

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1	1	A century and more of planning and wise use of a resource is threatened to help fish that had NO summer flows before dams were built. Your plan doesn't make sense.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
2	1	<p>I want to thank you all for your visits last month to the Northern San Joaquin Valley. Over 2,000 Valley residents had an opportunity to express their strong opposition to Bay-Delta Plan SED recommended by your staff and consultants. Their testimony was in addition to the thousands who already had signed petitions and sent you letters opposing this plan.</p> <p>Madam Chair, on a number of occasions during these hearings, you expressed frustration that there had been such a "disconnect" between those who wrote the proposal and those who are most impacted by it. The people in Merced, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin counties share that frustration, in no small part, because your office and staff have refused to meet to discuss the basic assumptions and facts which shaped the report before you today. In fact, your staff refused to even provide responses to the comments received on the 2012 version of this report. We were told responses would be incorporated into this newest version. Upon review, we have found that this latest version fails to directly address the most pressing issues raised by the impacted communities.</p> <p>Many of us counseled that the release of this new report was a mistake. We believed such action would poison efforts to reach a settlement, because the draft report would likely dismiss the many legitimate concerns that has previously been expressed. Any updated report should have established a set of basic facts to serve as a foundation for further discussion.</p> <p>Once the report was released in September, our worst suspicions were confirmed. The update is full of misinformation, is not realistic, does not reflect current circumstances, and, in the words of your own staff, is significantly flawed. As we advised, it has created enormous ill will and distrust in the adversely impacted communities.</p>	<p>The State Water Board used the best available science throughout the SED. A variety of data were obtained for the water quality planning process: quantitative data from peer-reviewed published literature on topics specific to the plan area; peer-reviewed published literature outside the plan area but on topics relevant to the proposed project; unpublished quantitative data from within the plan area and from outside of the plan area; qualitative data or personal communication with topical experts; and expert opinion if no other sources were available. Please see Master Response 1.1., General Comments regarding the adequacy of the public and stakeholder involvement process, comments received on the 2012 SED and basis for recirculation as well as responses to comment general comments received regarding the analysis contained dint the SED. Additional information regarding</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 1.1, for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.</p>
2	2	The report includes a chart that models the recommended alternative flows, which indicates an increase of 1,104 salmon. You later said that this was misinformation or misunderstood information. It would have been easy to discuss these numbers with the appropriate knowledgeable persons, but your staff and consultants chose not to do so. Nor have you or your staff published a correct number.	Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding SalSim, specifically for response to comments regarding the number of fish anticipated to be produced as a result of implementation of the plan amendments.
2	3	The report's treatment of groundwater is another striking example of poor analysis. It deliberately lowballs the economic impacts of the proposal on agriculture by claiming lost surface water would be made up by additional groundwater pumping, a solution seemingly at odds with SGMA which you and the rest of the Water Board also have a responsibility to implement. Such an action likely would not be allowed even before SGMA's implementation date.	<p>The SED was prepared based on the best available science consistent with the requirements of the certified regulatory planning process and in accordance with CEQA.</p> <p>The SED does not require or encourage increases in groundwater pumping as a response to reductions in surface water. The SED reflects the historical response of water users to increase groundwater pumping when surface water availability is reduced. The State Water Board acknowledges that it will be challenging, but implementation of the plan amendments does not conflict with SGMA; together they allow for true integrated planning of scarce water resources that does not trade impacts between surface and groundwater. It will be up to local entities to determine the precise actions that would be taken in response to the implementation of the plan amendments, with or without the future condition of SGMA. For further discussion on these issues, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.</p> <p>For responses to comments on potential economic impacts, please see Master Responses 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model and 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2	4	We know that the loss of surface water for recharge will directly threaten the quantity and quality of drinking water in Merced, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin counties. Your report dismissed drinking water concerns as significant and unavoidable and offers no legitimate solutions. Your refusal to make mitigation a part of your proposal sends exactly the wrong kind of message.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding the potential impacts of the plan amendment on service providers’ ability to provide safe and reliable water.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the State Water Board’s obligations under CEQA to mitigate for the significant environmental impacts identified throughout the SED.</p>
2	5	Your report should have recognized the serious water quality challenges the flows proposal poses to the city of Modesto, which has, for years, blended surface water with groundwater to provide safe drinking water for its residents and to Manteca, which fights salinity in their water with surface water from the Stanislaus River. Your report also should have reflected what the new flows would do to plans to bring surface water to the citizens of Turlock and Ceres, both of whom have serious groundwater challenges.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the general approach to analyses and the programmatic nature of the analyses contained in the SED, including the approach of the analyses as it relates to the WSE model.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding the potential impacts of the plan amendments on service providers’ ability to provide safe and reliable water.</p> <p>Chapter 13, Service Providers, provides a detailed discussion of the potential impacts of the plan amendments on water quality in the areas addressed by the commenter under Impact SP-2a. Chapter 13 also acknowledges that the potential impacts due to surface water reductions are considered within the general context of water supply agreements and contracts in Impact SP-1.</p> <p>Chapter 20, Economics, addresses potential economic effects of reduced surface water diversions on affected water districts and ratepayers within the plan area. South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Stockton East Water District, and Modesto Irrigation District were provided as examples (for the purpose of determining potential economic effects) of service providers in the plan area because they exhibit certain characteristics important to assessing potential economic effects because, among other things, they have agreements to either provide surface water to other water users or receive surface water. Further, Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, discusses water supply infrastructure planning.</p>
2	6	<p>You acknowledge the problem, but you don’t analyze the cost of remedial action or even if such remedial action is feasible.</p> <p>Nowhere is this disconnect more discernable than in the discussion of the implementation program, which contains carryover storage requirements in addition to new flow requirements. In dry years, this could amount to hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of additional water unavailable for beneficial uses. This element of the plan is even more ludicrous since any benefit to fish from this effort to manage the water temperature would immediately disappear once the fish reach the much warmer San Joaquin River.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding the LSJR flow program of implementation and carryover storage. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for a discussion of temperature benefits of the LSJR flow objectives to salmonids in the LSJR. Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding reservoir operations assumptions, including carryover storage. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.</p>
2	7	You heard in these hearings the financial impact on a myriad of essential services like health, education, and public safety. That should not have been new information and should have been incorporated into the update before the release. You heard from leaders what the impacts of water uncertainty will have on job creation, real estate, and investments. That too should have been part of your document.	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or the economic analysis, or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also see Master Response 1.1 for acknowledgment of the concerns of elected representatives and community members.</p> <p>Please also see Chapter 20, Economic Analyses, for information regarding potential fiscal effects on communities and Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, regarding water supply reliability.</p>
2	8	Pursuing this plan, which even its proponents say will not do much to help the salmon absent other policies, will bring economic devastation to an area where over one million Californians live. The plan offers no path to real solutions to the challenges it seeks to address.	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or the economic analysis, or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific justification for the plan amendments.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2	9	<p>I've made clear my support for the effort most recently expressed by the Governor for significant and meaningful settlement discussions between the parties on these important issues. Some of us in the Legislature have urged this course for the last four years. Once discussions did begin two years ago, they appeared to be one-sided, where the districts would make suggestions, but the state would be nonresponsive. As this was going on, your staff and consultants proceeded with the work to update the report you now have before you.</p> <p>There is strong and justified belief that you and your staff have not acted in good faith up to this point. The obligation to restore confidence that legitimate settlements can be reached through negotiations rests squarely on the State. Given the litany of new information provided to you during the recent public hearings, my recommendation is that you need to send this report back to your staff and your consultants with a directive to start over.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members, a discussion regarding the public outreach process for the plan amendments, a discussion on the substantial evidence standard as it pertains to the plan amendments and the SED, and for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.</p>
3	1	<p>Extend the comment period to 120 days (a 60-day extension). We believe the complexity of the issue, the magnitude of the impacts, and the absence of engagement with the local community on the plan requires more time for scrutiny and discussion.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public comment period and the public outreach process. Note that the public comment period was extended beyond the required 45-day period for a total duration of 6 months.</p>
3	2	<p>We believe all three rivers each require a board meeting in the largest city along the river. No one size fits all when it comes to rivers and watersheds, and the plan's impacts will vary by community. Merced, Modesto, and Stockton each deserve a hearing.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 3-1. Note that public hearings were held in Stockton (December 16, 2016), Merced (December 19, 2016), and Modesto (December 20, 2016).</p>
3	3	<p>We appreciate your board's willingness to immediately meet and engage with the impacted stakeholders in our area to discuss the assumptions, information basis, modeling, and conclusions that were contained in the recently released SED.</p> <p>As you know, our communities have been frustrated at the lack of communication and engagement with board staff and its consultants since the 2012 report was first issues. We believe local information exists that can help lead to a better informed report. To that end, we want to take you up on your offer of having local, meaningful discussions with us.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 3-1.</p>
3	4	<p>We want to have our local groundwater managers to have an opportunity to discuss with your groundwater staff and consultants the data, sources, modeling, and impacts your consultants and staff utilized when compiling the report, its assumptions, and conclusions. We believe local information can better inform your conclusions.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for discussions on the approach to the groundwater impact analysis and the reason why groundwater models were not used for the SED.</p> <p>For response to comments regarding the groundwater data used in the SED and the sources of those data, please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling.</p>
3	5	<p>We want the local drinking water managers and school officials to have the opportunity to discuss with your drinking water staff and consultants, and state's division of drinking water representative, the date, modeling, and impacts and sources you used in compiling the report and its conclusions. This is a significant problem for us, and must be addressed.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public review and outreach process for the Recirculated SED and plan amendments, regarding public outreach and technical workshops.</p>
3	6	<p>We want your economic impact staff and consultant to meet with appropriate irrigation district, city, county, and other local representatives to discuss the modeling and sources, assumptions and conclusions utilized in the 2106 report. We also would like to be sure this part of the report addresses the costs of mitigation of impacts.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also see Master Response 1.1 for a discussion of the public outreach process and mitigation measures identified in the SED.</p>
3	7	<p>Disadvantaged communities. As you know, this area is one of California's most economically challenged. We want to explore with your consultant and staff the assumptions, modeling and impacts that were utilized in this report to address this particularly difficult challenge, and if</p>	<p>Because the SED is a program-level document, the State Water Board was not required to model or assess impacts related to disadvantaged communities (DACs) differently from the rest of the plan area and did not have unique assumptions in regard to DACs. For the purposes of impact analysis in the SED, the plan area is divided into sub-areas depending on the natural or physical boundaries as appropriate to</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		your recommendations impact these communities in a disproportionate manner.	<p>the particular resource being assessed. For example, for groundwater resources, impacts are assessed for each groundwater subbasin underlying the plan area; for agricultural resources, impacts are assessed for each irrigation districts in the plan area; for service providers, the impact analysis, which included public water systems serving DACs, impacts are assessed for each sub-watershed underlying the plan area. Please refer to Appendices F.1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling and F.2, Evaluation of Historical Flow and Salinity Measurements of the Lower San Joaquin River and Southern Delta, for a detailed description of the models and related assumptions used to evaluate impacts. For further discussion regarding the requirements of CEQA as they pertain to a program-level analysis, please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.7, Disadvantaged Communities, for consideration of DACs in the SED, and the State Water Board’s technical and financial assistance programs for DACs.</p>
3	8	Agricultural impacts: Agriculture is our number one industry. It doesn’t exist without water. We want to discuss with your staff and consultants assumptions, information sources and conclusions.	Please see Master Response 3.5, Agricultural Resources, for discussion of impacts to agriculture. Please see Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, for discussion of the SWAP model and its assumptions. Also, please see Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources, and Appendix G, Agricultural Economic Effects of the Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results, for further discussion of the assumptions and results of the SED analysis of agricultural impacts.
