-1	I am writing to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) actively pursues an unsustainable isolated water conveyance infrastructure that would divert freshwater flows from the Delta. The benefits of this diversion accrue only to south-of-the-Delta consumers. The Delta Conveyance is the latest iteration of past diversion proposals, however, this DEIR addresses none of the devastating environmental impacts or takes into account the extensive cumulative impacts which would stress Delta communities and ecosystems.	The EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and adequately disclosed the potential, scope, severity, and magnitude of potential impacts for the environmental resources analyzed in Chapters 5 through 32. Please see Chapter 1, Introduction, for a description of the State Water Project and background information regarding how water supply has been developed and managed in California. Please also refer to Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the project's purpose and objectives. Please see Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, which includes a list of other projects and a cumulative impact analysis. The Delta Conveyance Project would be a part of the State Water Project, and Common Response 5, Public Water Agencies Water Management

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		Practices, describes existing efforts and future actions to be undertaken by State Water Project users to ensure California's water resources are being used efficiently and sustainably.
719-2	The DEIR is fundamentally inadequate and fails to inform the public of the true extent of the cumulative environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). By any measure, the Delta Conveyance project sacrifices the Delta region in favor of an unsustainable multi-billion-dollar environmental disaster.	The Delta Conveyance Project EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA and evaluates the full range of potential impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed project and its alternatives. Please see Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, which includes a list of other projects and a cumulative impact analysis. Potential significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapters 7-32 of the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 35, Public Involvement, and Common Response 2, Public Outreach Activities, regarding the outreach activities conducted throughout the EIR process. Please also see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding the CEQA baseline used.
719-3	The DEIR fails to analyze the significant impacts associated with building and operating a system capable of diverting 6,000 cubic feet-per-second of water from the Sacramento / River. Diverting about one-third to one-half of the average river flow would increase salinity and increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms. Yet the DEIR claims that these impacts would magically be less than significant.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water quality. Please refer to Chapter 9, Water Quality, and supporting appendices, for discussion and analysis of salinity, algal blooms, and other potentially significant environmental impacts on the environmental resources mentioned in the comment as a result of operation of the project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, regarding operational criteria, real-time operational decision-making, and adaptive management, which seek to avoid impacts on fish and aquatic resources.
719-4	The DEIR does not adequately analyze and propose mitigation measures for impacts on Delta communities. The project would destroy nearly 3,800 acres of highly productive Delta farmland, which feeds the people of California. A Community Benefits Program cannot address the real impacts to Delta residents during and after construction. The DEIR provides no significant	Please see Chapter 15, Agricultural Resources, regarding project impacts on agricultural lands and proposed mitigation. Please also see Common Response 12, Agricultural Resources, regarding the methodology and approach to analysis. Please refer to Appendix 3G, Community Benefits Program Framework, regarding the Community Benefits Program, which would include the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
	mitigation measures to address extensive and lasting project impacts on the region's quality of life.	Integrated Benefits to address local effects that may occur, beyond the mitigation requirements of CEQA. Please also refer to the Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects technical memoranda in the Engineering Project Reports regarding the engineering and design modifications made to reduce Delta community effects (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b).
719-5	As a result of project construction, toxic air pollutants, including particulate matter, would increase, and at times double, endangering the health of Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including toxic air pollutants. A health risk assessment was conducted for all alternatives and analyzes potential cancer and non-cancer health hazards associated with receptor exposure to diesel particulate matter. The results are presented in Chapter 23, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Impact AQ-6. The potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts for all alternatives except 2a and 4a. For Alternatives 2a and 4a, Impact AQ-6 identifies that DWR will provide financial assistance for air filters to residences impacted by construction of Intake A, which is the only location identified in the EIR where predicted health risks would exceed a local air district threshold (see Mitigation Measure AQ-6). In addition, Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would reduce the extent of Impact AQ-5; however, Impact AQ-5 could still result in significant and unavoidable impacts.
719-6	There is no comfort in DWR's weak assurances that construction noise would be mitigated to ensure an ongoing quality of life enjoyed by Delta residents.	The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including noise. Chapter 24, Noise and Vibration, evaluates the potential impacts associated with noise and vibration, and while mitigation is proposed in order to reduce impacts, some impacts are potentially significant and unavoidable.
719-7	I urge DWR to abandon the Delta Conveyance project in favor of sustainable projects that meet water quality and supply needs without destroying the Delta.	The assertion that the project will destroy the Delta is not consistent with the analysis contained in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 2, Purpose and Project Objectives, regarding the purpose of the project. Please refer to Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the development of the reasonable range of feasible

