

**Table 4-1. Responses to Comments**

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
100	1	Scientific data shows that the positions staked out by SSJID and OID have had much better results for fish. More water flow does not equal more fish. This water grab would devastate the farms and communities impacted by 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.
101	1	Please put human life before animal life. A non-native fish is not nearly as important as farming to feed millions is. If we truly evolved as American society has been lied to believe, then why shouldn't we believe and expect also that any animal that goes extinct will evolve again? Stop the environmental and animal rights madness and put people first.	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.
102	1	We write you today as California salmon fishermen and residents asking you to strengthen and adopt the recommendations from your staff to require at least 40 to 50 percent unimpaired flow in the three main tributaries of the San Joaquin River from February through June. As you know, the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife found that 60 percent of the rivers would be needed in the February to June period to restore salmon. Today, there are some months where as little as five percent of one of the rivers still flows.	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.
102	2	<p>Too much of the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus rivers are diverted, denying salmon the water they need to spawn, rear and migrate in. Never mind the harm salmon already suffer from loss of spawning and rearing habitat behind dams built with no fish ladders.</p> <p>We all know that the decision before you now is historic. You'll either make the right choice and set California on a new path that balances human development with the state's natural resources or we'll continue to lose salmon, the Delta, the Bay, and more of our natural heritage that has made California such a special place.</p> <p>We understand that it's not easy to tell those who are currently taking water that a mistake has been made and you have to take some of the water back. But that's the reality.</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.
102	3	Water diversion permits continued to be issued in violation of Fish and Game code 5937 which requires maintenance of below-dam fish in good condition. Salmon below the dams on the San Joaquin and its tributaries are all in bad condition, a violation of the law.	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.
102	4	Allowing too many diversions has slowly choked the life out of the rivers, the Delta and the coastal and inland communities that rely on salmon to make a living and as a food source. Today the Delta is so deprived of freshwater flows that not only are salmon crippled, so too is the Delta itself with toxic blue green algae blooms threatening both humans and animals and invasive weeds clogging waterways and water intakes.	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.
102	5	Salmon fishermen understand that by itself, increased flow in the San Joaquin River's three main tributaries aren't enough to get us more salmon. Those increased flows must be allowed to replenish the health of the Delta and Bay and not be diverted at the pumps, a step you'll next consider. Those flows must be adequate to reduce the predation of baby salmon from their birth place to the Bay.	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.
102	6	We're all victims of a history that's largely destroyed our salmon runs, allowed over-diversion of our rivers and streams, and decimated the natural landscape our forefathers enjoyed here in California. This is a history of our own making, we need to correct it, and the authority and opportunity to do so are with you now. As citizens of this state, as fishermen, husbands, fathers, wives and mothers, sons and daughters, we ask you to reverse a bad history of draining our finite freshwater rivers, so central to the survival of salmon and other wildlife, and instead restore those waters, communities, families, and the landscapes that	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
		depend on them.	
103	1	I strongly support the Water Board plan to keep more water in the rivers. In fact, I believe this is critical.	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.
104	1	Please set water flows at the appropriate levels to protect the salmon and their 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.
105	1	As a concerned, no...make that outraged California CITIZEN, I would like to register my objection to the State's continued policies of diverting excess amounts of our scarce water resources to the sea. We need this water for our people and agriculture, not for unsustainable fish populations.	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.
105	2	We are in a period of drought, and we don't know when it is going to end. Once again, this year appears to be fairly normal in terms of the amount of rain we have received so far. But the damage has been done...groundwater has been pumped far to low in many places. For God sakes, the Delta Smelt is not even a native species, and salmon are not at all an endangered species on the Pacific Coast. They are just minimized in marginal habitat areas subject to Normal Recurring Drought.	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.
105	3	Please reduce outflow to the ocean, only to the level needed to keep salinity from encroaching into the Delta and critical water 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.
106	1	I do not support your plan to raise unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. We need this water for our agricultural products and our fish. Our life depends on water and this is for Stanislaus County!	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.
107	1	I am writing this letter to state my concern for the proposed plan to increase water flows from our rivers. I am 100% against this. Our water is imperative to our survival, how stuff like this even becomes an issue I will never understand. They need to put more restrictions on the water they have, make it go further, enforce the drought rules down there. I feel like we're being punished for being conservative, we care, therefore our water should be ours. Not for any board to decide what to do with it. Our farm land needs it, our residents need it.  Please do not allow this to happen, no amount of money would be worth giving up something we need to survive.	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.
108	1	As an angler that spends an average of 10 days a year fishing Central Valley rivers for steelhead, I am writing in support of minimum flow standards for the San Joaquin River. The steelhead and salmon populations in the San Joaquin River, its tributaries, and other Bay-Delta rivers are in a fragile state. In order to protect these species and the ecosystems they are a part of, it is imperative to ensure suitable flow for them year-round.	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.