3	9	Flows and Fisheries. We all share the goal of restoring fisheries. We want to have our local governments, irrigation districts, and their experts discuss with your staff and consultants the assumptions, information, sources and modeling that led to your conclusions. We want to have a clear understanding of how much benefit the proposal will have on the goal of improved fisheries and what other methods we can take to better accomplish those goals.	<p>The assumptions, information, sources and modeling relied upon for this project are documented throughout the SED and responses to comments. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the benefits to fish expected with implementation of the plan amendments.</p> <p>While other non-flow factors are important, the scientific evidence outlined in Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, indicates that the reductions in flow during the February through June time period is the limiting factor to salmonid populations in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers. Flow affects nearly all other habitat attributes including water temperature, water chemistry, and physical habitat complexity, and these habitat features in turn affect risk of disease, risk of predation, reproductive success, growth, smoltification, migration, feeding behavior, and other physiological, behavioral, and ecological factors that determine the viability of native fish. Significant improvements in the underlying habitat conditions are needed to protect anadromous fishes in this watershed, and these are largely driven by flow and its effect on other habitat attributes.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-flow Measures, regarding the relationship of non-flow measures to the plan amendments.</p>
3	10	Mitigation: your report suggests many methods of mitigation, including fallowing hundreds of thousands of acres of land, conservation, recharging the basins, use of reclaimed water, etc. We want to know if your economic assessment includes these cost figures and the sources of this revenue. Your experts would meet with our city and county economic planners and analysts on this subject.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding a discussion of the definition of a mitigation measures and the mitigation measures proposed throughout the SED. Please see Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, regarding the approach to the economic analysis and the regulatory context for considering economics. Please see Appendix G, Agricultural Economic Effects of the Lower An Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results, and Master Responses 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model and 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, for a discussion of the potential local and regional economic effects associated with changes to agricultural production. Please see Chapters 20, Economic

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Analyses and Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions, for a discussion of the cost(s) of various indirect actions entities could take, including developing recycled water, and Chapter 16, Section 16.5, Sources of Funding, for a discussion of financial assistance programs designed to assist agencies with water quality projects (see also Master Response 2.7, Disadvantaged Communities, for a discussion of sources of funding and assistance).
5	1	I am writing to urge you to dedicate more of the flow in our Central Valley rivers to the maintenance and improvement of the environment. For almost 5 decades I have enjoyed recreating on many of the rivers that drain the Sierra Nevada and Coast ranges, often kayaking these rivers in the Fall and Winter to watch the salmon running. I did this last week on the America River in Sacramento. Although I can't quantify it, there has been a huge decrease in the number of salmon I see on these trips. My anecdotal observations have been quantified by scientist at UC Davis and other institutions. We need to take steps to improve the environment experienced by salmon and other native species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
5	2	It is my understanding that the Board is considering reducing the fraction of flow that must remain in the stream channel and increasing the fraction that is diverted in spite of expert opinions that more and colder water must be allowed to remain instream and ultimately flow into the Delta. This continues a direction in which we have been moving for at least my 5 decades in California. Ultimately this course will lead to the complete elimination of instream flow, something that has already happened in some Central Valley streams. Please heed the advice of fisheries experts and move to increase, rather than decrease, the instream flows reaching the Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
6	1	Steve Knell of the Oakdale Irrigation District is a great caretaker for OID and its customers, many of which are peach growers that not only provide jobs on the farm but for thousands of people in the processing plants (our customers) and the 50 employees in our local company. FishBio counts every salmon, many of which are all non-native to the Stanislaus River. And the pulse flows waste valuable water and don't push the saltwater from ingress throughout the Delta. Smelt are also non-native to the Delta. Food grows where water flows and trust me, we don't want our fruit to come from China but that is where we are headed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
7	1	Higher flows on the Stanislaus River and the others will destroy agriculture in our area.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
7	2	This water grab is a non-proven attempted solution to help salmon. How about addressing some of the proven issues, such as reducing predation?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
8	1	Owens Valley, the removal of the water in one area to benefit another area. The proposal by the Water Board for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers is Owens Valley on steroids with the destruction of a vibrant agricultural & metropolitan area. We have seen the effect of reduction of water on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Lost jobs, farms out of business, loss of business that served the farms and workers. Owens Valley was the destruction of an agricultural area to supply water to Los Angeles. This proposal is the same. Ship Sacramento River water to Los Angeles and use the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers to flush the Delta and San Francisco Bay with the destruction of the aquifers in the area caused by unsustainable pumping to supply water to farms and cities.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
8	2	All the citizens in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River areas will be negatively affected. Owens Valley all over again. The Water Board has no moral or legal basis for the taking of the	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water. Owens Valley is the classic example of the destruction of aquifers and habitat driven by the greed for water.	
9	1	<p>Destruction of multiple counties in the northern San Joaquin Valley is the end result of your proposal to require 40% (range of 30-50%) unimpeded from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers. There is no justifiable basis for this proposed action. It is being driven by monetary and political interests in Southern California desperate for more water.</p> <p>You cannot in good conscience approve this proposed action. The final projects in the California Water Project were never built out due to efforts from environmental groups with limited interest in the welfare of California residents. This crippled the ability to store and distribute water in California. Trying to solve the lack of water by destroying agricultural communities is EVIL.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
10	1	I am against your plan to increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River. We need to save our agricultural economy, locally.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
12	1	I believe we must protect salmon and other aquatic species which rely on the natural flow of water from the mountains. I support the Water Board's river flow proposal. The Clean Water Act mandates water quality to ensure the survival of threatened salmon, and maintain cold water temperatures essential for aquatic species. A 40% flow of natural is the minimum to meet that obligation. Biologists recommend at least 60% so the 40% figure is already a major concession.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
12	2	Farmers should practice less resource-intensive methods of agriculture that are sustainable for our region. To deal with water shortages, we should promote policies to support investment in rainwater collection systems, similar to the program which provides rebates to homeowners for cutting down trees infested by bark beetles.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
13	1	The trade-offs and unintended consequences of this water grab just don't make sense. The depletion of our water rights will decimate an agricultural industry that is solely reliant on the water from the Sierra runoff. The total economic impact of this regulation will reach far beyond the fields of this productive valley. Farmers are the economic engine of the Central Valley. Almost every job in this valley can be traced back in some way to the farm economy. I'm sure you understand how taking the only major industry out of our area will impact the entire Central Valley economy. In order to grow the fruits and vegetables, farmers need a consistent, reliable source of water. Trees and vines don't live on water one year then no water the next. The exodus of our economic engine will leave a wasteland of economic despair in an already economically deprived area. I am sure you understand the way this works: if farm income is gone, farmers don't spend the farm money in town; when the town jobs are gone the productive people move away; the people who cannot move stay in poverty.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
13	2	I understand having a salmon run back would be nice and replacing the Delta water that is being stolen to give to Southern California would be good, but at what price? I understand economics and have a reasonable grasp of our local water situation. I understand that every drop of water that falls in the Sierras at some point works its way down to the Delta. We live in a bowl after all. The only water that escapes the system is the water that we pump out of our valley to Southern California. This is clearly the problem. I believe that the recommendations of the TID and MID to improve salmon population need to be fully explored before draconian	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>water restrictions are imposed.</p> <p>Is this water grab the best way to solve California's water problems or just the easiest? Is it easier to decimate the Central Valley or fund the infrastructure improvements that are necessary to store and deliver more water to all users? Is it easier to destroy the economy of the Central Valley because we are the poorest area of California, with a relatively weak political voice or would it be better to let Southern California solve its own water problems?</p>	
13	3	<p>I would ask you to please come to our area, not just drive by, but arrange to talk to local farmers and see we are excellent stewards of our land. Spend some time here get to know our local people--both farmers and all those dependent on industries and jobs that will be impacted. We are worth saving, too.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
15	1	<p>Please stop sending water to the desert in southern and central California until the rivers, their fish and users are accounted for. If those farmers need water on drought years (they don't) then they should be building storage and providing desalination plants for coastal desert communities.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
16	1	<p>The Clean Water Act and other EPA regulations require the state to protect our waterways from pollution and require the state to protect the environment from unnecessary harm due to human activities. Accordingly, the state of California is obliged to prioritize the health of our waterways and other aspects of the environment above all other non-essential uses of water (e.g., landscape maintenance).</p> <p>Scientific evidence overwhelmingly suggests that the current flow rate plans for the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers are insufficient to promote the rejuvenation of the health of those primary waterways, the tributaries of those waterways, and the vast ecosystems that depend on those waterways. Given that the San Francisco Bay-Delta plan for water use and distribution has not been updated in over twenty years, it is long past time to bring those plans up to date. Accordingly, I strongly encourage the SWRCB to follow the wealth of scientific evidence on the matter. The evidence clearly shows that the flow rates of 30-50% of the natural flow of the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers proposed by the SWRCB are insufficient to support the rejuvenation of those ecosystems. The evidence strongly suggests that a minimum of 50-60% of the natural flow of those rivers is required to support the rejuvenation of healthy ecosystems.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that generally support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative and for information regarding the authorities of the State Water Board. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for a description of the water quality control planning process. Please see Chapter 3, Alternatives Description, for the purpose of the plan amendments and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for the scientific justification of the plan amendments.</p>
16	2	<p>California and its citizens are in a position to lead the United States and the world in prioritizing the protection of our natural resources, such that future generations will be able to prosper within a healthy and balanced ecosystem. I strongly encourage the SWRCB to follow the scientific evidence regarding this matter, and to follow the wishes of the vast majority of citizens of California, by setting the proposed flow rates of the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers to a minimum of 50-60% of natural flow.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that generally support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific justification for the plan amendments.</p>
17	1	<p>People rely on the water in and around our area. My house gets water directly from our lake (Tulloch) along with all of our neighbors. Increasing flows on the Stanislaus River would ultimately lower our lake to the point where we would not be able to get water to our houses, rendering them useless. This would impact hundreds of lives. I think people's lives and their livelihood should be considered before anything else.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