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		alternatives evaluated in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 3, Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, section titled No Project Alternative; Appendix 3C, Defining Existing Conditions, No Project Alternative and Cumulative Impact Conditions; and Common Response 4, No Project Alternative Description and Analysis, regarding reasonably foreseeable actions that are considered part of the No Project Alternative, which include additional water conservation programs, water recycling projects, groundwater recovery projects, desalination of seawater or brackish groundwater, surface water storage, groundwater management, or water transfers and exchanges, that may be pursued by a variety of local, state and federal agencies.
719-8	Thank you for the opportuni,-1,,.....,....,vide [opportunity to provide] comments on this project and please add me to the notice list.	Anyone who provided comments during the Draft EIR public review period was added to the project mailing list to be included on future notifications. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue relating to the proposed project or address the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
719-9	13 billion and 13 year project are you out of your mind. [?] You can't even balance the budget. LA sucks. Stick those tunnels up where the sun don't shine. We don't have enough water to wash our cars. What happened to save the smelt. Salmon population is down. Now you want to move the water elsewhere. Start your tunnel in Oregon.	Please see Common Response 1, CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues, regarding comments that state opinions of general opposition to the project. Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered but eliminated. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures, regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including aquatic species in Chapter 12, Fish and Aquatic Resources. The comment assertions regarding the significance of impacts on salmon and smelt are not consistent with the analyses contained in the EIR. As shown

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
		in this chapter, significant impacts on aquatic species would be less than significant with mitigation.
720-1	I am submitting 30 Letters from objectors to the draft EIR. They are being scanned Please review.	This is a description of the comment letters provided, it is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. The comment letters submitted have been responded to in Volume 2, Chapter 4, Response to Comments Tables. Please refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms, to locate the letter numbers of comments provided by other entities that are of interest.
723-1	I have been out of the country for holiday, just returning home. Unfortunately my mail from that time is deleted. Is there some reason it took 3 months to figure out there was a problem with the server, and subsequent quarantine?	This is correspondence with DWR regarding the receipt of the comment. It is not a comment on the contents of the EIR. DWR has reviewed all comments and will consider all comments in its decision-making process.
723-2	Thank you very much for getting back to me. If it counts, no tunnels as it REALLY would take Sacramento fresh water needed to keep the salt incursion at Antioch, and there are already 3 pumps on Old River.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered but eliminated. The EIR evaluates environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures regarding multiple environmental resources in the Delta, including water quality. As described in Chapter 9, Water Quality, the potential impacts analyzed would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. This includes impacts on salinity in the Delta.
723-3	Money should be spent for more reservoirs in Southern CA so they quit sucking our water. They truly have no idea where their water comes from. Use $$ to reinforce the levees on an ongoing and permanent basis.	Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives and Common Response 3, Alternatives Development and Description, regarding the alternatives screening process and the range and scope of alternatives considered but eliminated, including fixing levees. Please also refer to Common Response 8, Relationship to Other Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs, regarding DWRs levee management efforts in the Delta.

Letter-Comment Number	Comment	Response
724-1	Another major concern is cost or project overuns and who will be responsible i.e. Bay Bridge Times over budget. This could quickly escalate to a $60B-$100B project. Thank you!	Please see Common Response 7, Implementation Considerations, regarding comments related to project costs and funding.