108	2	Population and agriculture will always be inclined to consume as much water as is made available to them, but they can also make do with less water by updating technology and implementing conservation practices. Our salmon and steelhead cannot do this. In a warming world, having suitable stream flows is a bare minimum in the effort to protect and support Central Valley steelhead and salmon populations.	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
109	1	As a third-generation farmer, I know the importance of water and water conservation. Water is vital for valley farms those who live in the valley and it's wildlife. Just increasing the flow of water is a great solution to destroy the economy and make Californians buy more food outside of our borders for a higher price grown without all the laws California passes to make food grown here be safe to eat. Along with that, workers in California have higher wages and have more laws to protect them.	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.
109	2	Farms need water and this water grab will not even save the fish since there are too many non-native predators in the rivers. So should we let the valley dry up for fish? Maybe we just need to find a better solution than this. My job and many many others depend on agriculture. I hope you consider the negative impacts this will have and see that food is vital for our 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.
110	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.
110	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.
111	1	<p>Bill Lyons, the former California Secretary of Agriculture, said it first: "I call this a water taking by the state." It came up again during the Merced Irrigation District panel discussion. "This is an illegal taking of storage space on Lake McClure," said general counsel Phil McMurray. Coincidentally, the same word was being heard in the courtroom of federal Judge Marian Blank Horn some 2,400 miles away. Ruling in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, she told farmers in northern California and southern Oregon they could sue the Bureau of Reclamation for damages after the Bureau refused to live up to its water contracts on the Klamath River. That happened in 2001, when the Bureau decided fish needed the water more than the farmers who had relied on it for 90 years.</p> <p>Judge Horn ruled the farmers' losses were from a "physical" taking of their rights, not a "regulatory" taking--which government can do with impunity. The situation here doesn't appear all that different, though far larger in scope. On the Klamath, 1,200 farm families were affected; here it will be several thousand. And that doesn't count those who rely on those farms for jobs, or who work in factories, or those who will suffer from lost public services.</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 1.2 regarding the State Water Regional Control Board's (State Water Board's) authorities and regulations governing the Water Quality Control Planning Process.</p> <p>The commenter asserts that the State Water Board's action requires compensation under the Takings Clause of the United States Constitution because it will result in a physical invasion of property. (U.S. Const. Amend. V; Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council (1992) 505 U.S. 1003, 1015.) The United States Supreme Court has acknowledged that the physical taking test must be reserved for the "relative rare" cases in which the physical occupation can be "easily identified," such as "[w]hen the government physically takes possession of an interest in property for some public purpose" or otherwise directly appropriates or occupies private property for its own use or use by a third party. (Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (2002) 535 U.S. 302, 322, 324.) The requirement that there be an actual physical occupation, invasion, or appropriation of property by the government is the defining characteristic of a physical taking. Use restrictions, including regulatory requirements that have the effect of limiting the amount of water that can be diverted or used, do not constitute a physical invasion. (Allegretti &amp; Co. v. County of Imperial (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 1261, 1273.)</p> <p>The comment raises hypothetical issues concerning the implementation of the Plan amendments that will be addressed in a future, separate proceeding. A future potential requirement regarding as-yet-undetermined reservoir storage targets is not sufficient to demonstrate an actual impairment of a right to use water that precludes implementation of the Plan amendments.</p> <p>Even if the courts were to find a physical invasion or a loss of all economic value, the courts hold that there is no taking if the property right does not extend to conducting the activity or imposing harm that government prevents the property owner from carrying out, as the government is imposing limitations that inhere in the title of the property. "[I]n order for there to be a cognizable property interest sufficient to support a takings claim," the claimant must show that he or she actually possesses a right to use the property allegedly taken. (American Pelagic Fishing Co. v. United States (Fed. Cir. 2004) 379 F.3d 1363, 1377.) All water in</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>California is the property of the people of the State and is owned in trust for them by the State. (Wat. Code, §§ 102, 1001; Kidd v Laird (1860) 15 Cal. 161, 179-180.) Water rights in California are non-possessory rights of use only; there are no rights to the corpus of the water and no water right holder has a vested right to divert a specified quantity of water without limitation. (Eddy v. Simpson (1853) 3 Cal. 249, 252; United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (186) 182 Cal.App.3d. 82, pp. 100, 105-106, 147.) Rather, the right is to use up to a certain quantity of water, subject to the overriding limitations and restrictions of California’s reasonable use and public trust doctrines, which inhere in the water right itself. (National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 437, 440, 445, 447; Joslin v. Marin Municipal Water Dist., (1967) 67 Cal.2d 132, 144-145.) Pursuant to the reasonable use and public trust doctrines, a water right holder may be prevented from diverting the maximum quantity of water under its water rights in order to prevent harm to fishery resources and other beneficial uses of the source of water from which the water is diverted. This includes preventing deterioration of water quality that impairs beneficial uses. (United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd., supra, 182 Cal.App.3d at p. 130; see State Water Resources Control Bd. Cases (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 674, 778-779 [State Water Board’s development and implementation of water quality control plan largely fulfills its obligations under the public trust doctrine].) Such limitation does not infringe on any vested right. Thus, the regulation of activities that have the potential to affect public trust resources or to contravene the reasonable use doctrine cannot result in a taking because no one has a property right in the unlimited and unregulated use of surface water in California.</p> <p>Further, the Plan amendments do not require a water right holder to divert water to storage, as the comment inaccurately suggests. Nor would the State Water Board take available storage space for itself. Rather, the purpose of the Plan amendments is to protect the beneficial uses of the waters of the State, which belong to the people of the State, by imposing requirements on the diversion and use of water through water right or water quality actions. (Wat. Code, §§ 102, 13241.) Under the proposed Plan amendments, a water right holder who is responsible for meeting the unimpaired flow requirement could do so by reducing surface water diversions through bypassing flows, releasing stored water, or by reoperating reservoirs. There is no requirement to divert to storage in the first instance; rather conditions may be imposed that address the availability of water for diversion or the water proposed to be diverted for beneficial use. Because water rights are non-possessory rights of use subject to the overriding limitations and restrictions of California’s reasonable use and public trust doctrines, and implementation of the Plan amendments do not result in a physical taking requiring compensation.</p>
111	2	In its Substitute Environmental Document, the State Water Resources Control Board says it doesn’t want all of the Tuolumne, Merced and Stanislaus rivers for environmental purposes--just 40 percent, or maybe half. For now. The state also wants to control even more of the water it allows to be stored in dams.	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.