18	1	<p>I am opposed to your proposal to increase river flows because the agribusiness in our river basin will be greatly harmed by the loss of this amount of water. These are livelihoods that are</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		at stake. We have been hit hard by the drought...don't take the river water from agriculture as well.	general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
19	1	I am definitely opposed to your plan to raise unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. The water is desperately needed right here. We feed most of this country. Agriculture requires great amounts of water and we've been in a severe drought for several years. A year ago, there were people in my area who had their wells go dry! We barely have enough water to meet our own needs. We definitely do not have enough to send elsewhere! Don't forget, less water translates to higher costs for farmers, which trickles down to higher cost to put food on the dinner table. This affects the whole nation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
20	1	I am opposed to the increased amounts of water to be taken from our rivers to flow to the Delta. This will cause more groundwater use and deplete the aquifers, causing the ground to settle, our water tables to lower and affect our drinking water - if there will be any left to drink. How are we supposed to replenish our groundwater if such a huge amount is sent to the Delta. All of the river water did not used to go to the Delta. It used to sink into the ground and refill the aquifers. This is no longer the case.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
20	2	Why should we be made to give up water so that water from north of the Delta can be sent south? Why should we be giving up our water so that farm operations south of us and Southern California water districts take our water? Why do they have rights to our water? Water from the Sacramento River can flow to the Delta just as easily. Why is this not happening? Sacramento River water should be flushing out the Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
21	1	Please do not send any more of our precious fresh water into the ocean! We did not spend millions of dollars in dams to do that. It is needed for drought years as we Californians are all very much aware.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
22	1	I have looked over the phase plan for the water flow proposal. In the 2012 environmental docs it was suggested the flow be 50-60. Please consider this as our states' ecosystem and native fish, including our salmon, are in jeopardy. Please reconsider for a hier [sic] plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
23	1	What do you think you're doing? The human race can't live without water. With the drought California has had why do you want to throw it away? Have you no common sense?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
24	1	Your proposal to increase unimpaired flow is a gross and wasteful use of water needed to support our lives!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
25	1	<p>There are now twice as many people in the state as when I moved here [in 1975] and they all want lots of water and are putting their straws in the flow anywhere and everywhere they can.</p> <p>The effects on commerce and wildlife are immense. Ten years ago someone told me that when they built the C&H Sugar Company plant in Crockett, the water was fresh enough to take right out of the river; now it is too brackish as all those straws keep sucking away upstream.</p> <p>I believe the flow objectives for the San Joaquin River and its tributaries should be 60% of unimpaired. I lived on less than a gallon of water a day for a year in my RV (except for showers and clothes-washing) while on assignment in Arizona. All it requires is a will.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
26	1	Pittsburg lies right on the delta and the delta serves many important roles in the lives of our residents. Increasingly, new businesses are seeking to combine their business interests with	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the beauty and health of the delta—and no, they don't intend to drain it. If these are some businesses and livelihoods that can be affected in Pittsburg, I can only imagine how other delta communities downstream will be affected. These communities depend on the freshwater nature of water even more so.	general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
27	1	<p>I am writing to ask you to protect our Delta water quality and restore water to the Delta. I ask for a permanent reduction of water exports.</p> <p>The Delta is also an essential overwintering ground for many of our migratory bird species, for fisheries, and its health needs to be protected. These species healthy population need to be included in plans while Big Agriculture does not need to be protected. More than enough water has already been diverted.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
27	2	I am concerned about projected increases in salinity, algal blooms, pesticides, and methyl mercury, and ask that water quality be evaluated and improved as opposed to worsened. Both for wildlife, the health of the estuary, and the health of the communities using this water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
28	1	I oppose the State Water Board's proposal to unjustifiably increase unimpaired flows on the Tuolumne River because such an increase will have potentially irreversible negative effects upon surface water supply availability, groundwater sustainability, jobs, labor income, tax base and the greater socioeconomic backbone of the regions served by MID and TID.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
28	2	I implore State Water Board staff and board members to give greater consideration to the benefits of non-flow measures before considering this unfounded and misguided flow-first proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
29	1	Please give every consideration to the science behind the request to make the flow 50%-60% in order to protect the eco-system of the Delta and to protect and preserve the Salmon population in those waters.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
29	2	Once the Bay-Delta water flow has been changed to cause damaged, the recovery of the Salmon and the general health of the eco-system would take much more time to effect any recovery. Don't make this mistake. Make a decision that will be the most beneficial over time.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
30	1	Listen to the science and set flows at the 50-60% level required to fully save salmon and protect the ecosystem!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
31	1	In updating San Joaquin flow standards, water exports from the Delta must be addressed. Water exports are unsustainable and this must change in order to meet Delta water quality and quantity goals. The San Joaquin needs to reach Chipps Island if we are going to protect the estuary. Water flows must be sufficient to restore and protect fisheries and restore/protect the health of the Bay-Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
31	2	Water quality standards must be maintained for agriculture, drinking water and fisheries, as well as groundwater recharge and municipal discharge. Salinity standards in the south Delta must not be weakened.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
31	3	Our State's Bay-Delta is an extremely valuable natural resource that deserves protection. A thoughtful, science-driven update of inadequate water quality standards will advance that objective.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
32	1	<p>Our organizations write to request that the State Water Resources Control Board extend the comment period on the above referenced revision to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and its Recirculated Draft Substitute Environmental Document. Currently, the Board’s notice states that submission of written comments must be received by the Board no later than 12:00 noon on November 15, 2016.</p> <p>We request an additional 76 days to review and comment on these documents. Their issuance comes at a time when many organizations like our own are also engaged in either monitoring or actively participating in hearings concerning the change petition on the proposed California WaterFix project. As important, the Board’s revised amendment and recirculated Draft SED contains significant new information that our organizations will need additional time to review and consider before commenting. This new information includes the Board’s new considerations of economics, drought factors, other flow and non-flow actions, management options, and several hundred pages of modeling methodology and results.</p> <p>In 2012, the initial environmental review on the Phase 1 amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan provided for a comment period of December 31, 2012, through March 5, 2013, a total of 64 days for review. Upon request, the Board provided an extension of that comment period to March 29, 2013, for a total of 88 days for review. The documents released at that time contained just 2,100 pages. The Board has expanded the scope and size of these documents to nearly 3,600 pages, a 71 percent increase over the size of the 2012 documents. This year, the Board provides just 61 days for reviewing a larger set of documents. Further, release of these documents coincides with our groups’ participation as protestant parties in the California WaterFix change petition proceeding before the State Water Board. An additional 76 days in which to comment would be proportionate to the size of the documents now at hand and fair to all parties. We ask that the comment period for the above referenced documents close on January 30, 2016.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process. . Note that the public comment period was extended beyond the required 45-day period for a total duration of 6 months.</p>
33	1	<p>Water to irrigate new orchards is being pumped from aquifers at an alarming rate. There are better ways to protect fish than increased river flow. Use science to find the answers. Water will be our most valuable commodity in the years to come. Don't just flush it away.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
34	1	<p>We appreciate that the State Water Resources Control Board recognizes that California’s water is a shared resource, and that the board’s challenge is to ensure that the resource is equitably shared among all members of the community. We know this is a hard decision for the board to make, but we agree with your plan to require 30-40% of unimpaired flow in the lower San Joaquin River and its tributaries -- the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced -- between February and June. We recognize, however, that some compromises must be made to accommodate different sectors of the community.</p> <p>May we suggest that you consider a flow increase of 5% more than the 20% that is the current rate? That isn’t much, but it may satisfy all parties to some degree—not only farmers and municipal water consumers, but also environmentalists, conservationists, and recreational businesses. This benefit may also extend to the salmon, not to mention the rivers as healthy ecosystems that harbor so much wildlife, instead of little more than managed irrigation channels. Whatever decision you choose, we hope for some increase in water flow to these rivers, which flow through our service areas of Stanislaus and Merced Counties.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that generally support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative and for information regarding consideration of the beneficial uses.</p>
35	1	<p>The plan for taking more water and shipping it down south, while supposedly helping salmon, has been based on faulty science. Here’s what I believe you should think about. Before the dams were built in the Sierra Nevada Mountains to control the rivers, my grandfather needed</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>a boat to get from Ripon (where he lived) to Salida. As I have often explained to my junior high students, the rivers they see year-round as they travel from place to place in the valley are not natural occurrences. The fact that they basically look the same all year was not the way it was before the dams. Now think about this: Before the dams, when the snow melted in the Sierras as it warmed in the spring, the rivers flooded their banks. Many parts of the valley were akin to swamps. Then as the snow disappeared during the summer, less and less water flowed down into the valley's rivers. By the time autumn rolled around, those rivers were small, shallow, warm streams. And during the fall, millions upon millions of salmon came up those rivers to spawn. My father says that as kids, the salmon were so prolific that were one able to do so, one could walk across the river on the backs of salmon. So why is it that you are being fed a line about salmon needing huge amounts of cold water in order to come up river in the fall to spawn?</p> <p>Last year, we decided to see what the Salmon Festival was all about in Knights Ferry. I noticed a ranger along the bank of the Stanislaus River in his uniform teaching residents about the salmon. When he had a moment alone, I posed this question to him. Why did millions of salmon come up the warm shallow streams in the fall in the past, and now we're told they need massive amounts of deep cold water to do so. His response? "That's what we'd like to know. We have been trying to explain that to the feds for years, and they simply won't listen. Science doesn't support what they are forcing us to do."</p>	
35	2	<p>So it would seem that big money in Southern California, along with support in high places, has no interest in the salmon. This is a water grab, pure and simple. Farmers in this valley poured blood, sweat and tears into creating irrigation systems, including the dams. Those residents of this state who are in the direct path or alongside the rivers should have the rights to those rivers. If parts of the south do not have that water because they are not in the path or alongside rivers, they should be part of a desalination plan. Even Saudi Arabia desalinates most of their water, and it's solar-powered! Would it be expensive? Yes, but losing billions of dollars in agricultural profits, jobs, etc. is also extremely expensive. Stanislaus County alone would lose billions of dollars. The numbers you have been given about monetary losses by the agricultural communities is not accurate. Those pushing this idea of taking more river water don't want you to know the true costs to the valley.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
35	3	<p>It would do you well, if you honestly want to do the right thing, instead of bowing to pressure from the southern part of this state, to really look at the scientific research that has been done at great cost by the irrigation districts and by people who have studied this for years. California's groundwater is at stake. As the only state in the Union to not regulate groundwater (idiotic), we cannot afford to take more water from the rivers. This will force farmers and cities to have to pull more from the aquifers, and subsidence will be the result. The southwestern part of the state near Fresno has already seen what that can do. So they scream for more water from the north. They should be thankful for the Delta Mendota built when I was a kid. But they have overfarmed and overbuilt for the amount of water they have had. When does it stop?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
35	5	<p>Stop pretending this is about fish. We know better. Big money equates to big power. Are you strong enough and ethical enough to do what's right? That seems to be the question. Surprise us by doing the right thing. No more water shipped south. No more water to the Delta under the false guise of helping fish that don't need cold or deep water. And no more talk about forty-foot diameter tunnels under the Delta so that the Sacramento River can be shipped south. Hopefully you do know that the Sacramento River carries more salmon than all the</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>other rivers. So tell us again how this is about salmon. Get rid of predatory fish. Sports fishermen throughout our family will tell you there are other fish in the waters that don't swallow whole salmon fry the way the big mouth bass do.</p>	
35	6	<p>As much as I have supported Governor Brown, having voted for him each time, I am disheartened to the point of anger to see him bend to his buddies in the south. Listen to the honest science. Do the right thing. Leave the rivers alone. Desalinate along the coast of California in half a dozen strategic spots, and show the rest of the world we are truly leaders.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
36	1	<p>Many property owners along the Stanislaus River are now having to re-drill or drill new wells due to lowering water level in the area aquifer. This is due to pumping for new orchards being planted in the Oakdale, Knights Ferry area. As I live in this area how is your plan of going to help mitigated the over drafting of the water table? How are increased flows going to replenish water aquifers?</p> <p>How are increased water flows going mitigate or replenish any aquifers fed the rivers (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced) within plan?</p>	<p>As noted in the comment, overdraft of groundwater basins in the plan area is a legacy issue resulting from long-term overpumping to sustain agriculture. The plan amendments are not designed to replenish groundwater aquifers, but to protect fish and wildlife. SGMA is intended to address groundwater overdraft in high- and medium-priority groundwater basins. For further discussion on groundwater overdraft as a legacy issue, and SGMA compliance in the context of plan amendments, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.</p>
36	2	<p>I cannot locate or find an environmental impact study within your plan for increased flows. Have you done one, if not why not? If any environmental impact study exists will it address my and all others concerns? If not I be-leave it to be dreamed necessary for such a radical change in water flows on the three rivers.</p>	<p>The Executive Summary, Chapters 1 through 18, and the various appendices that support those chapters make up the Substitute Environmental Document (SED), which is the certified regulatory equivalent of the an environmental impact report that is required by the regulations that govern the preparation and approval of changes to water quality control plans under the jurisdiction of the State Water Board.</p>
36	3	<p>I noticed the headwaters of the San Joaquin River is not part of your cited plan of increased flows, why not?</p> <p>I noticed that all tributaries in the San Joaquin River system were not include within your plan other than three for cited rivers, why? Nor were tributaries into the three cited rivers not include within your plan, why are you excluding? Again no environmental impact study addressing the total river and the Delta as a whole, why not?</p>	<p>As discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 3, Alternatives Description, and Volume 2, Appendix K, Revised Water Quality Control Plan, the Upper San Joaquin River is undergoing flow setting under a separate process. The flows that occur under that separate process would be expected to contribute to the overall health of the Lower San Joaquin River and the flows entering the southern Delta at Vernalis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for a discussion of the approach to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan updates and the inclusion of the Delta as a whole, and other tributaries, in the comprehensive update. The plan amendments are based on a percent of unimpaired flow from the three eastside tributaries (i.e., Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced). The percent of unimpaired flow is defined as: the water production of a river basin, unaltered by upstream diversions, storage, or by export or import of water to or from other watersheds. It differs from natural flow because unimpaired flow is the flow that occurs at a specific location under the current configuration of channels, levees, floodplains, wetlands, deforestation, and urbanization. As such, it would include the flow from the tributaries above the rim dams.</p>
36	4	<p>How or what environmental impact study did you use to determine the water flows on each river and or tributary as planned in your proposal?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>In addition, the scientific basis report for the plan amendments, which is included in the SED in Volume 2, Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, provides the basis for determining the use of a percent of unimpaired flow as part of the plan amendments, which was evaluated in the SED. In addition, in Volume 1, Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30 document the expected benefits for different percent of unimpaired flows evaluated in the SED. State Water Board staff are proposing in their amendments a percent of unimpaired flow that is consistent with information contained in both Appendix C and Chapter 19.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
36	5	I see nothing within the plan that accounts or address the twin tunnel project proposal by the Governor of California, as you are also a state body why have not included this in your proposal?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information related to the California WaterFix.
36	6	I see nothing that address no-native species within the 3 rivers in your plan let alone any of the rivers within California, as a concerned environment body why is this so?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments in the Ecological Approach and Restoration Actions section regarding non-native species, Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for information regarding incorporation of other species in implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, section on Other Stressors for further discussion of non-native species relative to predation.
36	7	<p>If mitigation of environmental concerns for the survival of native salmon is the goal, your plan chooses not to consider other way of restoration of species, why?</p> <p>-Fish ladders on all dams or other means for salmon to have access to the headwaters or traditional spawning areas.</p> <p>-Fish hatcheries on all rivers within your plan in order to preserve each river’s natural native sub-species of salmon. Right now this is not happening as salmon fry are trucked between river systems.</p>	<p>Non-flow measures are considered in Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions, Section 16.3, Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives – Non-Flow Measures. These non-flow measures would inform the body of scientific literature and understanding regarding special-status fish species and the stressors and mechanisms that have contributed to their decline on the three tributaries and in the southern Delta.</p> <p>For responses to comments regarding the need for flow in protecting fish and wildlife, please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection. For further discussion on consideration of non-flow measures in the plan amendments, please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures.</p>
36	8	Why is the water drafted by the city and county of San Francisco (Hetch Hetchy) on the Stanislaus River basin not part of your plan?	The plan amendments would include a narrative objective to be implemented through a percent of unimpaired flow, which could be adaptively implemented, as described in Chapter 3, Alternatives Description, and Appendix K. The percent of unimpaired flow and the adaptive implementation would be applied to each tributary, including the Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers downstream of the rim dams (New Melones and New Don Pedro). Depending on the percent of unimpaired flow and the adaptive implementation on the Tuolumne River and Stanislaus River water users in the extended plan area (upstream of the rim dams, including the water supply for the City and County of San Francisco) could be affected as described in Chapter 5, Surface Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 5.4.2, Methods and Approach, Extended Plan Area, as well as in Chapter 13, Service Providers. The State Water Board did consider potential effects the plan amendments might have on the City of County of San Francisco. Detailed discussion of those impacts can be found in Appendix L, City and County of San Francisco Analyses, and Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System.
36	9	Why as a board do you chose not to consider existing water rights, many of which are over 100 years old?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, and Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for responses to comments regarding the water rights system.
36	10	<p>Why as a board do you chose to not consider the federal licenses granted to each agency operating the dams on the rivers?</p> <p>The federal license to operate the dams and the water rights in each river basin dictate total water flow within each river system. Not a non-elected board such as your self’s, how do you as a body justify your actions and purposed plans? Especially seeing as no environmental impact study has ever been done for your plan.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, section State Water Board Authorities, regarding Water Board actions and authorities. Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, section Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Process, regarding federal licenses. Additionally, the SED Executive Summary, section ES2 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), describes that an SED is the appropriate environmental impact document for the water quality control planning process and fulfills the requirements of CEQA.
37	1	I strongly oppose your proposal to take 40% of the unimpeded flow from our rivers which TID and MID have historical rights to for over 100 years. This action will not only devastate our region but the impact will be felt worldwide. I know you have a dislike for farmers but this will impact all the residents of the region as well as the San Francisco region forever. The drinking water for all will be depleted, the groundwater saltier and depleted as well as less electricity produced by Don Pedro resulting in more expensive power for all the residents. This is not to	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>mention the economic disaster that will result from an almost complete dependence on agriculture economically in the region. There will be much less food production for the world from the most agriculturally productive region in the world.</p>	
37	2	<p>This is a political and misguided decision that your staffers cannot adequately defend. It only considers the interests of a few special groups. And of course, the voters from Southern California. It is unwise and not based on scientific facts. Why can't you consider some other options to the problem you have created? I know this proposal is mainly to steal more of our water to give to Southern California.</p> <p>I have a suggestion. Why don't you urge and even mandate that Los Angeles conserve their water like the rest of us in the state have done – maybe they will have enough water so you do not need to steal ours to give to them?</p> <p>I might just add that this is just another bad government decision of many lately that just makes our country rely on foreign products that we need, making us more and more vulnerable to the whims of countries, many of which do not like us.</p> <p>Please reconsider and do what is obviously right and not what is politically expedient!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
38	1	<p>I am asking you to apply the science to saving the salmon and the striped bass. Future efforts to save salmon will be naught as depletion will be too far gone. You can't resuscitate a neat dead or brain dead item! I'm asking you to ignore the politics of this issue and vote for the salmon. Please find a solution to saving these the two "Fs," farming and fishing. Smart folks are on the board for a reason. It will require real intelligence to sift through the pseudo facts and develop a reality-based solution!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
39	1	<p>Our family has been farming in the Central San Joaquin Valley for seven generations, and plan on continuing to provide food and fiber to support our United States along with foreign sales to people around the world. Our water is essential to provide this food and fiber. Our family farms on the old Crocker Huffman ranches that started the Merced Irrigation District.</p> <p>Putting family farms, employees throughout the world and our California Economy out of work due to water is not an option. [FOOTNOTE #1 - Newspaper article hyperlink- "The LA Times ranks California as the Eighth World Economy" - http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-california-world-economy-20150702-story.html]</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
40	1	<p>I am writing to strongly support the flow objectives proposed by the Board for the following reasons:</p> <p>-San Francisco Bay is the outermost edge of the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas. The mixing of freshwaters from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers along with our local rivers and streams creates a place of rich biological abundance. But this abundance is under siege through the slow starvation of its fresh water flow.</p> <p>-The state's complex system of water movement and use has left the San Francisco Bay a starved estuary--with nearly 50% of the freshwater that it would otherwise receive being taken out of the system. A new report by the Bay Institute shines a bright light on what State Board scientists and others have been saying for years; critical fresh water flows into San Francisco Bay have been drastically reduced, threatening the survival of fish and wildlife, degrading</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding general support or opposition to the plan amendments. Please refer to Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection for additional information regarding the evidence that demonstrates that increased and more variable flow is the foundation for survival for fish.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water quality, and shrinking our beaches and marshlands.	
40	2	In June, the people of the Bay Area made a remarkable decision to restore the wetlands that ring our amazing bay. The passage of Measure AA and the \$500 million it will bring over the next 20 years will allow us to move faster to create and restore our marshes and creek mouths. This important work will help protect our bay-side communities against sea level rise while creating new places for our fish and wildlife to thrive. But without attention to the critical issue of freshwater flows, the hard work of bay lands restoration will be jeopardized and \$500 million in investment threatened.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
40	3	<p>The time is now to address our freshwater flow crisis. The State Water Board’s proposal for a small increase in the annual freshwater contribution from the streams on the San Joaquin River tributaries is a critical first step needed to begin to address this ecological issue. As I watch this process unfold, I am deeply concerned that this proposed small step is being bitterly opposed by numerous water users. The stark fact is that every stream and river in California is over-appropriated with cascading paper water rights. There will never be enough water to satisfy the demands of all those clamoring to take more out of waterways of the state. By law, the Water Board must balance the competing demands of the state’s water users, but it is the only the Board that can act on the needs of the silent; the native fish and wildlife who will not survive as species without the intervention, now, of this Board.</p> <p>I urge the Board to approve the proposed flow objectives and to move ahead with Phase II and III of the work to save our freshwater-starved estuary.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Responses, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
41	1	I oppose your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers because the economic impact to the valley could be more than \$8.5 billion annually.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
41	2	The plan could divert more than 300,000 acre-feet of water away from agriculture. Farmers will have no choice but to pump more groundwater to keep crops alive. That would happen at the same time the state is directing counties to enact sweeping policies to sustainably manage critical groundwater supplies.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
41	3	There is no scientific research that more water equals more fish. Please stop the plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
42	1	The SED update is full of misinformation, is not realistic, does not reflect current circumstances, and, in the words of the Board's own staff, is significantly flawed. In my comments in Sacramento and in my letter, I urged the Water Board to start over.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
43	1	<p>Are we to lose the salmon and river-dependent species over people's refusal to conserve?</p> <p>Water is too expensive! People don’t value that which is (almost) free. I pay only 50 cents daily for water. (80% of my bill is not for actual water use, but the cost of running the district.) I scoop up my shower rinse water, replaced my lawn with drought-tolerant natives and installed a low-flow toilet not to save money, but to save those species. There are many water conservation measures which have not been mandated.</p> <p>I urge the Board to ensure adequate river flows so salmon and other species can recover. Presiding over the continued demise of our natural heritage because people don’t want to adapt would be no accomplishment. Heed the scientists who advice that most of the river</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water must flow naturally. That's not wasted water!	
44	1	If approved, I envision the irony of having to pass emergency authorization of desalinization plants in the Delta because of the unforeseen or ignored consequence from reducing water flow. Please ensure sufficient flow to prevent saltwater from encroaching [on] the estuary!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
45	1	<p>In these times of perceived "post drought" water availability, it seems foolhardy at best to squander what small amount of water we have been able to save. We are not, by any measure, out of the drought cycle. One marginally good year does not signal an end to water shortages. The major urban areas are becoming more demanding of our Northern California resources as time goes by and populations rise.</p> <p>Please take a break from depleting our water storage until we can fill the reservoirs on a more predictable basis.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
46	1	I oppose the State Water Board's proposal to unjustifiably increase unimpaired flows on the Tuolumne River because such an increase will have potentially irreversible negative effects upon surface water supply availability, groundwater sustainability, jobs, labor incomes, tax base and the greater socioeconomic backbone to the regions served by MID and TID.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
46	2	<p>I implore the State Water Board staff and board members to give greater consideration to the benefits of non-flow measures before considering this unfounded and misguided flow-first proposal.</p> <p>As an avid fisherman who fishes the Tuolumne, I feel I must put the interests of my fellow citizens above those of my own parochial interests. There are alternative, less deleterious ways to work towards the intended objectives, and these should be pursued instead.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
47	1	Your ill-advised plan to put more water in the Stanislaus River for fish would adversely affect recreation on Lake Tulloch and surrounding water areas. Please rethink your proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
48	1	<p>I am a farmer and agricultural researcher in Stanislaus County who also witnesses the devastating impact of predatory species on the Tuolumne River every year. In the summer months, I regularly fish the Tuolumne with my children. We put our kayaks in at the Fox Grove fishing access and exit under the railroad bridge along Santa Fe Road in Empire. When people ask us if we catch fish, I laugh and tell them that we catch so many large and small mouth bass that we get sick of catching fish. I would estimate that on average we catch 20-40 bass in an hour and a half of fishing.</p> <p>As someone who works in a research field, I always ask myself what food source sustains these bass. I also wondered why we never caught nor have seen any native fish in this section of the river. I now understand that these bass thrive by feeding on the native fish populations. Because this portion of the river is not accessible to foot traffic due to the private farms surrounding it, and because it is too shallow to safely navigate with a motorized boat, not many people know just how many bass are in this section of the river.</p> <p>I agree with FISHBIO President Doug Demko that salmon restoration makes no sense if their path to and from the sea is literally a death march into a wall of predatory fish. Water release is not the answer in my opinion. Watch salmon documentaries in Alaska where the salmon swim in just inches of water. Even under extreme drought conditions, the river was still passable with kayaks and plenty of water for the fish to breed and travel. Try a predatory</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		culling program first. Do a 5- or 10-year study as to the impact on the populations due to culling predators, then begin to talk about flow issues.	
49	1	Please hold back and store our water. California is built upon water storage. For that reason, I am against your plan to force more water down the Stanislaus River for fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
50	1	Your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus River would waste thousands of acre-feet of water and that hurts local agriculture. It is an irresponsible and ignorant approach of trying to increase salmon numbers. Please reconsider.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
52	1	<p>I am a farmer (one of many) asking that [the] water plan that would increase the river flows to be reconsidered. There have been many people at the meetings requesting this. There have been many letters written asking the water board to reconsider.</p> <p>Many people and organizations (not just farmers, but also Modesto residents who are provided water from the reservoirs by Modesto Irrigation District) have given many reasons that the increased flows are a bad idea. It's up to the water board to listen to all the reasons you have been given and consider the alternatives.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
52	2	Better solutions have been proposed based on studies of alternate methods of restoring habitat. Agriculture and the jobs and related businesses that it supports are why the Modesto area is not lagging even further behind where it would be without the water that supports it.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
53	1	As an avid outdoors man who enjoys trips to your region, I am very much in favor of the proposal to maintain river flows of at least 40% in the Tuolumne, Merced and Stanislaus Rivers in order to benefit salmon and overall water quality. I think commercial interests should be very grateful that they would still get up to 60% of the water in this proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
54	1	I am strongly opposed to an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River! This valley's financial stability strongly relies on this very water the State Water Resources Control Board is trying to take! This move affects farming operations, property values, unemployment rates, consumer food costs...just to name a few. The costs and the benefit are completely out of proportion.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also see Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for responses to comments related to the economic analysis provided in the SED.
54	2	There is no scientific evidence backing up the State's plan, and the State admits this! The habitat improvement has been proven effective by SSJID and OID; this is an alternative that makes sense. The municipal water supply will have to be cut back severely and the cities will be forced to pump, which the SGMA is limiting. This is not a common sense move on the State's part. We will continue to fight for the water rights that this area so heavily depends on!	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for information regarding SGMA.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for responses to comments regarding non-flow measures.</p>
55	1	You guys are doing nothing but killing the fish. Look at the reports and findings; it's not hard. It's easier to ignore and cover your ass, though. In the past four years, New Melones has turned into a place no one wants to be because of you guys. Boats don't have boat ramps or courtesy docks. You have to walk a mile after you park to get to the water. Oh, I'm sorry, I mean hike to the water. The trout/bass/Kokanee/salmon/steelhead are nothing but small little things, and when you do catch a fish they have sores from the hot water. They all have parasites that are thriving because of the warm water. You're taking money from local places	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		up here, who have felt the difference in their business accounts because less people want to come to a mud hole and bake in the sun like a pig.	
55	2	<p>The water board current members are the only reason California is in a water shortage. They are the cause of dwindling fish populations. They are the cause of lost jobs and revenue. They are the cause of water rights to become worth more than gold. I hope your future generations of kids are ready to answer for mistakes you've made for thousands, millions of people. I doubt you guys will even reply to this email or care.</p> <p>I know the people that actually care for nature and want to preserve it for future generations. They are the ones that live with it. You are supposed to be our voice. You guys are nothing but crooks lining their pockets for the future. Remember, the water comes from our home. Don't bite the hand that feeds you.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
56	1	<p>I applaud the board's effort in addressing the current inadequate flow, and setting a target flow.</p> <p>However, my understanding is that the starting point of 40% is not adequate to promote the necessary ecosystem health of the Delta. Management of the Delta is so integral to water quality and native fish populations that I believe a target of 60% is much more reasonable and necessary.</p> <p>I know the issue can be a contentious one. However, I look to the Board to act as my stewards in protecting the Delta, and ask for your support in setting the appropriate target.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
57	1	Wasting water trying to "protect" fish is a crime, especially when our farmers need the water to feed us. Save the people.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
58	1	The notion that more water equals more fish is clearly incorrect. It's not helping the smelt population and it's not helping the salmon. Reduce non-native species like striped bass, repair riparian areas and build up their spawning habitat instead.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
58	2	Flushing more water down the Stanislaus River and other waterways will only do one thing: damage a \$6 billion agricultural community that provides jobs and supports entire industries. Also, if you don't want farmers to drill wells and increase groundwater pumping, then you absolutely cannot decrease their surface water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
58	3	As a farmer and a conservationist steward of the land (it is definitely not an oxymoron), I am so appalled that the State Water Resources Control Board would even consider this plan. It's bad for the people and it won't help the fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
59	1	More water does not equal more fish. In fact, your plan can do more harm than good to the fish population.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
59	2	This is a waste of water that is needed for many other uses. This plan will harm agriculture in several ways, including the need for farmers to pump groundwater to produce much-needed food for our country. Please consider these and other issues in making decisions.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
60	1	Over time it's become clear to me what a loss we have suffered by trying to over-engineer California's watersheds--redirecting California's rivers, diminishing the runs of wild salmon and	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>drying up our wild places.</p> <p>Please preserve the wild flows of our rivers and watersheds for the seventh generation from today. Please direct efforts toward creating a system to manage California’s groundwater responsibly. Your work will help protect California’s wild places and create a sustainable agricultural economy for California’s long term, not just for a lifetime or two.</p>	
61	1	<p>As a wholesale customer of SFPUC that purchases 100% of its potable water supply from the San Francisco Regional Water System, water supply available to the City of East Palo Alto under the SED proposal could be reduced more than 50% under drought conditions for multiple consecutive years.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board’s evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers. Please also see Master Response 8.5 for a discussion of the city’s transfer agreement with the City of Mountain View and Palo Alto.</p>
61	2	<p>Being a low-income, minority community, this level of water reduction would disproportionately affect East Palo Alto, which already has one of the lowest per capita water consumption rates in the state, and would devastate the economic development efforts of the City to attract commercial development to finance the basic municipal services that are essential for our residents and our survival as a low-income community in the middle of wealthy Silicon Valley.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 61-1. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding economic consideration, growth effects, and demand management. As set forth in the Program of Implementation (described in Appendix K, Revised Water Quality Control Plan), the State Water Board will “take actions as necessary to ensure that implementation of the LSJR flow objectives does not impact supplies of water for minimum health and safety needs...”, which applies to low-income, minority communities. For further discussion regarding the resources available to assist disadvantaged communities as regards their water supply, please refer to Master Response 2.7, Disadvantaged Communities.</p>
61	3	<p>The City of East Palo Alto has maintained its significant conservation efforts for the past 10 years. Residential per capita water use during the mandatory drought period was a very low 43 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), lower than the average per capita water use of 60 gpcd across all BAWSCA agencies, and significantly lower than the statewide average of 80 gpcd during the same period.</p>	<p>The State Water Board acknowledges the City of East Palo Alto’s water conservation efforts and ongoing commitment to demand management of its water supply. This comment does not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments. Please see response to comment 61-1.</p>
61	4	<p>Based on the City of East Palo Alto’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, this significant cut to water supply would force the City of East Palo Alto to take a number of significant actions including, but not limited to, continuing the implementation of our already adopted moratorium for new or increased water connections, accelerating the development of our groundwater resources, including fines or penalties to our low-income residents for non-compliance, increasing water waste patrols, implementing a drought rate structure, limiting water use for public health and safety and fire protection, prohibiting all recreational water uses, and to minimize nonessential uses of water so that water is available for very basic human consumption, sanitation, and fire protection.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 61-1. Please see Master Response 2.7, Disadvantaged Communities, regarding public health and safety. Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding Water Code section 106, minimum health and safety needs. Please refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for additional discussion regarding health and safety and the emergency provision. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding groundwater use. Finally, please also see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for a general discussion as to the approach to the analyses contained in the SED, and the programmatic nature of analysis, and Master Response 8.5, for a more specific discussion of programmatic analysis.</p>
61	5	<p>The City of East Palo Alto serves water to 3,400 residential accounts and over 180 businesses and other 100 non-residential accounts. Potential consequences of the SED proposal include health and safety concerns due to lack of potable supplies, major job losses, potential loss of affordable housing, slower economic growth and continued community development</p>	<p>Please see responses to comments 61-1, 61-2, and 61-4.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>stagnation in the City of East Palo Alto service area.</p> <p>Since outdoor use represents a relatively small proportion of The City of East Palo Alto’s commercial, industrial, and institutional account water demand, commercial, industrial and institutional customers generally have fewer opportunities to reduce water use without changing their operations of incurring significant economic impacts.</p>	
61	6	<p>In the light of these aforementioned impacts as well as those articulated in the BAWSCA and SFPUC comment letters incorporated here by reference, the City of East Palo Alto requests that environmental, economic impacts, and social justice impacts of any shortage on the San Francisco Regional Water System, and the associated loss of jobs and delayed development, be fully and adequately analyzed as part of the SWRCB’s proposed flow alternatives. Such full and adequate analysis should be given at least equal attention, consideration, and weight with all other elements of the SWRCB’s subsequent deliberations and decision making.</p>	<p>Please see responses to comments 61-1 and 61-4. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.</p>
61	7	<p>The Governor has indicated his strong support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues. The City of East Palo Alto requests that the SWRCB provide adequate time for voluntary agreements to be reached amongst the stakeholders prior to any action on the SED. Please give this settlement process a chance for success instead of expediting implementation of the current proposal. The City of East Palo Alto shares BAWSCA’s commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.</p>
62	1	<p>I wish to applaud your plan to increase the flow of Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced rivers into the San Joaquin River and on to the Delta and the Bay. It is obvious from the Save the Bay’s study document that the rivers, delta, and Bay all the way out to the Farallones Islands are being stripped of their ecosystem capacity to support life. I would also strongly support increasing the percentage of unimpeded river flow to be 60%, as the minimum to refurbish spawning, salinity, bay and delta life, bay shores, etc.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
62	2	<p>It would help all of us for the Boards to disaggregate and clarify the data on exactly what kind and size of enterprises conduct farming and otherwise utilize water in the Central Valley, which claim this water—i.e. corporate, mom and pop, etc., and also exactly to inform us what crops are grown on how many acres (whether water-thirsty) and by whom; as well as the amount of water conservation and recycling are currently conducted, and the amount of groundwater typically used, utilization of storm water (if any) to recharge aquifers and fields, plus the health/level of aquifers being utilized for agriculture. Plus an accounting of water pollution caused by fertilizers and livestock. This data is no doubt available, but it needs to be presented to the public in the case of such a hot issue as this one.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
62	3	<p>The other data that would be helpful for the public to know is the "expected" amount of drought within various boundaries that we are most likely to see in California in upcoming years, based on our current knowledge, and the need to conduct risk management on those aspects of California which are the most vulnerable at this time.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
62	4	<p>There has to be work toward solution and win/win even in a time when it seems quite difficult. That is why I am suggesting another potential resource that we have in California, which the folks farming over the Ogalala aquifer in the center of our country do not have at all: the Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>We have sun, the potential for offshore and onshore wind, up and down our coast, to power large desalination, and, if we dare, we can partner with Mexico and develop the same down</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the Pacific Coast of Baja California. Baja has large deserts next to the sea. What a great export (power and water) Mexico has to offer us—somehow they haven't stumbled upon it. But as a true partnership, it could happen.	
62	5	Initially, to save our ecosystems, we must compromise, and that means no one gets everything they want. But looking forward, we might, should, and actually must consider a bigger picture for our water and people in California in which we preserve ecosystems, provide drinking water, use water and soil judiciously, and search for additional sources of new water, instead of fighting with all our forests, fish, birds, animals, marine mammals, other people around us, failing to cope with drought, and in some cases, causing permanent damage to the place we call home, not to mention, damaging our sense of strong capacity as the 6th biggest economy in the world.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
63	1	What do you plan to eat if you dry up our farmland...a few fish? California's climate, fertile land, and the availability of water have made our state a vital source of food for our state, our country, and the world. I support a balance to our water resources over this unimpaired flow that will change this valley back to a desert.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
65	1	In light of the breadth and scope of the 3,500+ page document, TID [Turlock Irrigation District] requests the SWB to revise the Notice to establish a new deadline to provide written comments. We request that the comment period be extended for an additional 120 days or until March 15, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. TID, its customers, and the surrounding communities are adversely impacted by the actions proposed in this draft document, and therefore, we must be allowed adequate time to assess and communicate constructive and relevant comments back to the SWRBC for its decision making.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
65	2	<p>This WQCP has been ten years in the making, beginning with the SWB's review of the Bay-Delta Plan in 2006. The SWB noticed the Phase 1 WQCP/SED in 2009 and the initial draft of this SED was first released in 2012. In response to comments, the SWB then spent nearly four years and \$70,000,000 to prepare this newly-revised version without meaningful public input. The revised SED was released for recirculation on September 15, 2016 and concludes that there will be significant adverse impacts to the regulated community, and yet TID [Turlock Irrigation District] is provided only 60 days to respond. Sixty days to provide comment is not sufficient to read the draft SED, much less to provide any meaningful analysis. The imposition of this deadline is patently unfair and violates the rights of the regulated community.</p> <p>We understand that the SWB desires to expedite the comment period due, in part, to the expiration of two Board Member's terms in January 2107. This, however, is not a reason to deny directly impacted parties or the public their rights to review this document, the information supporting the document and to fully and meaningfully participate in this legislative process. Again, the SWB and its staff took four years to revise and release the recirculated draft. The party to bear the burden should be the SWB and not the directly impacted parties nor the general public.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
65	3	The WQCP/SED appears to have several fundamental deficiencies that hamper any efficient understanding of the information and, therefore, will require additional review and analysis in order for TID [Turlock Irrigation District] to understand and to provide constructive comments. There are references to reports that are 50-200 pages with no page citation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, the length and complexity of the SED. The State Water Board made every effort to provide page numbers in in-text citations throughout the SED and the comment period was extended for a total duration of six months to provide sufficient time for review and comment.
65	4	The SED uses a revised Salsim model and revised Water Supply Effect model with no	Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding SalSim. For a description of the changes to

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		description of the changes from what was analyzed in the 2012 SED as compared to the 2016 revised SED.	<p>the water supply effects model between 2012 and 2016, refer to Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, and to Appendix F, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling (specifically see Section F.1.2.2, Development of the WSE Model Baseline and Alternative Assumptions).</p> <p>The use of SalSim is also described in Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30. The version of SalSim is documented in CDFW 2013a and CDFW 2014 as cited in Chapter 19.</p>
65	5	The SED often uses averages of important water supply and natural resource metrics that mask the impacts of the WQCP.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the general methods and modeling used in the SED. Refer to Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results in SED and Response to Comments, for additional general information regarding the presentation of data and results.
66	1	I don't like your plan at all to increase flows in the Stanislaus River. It will devastate our economy while saving very few fish. The true purpose appears to be to support the Delta tunnels, which I also oppose.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
67	1	I see how important agriculture is to our economy and our culture. Our farmers, reservoirs, and ground water have already suffered from the drought. This increase in unimpaired flows from the Stanislaus River will make a bad situation worse. Our farms produce far more food than the fish population that this proposal is trying to support.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
68	1	I firmly believe that in order to protect the Delta, water exports must be reduced. I am particularly concerned about salinity levels in the ground water on which my community of Manteca relies, for both drinking water and agricultural use. I have seen maps showing recent significant salinity encroachment on this precious resource, endangering the physical and economic health of my community. Any plan for the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta must include rigorous protection of salinity standards in the Delta as this has a direct effect on our groundwater supplies.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
69	1	I have serious reservations regarding the Bay-Delta SED released in September. My first concern was with the public comment process for a proposal with such serious impacts to the areas involved. Although I appreciate the 60 day extension to the original 60 day comment period, I do not believe it adequate for the affected parties to thoroughly review and respond to a complex 4,000 page report compiled over 4 years suggesting a significant allocation of water from the three rivers that will have dire impacts on the three county area and beyond.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
69	2	Studies and estimates by local economists and water and agriculture agencies clearly suggest that the assumptions in the SED in regard to the impacts on the local economy, groundwater, drinking water, and agricultural production are greatly underestimated. Most experts suggest that the potential for increase in the salmon population may be very minimal and is very speculative.	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for a discussion of the potential benefits of the salmon population, and refer to Volume 1, Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, for additional information regarding benefits to salmon populations.</p>
69	3	The SED acknowledges that the region would have to make up the loss of surface water by increased pumping of groundwater. This directly contradicts the goals of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act process by reducing irrigation water which is the largest recharge factor in this area which already has some significantly over-drafted basins.	The SED does not require or encourage increases in groundwater pumping as a response to reductions in surface water. The SED reflects the historical response of water users to increase groundwater pumping when surface water availability is reduced. The existing groundwater overdraft conditions are legacy issues caused by unsustainable agricultural expansion; SGMA was passed by the legislature in 2014 to address overdraft issues. The State Water Board acknowledges that it will be challenging, but implementation of the plan amendments does not conflict with SGMA; together they allow for integrated planning of scarce water resources that does not trade impacts between surface water and

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>groundwater. It will be up to local entities to determine the precise actions that would be taken in response to the implementation of the plan amendments, with or without the future condition of SGMA. For further discussion on these issues, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater Resources and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.</p> <p>For discussions on potential economic impacts, please see Master Responses 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model and 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects.</p>
69	4	<p>The SED suggests no forms of mitigation for these economic and groundwater impacts but merely states that "the impact will be significant but unavoidable." This a less than acceptable response to these three counties which have not yet recovered from the economic downturn, has been one of the most impacted areas in the country by the mortgage crisis and has been weathering an historic drought.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 69-3.</p>
69	5	<p>I have proposed for years that California needs a comprehensive and consistent approach to water planning taking into account all projects in development and all proposed projects, large and small.</p> <p>A plan that does not take into account 165 years of alterations to the Delta and the rivers that feed it as well as the introduction of invasive species and subsequent predation seems unlikely to succeed on its own without the expertise and assistance of our local water agencies. Even this Board recognized in 1995 that the health of the salmon rests on more than just increased flows, allowing that actions on predation, hatcheries, ocean harvest and habitat are required.</p> <p>A report released last year by four Delta lead scientists on the challenges and recommendations for managing the Delta stated:</p> <p>"If the problem were just about allocating fresh flows, it might be solvable. Add in the complexity of moving water through a hydrodynamically complex Delta, it becomes complicated. Add the uncertainty of ecological response and the institutional complexity of many actors with many visions and the problem becomes wicked. Then add the ever changing water supply and ecological and economic contexts within which decisions must be made and the problem becomes devilishly wicked."</p> <p>The Water Board staff presentations to the Merced, Stanislaus and San Joaquin County Boards of Supervisors included a suggestion that the best approach would be to work with our water agencies to achieve the desired goals rather than spend years and monetary resources in litigation.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection for a discussion regarding the justification of the plan amendments for protecting fish as well as a discussion on other stressors such as predation and protection through the Delta.</p>
69	6	<p>The Merced Irrigation District has recently released their S.A.F.E. proposal which seems to be a step in this direction. I think this kind of a cooperative and comprehensive program with all parties working together would be a much more productive way to move toward the Board's goals.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.4, Alternatives to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding information about the S.A.F.E plan. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding collaboration with agencies and stakeholders and for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
70	1	<p>Please listen to the science and set flows at the 50-60% level required to fully save the salmon and protect the ecosystem. 50-60% is very important for the future of the fisheries.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
71	1	<p>We are tired of our water being shipped to everyone else in the state. We live in the foothills where the water comes from and we don't have enough for ourselves. Wells are drying up and lakes and storage facilities are far from being full and you want to give all the water to the Big City Money people that buy their way through the system. Make them fix their own problems</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		by helping us build more storage areas so we can all have water equally.	
72	1	We should care more about the farmers, businesses and families that rely on the agriculture in our area than fish that will still survive with current flows. We cannot pump more groundwater without replacing it through flood irrigation. This is a terrible idea without thought of the major impact it will have on the middle class.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
73	1	<p>We need our agriculture sustained. We need our water conserved for this, and remain in the dams until needed. We run out of water too quickly, the price goes up and our watering days are going down, to one day a week now! We are tired of reading how much water is going out to the oceans and wasted each year, while our dams are nearly empty. This is the way it has been in recent years that is so unwise, and the also the usage of the water diverted in recent years. Our dams have been placed there for good reasons, and we should continue to use them to store water.</p> <p>It is good for our economy, and it is good for our farmers, not to mention a lot of other things, such as the recreation for the lakes. To do otherwise is foolish, and damages our valley.</p> <p>We should not be prohibited to have water for residents, especially growing food crops in their own gardens. Once a week watering for our citrus trees is not good, nor for growing vegetables. Removing water from our aquifers will remain dangerous, and lead to continued collapse of the ground, and settling buildings, and causing a situation which they can never be refilled again. This will only increase effects of droughts. This drought is manmade, and could be stopped right now if the dams were allowed to fill, and then be used wisely.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
74	1	We need to protect our water sources and use our water responsibly. Most crucial to our state water management is actual protection of the west coast's most important estuary, the San Francisco Bay Delta, whose viability requires at a minimum half the flow of water from the rivers that feed it, the Tuolumne, Merced, Stanislaus, and lower San Joaquin, and which provides for migrating birds and fish essential to biodiversity in California. Our floodplains serve a valuable purpose crucial to the recovery of our fisheries. Reduced fresh water flow is so concentrating pollutants in the Delta that we're seeing toxic blue-green algae in California waters. Our historic salmon-based ecosystem not only provides food and income for the fish industry but it supports other plants and animals in the upstream ecosystems. It must be restored.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
74	2	It is unacceptable that the moguls of California industrial agriculture should attempt to shape California State water policy. The abundantly profitable almond industry alone uses 10% of our fresh water, to the huge detriment of California's salmon and other fisheries that contribute to California's economy much more widely than the almond business. New almond orchards have been planted in the past three years, well after it was apparent we'd be suffering an ongoing drought. Central Valley industrial agriculture's profit drive and disproportionate and careless use of our valuable and limited fresh water must be curbed. The hugely costly, wasteful, and environmentally destructive twin tunnels must not be permitted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
74	3	California should provide the model for educating and requiring the public, including industrial agriculture, to achieve the most effective conservation practices and efficient use of this most essential natural resource. There is no place for profit-making and privatization of our water; we have an obligation to ensure California's biodiversity and to protect our water for future	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		generations of Californians.	
75	1	If you follow through with your plan to increase flows on the Stanislaus River, you will do great harm to our farmers as well as our groundwater levels. Reduced surface water will devastate the local economy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
76	1	<p>We are opposed to your plan to raise unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. We feel Lake Tulloch is an extremely valuable and wonderful resource to the Calaveras County community. My wife Anne and I favor a sensible water management plan for the Stanislaus River and Lake Tulloch. Thousands and thousands of homeowners and tourists visit and use the lake regularly to enjoy the beautiful scenery and outdoor recreation.</p> <p>Not only does the community rely on the lake to draw people to the area for local business, the fish, turtles, birds, deer, and many other marine life and animals depend the lake for their survival. Draining the lake will destroy their habitat and could bankrupt or at the very least cause extreme financial hardship within our fragile, small community. The importance of agribusiness also looms large in the decision.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
76	2	We were at the salmon festival at the Knights Ferry Recreation Area this fall and saw the relatively small amount of salmon going by the bridge for spawning. It is my understanding that simply flushing the water down the river in the spring and fall does not work.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
76	3	Please do not allow this to be a reason for inappropriate water management and release for beautiful Lake Tulloch, possibly ruining the economic and recreational viability of the area in the process.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
77	1	California water has been unfairly managed for years. All of these proposed restrictions do not benefit the people of these affected counties and only help politicians who seek to move forward their agendas. Stop unfairly putting the good of the people ahead of progressive goals to save fish that don't need to be saved, or tunnels that do not need to be built.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
79	1	I am against raising flows on the Stanislaus River. Most likely, you want to send the water down to fill the Delta-Mendota Canal and other aquifers. I think it should be kept local where it can help our farmers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
81	1	Scientific evidence points to Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers needing 60% of water flows to remain and flow into the Delta and SF Bay Estuary. A recent Bay Institute report describes the negative impacts of the lack of freshwater flows throughout the SF Bay Estuary and as far as the Farallones Islands! ("San Francisco Bay: The Freshwater-Starved Estuary, How Water Flowing to the Ocean Sustains California's Greatest Aquatic Ecosystem," the Bay Institute, Sept 2016).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
81	2	<p>There are many documented ways to further conserve water in both urban and agricultural settings, by recycling, installing water-saving devices, changing landscaping, etc.</p> <p>A recent report documents how new unirrigated land is being cultivated for water-intensive crops in the San Joaquin Valley, in spite of the drought and water conservation imperatives. (http://www.forbes.com/sites/mallorypickett/2016/09/28/satellite-images-reveal-impact-of-almond-boom/#2735f74c550d)</p> <p>Federal and state law dictates that wildlife and the environment in the San Joaquin Valley and</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the Delta be kept healthy.	
81	3	I request that flows be increased to the full 60% required. If necessary, agricultural lands should be followed, ideally with compensation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
82	1	This water board has not properly done their work to ensure that both sides of this have been taken into account. Your numbers are wrong, your plan is wrong, and your science is wrong. Flushing water down the river, your way, will hurt California and the world. We feed the world from here. You need to arrive at a much better balance of how much water is retained in the reservoirs as they were planned. Please rescind your plan, and come up with a much better one which provides water to our region, farmers, citizens.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
83	1	Agriculture is the staple of all business in the valley. Sending more water down the river will only ensure that agriculture stops and we run out of water in lean years. When that happens business will leave and jobs will be lost.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
83	2	There should be more dams built and more water held back for drought years. Everybody benefits when we control the water with reservoirs. When we send all the water down nobody benefits at all.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
85	1	We obviously have an incredible shortage of water. We should not be selling water or flushing it down river as your plan proposes!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
86	1	I live and play on Lake Tulloch, I work overlooking Lake, or should I say, Creek Melones (you can literally walk across it right now). The water in CA has been mismanaged for years, and now it is suggested we trust how you plan on managing the future of it. I just don't buy it. I work in ag, and my livelihood depends on it, as does our country and others. Currently, the drought is predicted to continue, there are no household water use restrictions in place (This I do not understand) and studies show the warm water is detrimental to fish. When will you wake up and start managing this precious resource better?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
87	1	<p>My question to you is, are you willing to take a 40% pay cut? Are you willing to deplete your savings to survive? How long would your savings last you if you had to supplement 40% of your pay with it?</p> <p>What you are asking, what you are telling us, is that is what we are supposed to do is sit back and watch you do that to our livelihood.</p> <p>Our district water is our crops paycheck and our aquifer is our savings. If you cut that pay by 40%, everyone's pay by 40%, everyone is going to have to pull from our savings. How long will our savings, and aquifer last? How will that devastate our valley? And how long will that take to devastate our land and economy permanently?</p> <p>Not two years ago the government was trying to regulate how much we could pull from that savings and now you are about to give us no other option.</p> <p>Every farmer that I know is a steward to the land. Takes more pride in giving back to the soil and land, while providing you food to eat with your family at dinner tonight. As the population has grown in California and the United States, our farmers and this valley have adjusted to provide water and food for everyone. How can one decision by you, a non-elected board, tear down all that these people in here have worked for, for generations? Do you even realize the</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>impact that this decision will ultimately have for you and your food and your family? And for WHAT? 1100 fish?</p> <p>People matter more than fish.</p>	
89	1	<p>I am very concerned about protection of our rivers and streams. The health of these water bodies and the flora and fauna that depend on them are very important to me as a Californian. I understand that the State Water Board is updating the Bay Delta Plan and Phase 1 will adjust flow objectives for the San Joaquin River and its major tributaries to protect fish and wildlife. It is also my understanding that a 2010 report recommended that 60% of flow be maintained in the river in the important spring months but the draft EIR for Phase 1 only recommends 40% of unimpaired flow.</p> <p>I disagree with this recommendation and strongly urge the State Board to increase the percentage of water that will be retained in the river system during this crucial time to at least 50-60%. The state needs to protect the fisheries and other habitat that these rivers and streams provide. These systems are integral to the health of the state's environment which is already under attack from climate change which will only be getting worse in the future. Now is the time to resist the pressure of Big Ag and do the right thing to protect our rivers in this time of swift climatic change. Big Ag needs to adopt more water-conserving practices and crops (80% of state water going to agriculture is too much!) The present system is not sustainable in this new day and age. Similarly urban users must reform our water use as well as there will generally be less water available for all in the future.</p> <p>The Bay-Delta needs to be protected and increasing the amount of freshwater flowing into the system is essential to protecting and improving its health especially with sea level rise. This is one of the most important estuaries on the West Coast and needs stronger protection now!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
89	2	<p>The science has told you already that the rivers need at least 50-60 % flows through the spring. I strongly urge you to support science and doing what is best for California's long-term health and well-being by implementing this recommendation.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
90	1	<p>I am writing to support the proposal by the State Water Board to increase the flows on the Tuolumne, Merced and Stanislaus Rivers. This is our last best chance to attempt to restore the severely degraded tributaries of the San Joaquin.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
90	2	<p>I have heard the emotional comments of the agricultural water users stating how the proposed new flow regime poses a threat to their life and livelihood. I too have an emotional connection to these rivers. The current irrigation diversion levels have clearly been a major factor in the reductions of fish population numbers. The concept of a more balanced use of the water in these three watersheds should not be considered a radical step, but a long overdue re-balancing of a public resource to a broader beneficial use.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
90	3	<p>I have fished the lower sections of the San Joaquin tributaries for 25 years. I have been witness to the diminished quality of the aquatic resources and seen habitat degraded over many seasons and many water year types. This rapid decline of these once great trout, steelhead and salmon fisheries has occurred in all 3 tributaries.</p> <p>Three years after higher flow years, salmon return numbers show a large increase. These differences can be dramatic as in 1985 when 40,000 salmon returned to the Tuolumne. In the fall of 2016, the returns were sadly greatly diminished. In 2015 water temperatures in the</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Merced were so warm that the few remaining trout were rescued and held in a special refrigerated tank. During this same year urban Californians were subject to the historic water conservation requirements. However, in 2015 San Joaquin valley farms set agricultural revenue records. The fish paid the price for those profits, the urban users also paid those costs by decreasing water usage as much as 40%. During the prolonged drought Central Valley agriculture has expanded permanent crops, specifically tree nuts, dramatically.</p>	
90	4	<p>The numbers of people seeking recreation in natural areas is increasing annually, as is the economic importance of those visitors. The citizens of California, the same people who sacrifice their water during periods of drought, deserve a chance to recreate on healthy, environmentally functioning rivers. Rebalancing the beneficial uses of these rivers is overdue. Do Californians deserve to live in a place that is so degraded that salmon are just a memory? No, they don't. Let's not trade our chance for healthy, functioning river systems and the vibrant ecosystems that they support for a salty snack food that is mostly exported.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
90	5	<p>I urge the State Water Board to stand firm on the proposal to increase the flows of the San Joaquin tributaries to support the restoration of the Bay-Delta system which is so vital to so many species of wildlife, not only fish.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
91	1	<p>Congresswoman Doris Matsui has written that if the twin tunnels are built. the flow could be reduced to less than 10% of its average volume. It seems impossible but we've done something like this before in California on the San Joaquin. The actions we take now and in the future are critical to the survival of Salmon and other fish and all of the other species that depend on them. We need the river and riparian and marsh habitats that are in such great peril. We need them and the water for all the benefits that their species and the water provide for us. We need them for their beauty and their calming, cooling and flood preventing attributes.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
91	2	<p>The history of our actions impacting the Bay and Delta is a history of savagery. It began with dredging for Gold and continued through misguided and ill-fated efforts to correct the first problem. I attended a workshop more than a decade ago that was sponsored by the USGS and others. It was attended by scientists and local water regulators and was centered on sediment in San Francisco Bay. One of the scientists said that it was not possible to restore the Delta because no one even knew what it was like in the mid-19th century. All that can be done is to do our best to make the water and shoreline the best environment we can to sustain the life that exists now. It is what I am fighting for and what you are working toward.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
91	3	<p>Governor Brown has said that a million hours of meetings were held to come up with this Plan. If the underlying assumptions of the plans discussed in those meetings are no longer valid then the number of hours spent discussing them is irrelevant to a successful outcome of the Plan. I believe that the combined impact of the: drought, climate change and its sea level rise, 39 million people in California, the pressure of what is being called the 6th great extinction as well as increased understanding of how little we know about the dynamics of these interlocking systems of life means that some of the underlying assumptions are not useful in predicting the future or in basing drastic infrastructure decisions on. It would be a grave error to build these two tunnels south of Sacramento. There is a tendency to look to the past and grand projects to solve problems, and often, though one problem was solved, many others were created.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
91	4	<p>You issued a report in 2010 called Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem. It stated that 60% of unimpaired flow from mid-winter through Spring would be required to fully protect fish and wildlife in the Delta. It was written before</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the drought. You intend to call for 40% unimpaired flow. It seems that you should raise your requirement higher, perhaps to 50% to account for the long drought and the vagaries of climate change.	
91	5	I have two suggestions for extending the water supply. First, every water agency in the state should examine and repair or replace their piping to stop the tremendous amount of water lost through leakage. It would be expensive but worth it. Second, the canals of the Central Valley Water Project should find ways to cover their canals and thereby reduce water evaporation. We all must persevere to use less water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
92	1	Your unfair water grab has potentially devastating economic consequences. The state's plan would harm agribusiness. Farmers will not be able to farm and many thousands of acres would be fallowed in the region. Our San Joaquin Valley is one of the most fertile agricultural areas in our country. Farmers need water to produce crops.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
92	2	The irrigation districts are stewards of the Stanislaus River. More water does not equal more fish. Releasing water will also have a big impact on hydroelectric power by wastefully producing cheap power in the winter during a non-peak demand period. I vehemently oppose an increase of unimpaired flow on the Stanislaus River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
94	1	We cannot go back to being a desert. We need to use every source of water to the best of our ability to benefit our people. Here in Tuolumne County, the federal government takes our water out of our reservoirs when we are in a drought to benefit a small amount of little fish instead of we the people being able to use it for PEOPLE! These asinine policies need to stop. Government overreach needs to stop. We are now going to have our own private well monitored, and most likely, taxed. Water rights are bought and paid for when we purchase our property. Since when should we be taxed again and again for something we have already bought? This is what the government does with our property already; we pay every year to own our same property, and now it is our wells. Will we be taxed on the air we breathe next? Yes, it is just disguised in "green" policies. To use fresh water that will just flow into the ocean to raise food for ourselves is only sensible. Construct water policies that will benefit people raising food. Is that so hard to understand?!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
97	1	As the State Water Resources Control Board makes a decision regarding cold water flows to the San Joaquin River watershed, can we please pay attention to what scientific research says about the flows needed to all for recovery of salmon and steelhead runs? Specifically, flows of at least 60% are needed to allow for recovery of these runs and to allow the populations of fish to become self-sustaining.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
97	2	I recognize the conflict between the water needs of farmers and the needs of fish. For far too long, the state has provided large amounts of water to the farming community without adequate consideration of the needs of salmon and steelhead. These fisheries have the potential to provide significant income to the region In addition, cold, clean water benefits everyone.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
97	3	Clearly, the farm interests must demonstrate that they are ready to use proven methods of water conservation to greatly decrease their water needs while still providing adequate water for crops. These conservations measures should be required of anyone receiving water from	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the state.	
97	4	The time is past to continue the status quo. Salmon and steelhead are disappearing. The time has come to abandon the failed policies of the past and to recognize that the solution to the problem is easy; provide more water to the fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
98	1	I am concerned your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers will negatively impact the very lifeblood of our communities in the Central Valley: agriculture.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
98	2	It will also have a negative effect on our environment, by pushing more and more pumping from our aquifers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
98	3	Finally, there is no guarantee that this water grab is actually going to help the fish population.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
98	4	Please rethink the entire project and work with those local experts who have the best interests of our communities in mind.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.