111	3	The state says its plan will cost the local economy \$64 million a year. Virtually every public official from Chowchilla to Manteca disputes that number, putting the costs at five or 10 times higher.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that make a general comment regarding the plan amendments and general information regarding the economic analysis.
111	4	The state’s plan will make water deliveries to farms unreliable. And when the state’s groundwater rules kick in, there will be even less water for farming-- compounding the economic implications.	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 and general information regarding the economic analysis. Also, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for discussion of SGMA compliance.
111	5	"The state has the ability to regulate the use of water, and they need to," said land- and water-use attorney Gene Tanaka of Best Best Krieger in the Bay Area, citing efforts to deal with flooding or drought. But, "the issue becomes a lot more complicated when the state is	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 or.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>regulating the amount of water available and it affects the viability of the dams--then there is an issue of taking." So what's a dam worth if there's no water behind it? Exchequer Dam is owned by the people who live within Merced Irrigation District; Don Pedro Dam belongs to the people living in Turlock and Modesto irrigation districts. Together, they must be worth \$9 billion--unless they're empty. Oakdale and South San Joaquin irrigation districts own three dams that generate substantial power--when there's water.</p>	
111	6	<p>Then there's the land itself. Reliable water makes farmland more valuable. The five districts with rights to the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus irrigate 460,000 acres between them. With reliable water, each acre is worth at least \$25,000. In districts without reliable water, an acre sells for \$5,000 (often less). A difference of \$20,000 per acre would cost farmers here \$9.2 billion in lost value. As land values fall, so will taxes, meaning there will be less to pay deputies, firefighters, teachers and doctors.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that make a general comment regarding the plan amendments and general information regarding the economic analysis. Please see Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, regarding the scope of the economic analysis and property values.</p>
111	7	<p>At the Water Board hearings, many spoke of their mistrust of the state--not its motives, but its methods. No wonder. Legislation introduced last year would have allowed the state to implement its plan even if the water districts sought an injunction. Such tactics are both unfair and likely to fail. First, what judge would look kindly on an effort to usurp his or her power? Second, it might be hard to convince anyone that we're in an environmental emergency after the state took eight years to put its plan together and when salmon populations are actually rising. If misguided environmental groups push such legislation again, it will only deepen the distrust and increase the anger.</p> <p>What would such anger look like? Ask Alex McCabe, a Livingston city councilman who got emotional while addressing the board: "I'm embarrassed, as an elected leader, over the water quality in my own city," he said. "This plan will turn my city into Flint (Mich.) . . . "I am the face of an unreasonable man; I'm angry, if this comes through, we will unleash dogs of war. . . . I pray you listen. I don't want to be your devil as you are mine right now." Or it could look like Stanislaus Supervisor Terry Withrow, who recommended the state go slowly, "Because you know we'll all end up in court." And if the judge in that court sees things as Judge Horn sees them, the state will owe our region billions upon billions of dollars.</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>To review responses to comments submitted by other entities within the comment period on the 2016 Recirculated Draft SED, please refer to the index of commenters in Volume 3 to locate the letter number(s) of interest.</p>
112	1	<p>I am completely against the water being directing to Southern California from Central and Northern State of California! We need to have enough for crops to feed all the state and country. If you continue to take the water away from crops next will be food shortages for all. Maybe get the water they need by doing more desalination of the coast water. You may have to increase Southern California rates to cover the cost! They have a choose between paying extra or moving to where the water is! DO NOT TAKE OUR FOOD AWAY!!!</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>
113	1	<p>There are much better ways to support these initiatives for fish that would waste less water overall. The state water board needs to open its thought process.</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>
114	1	<p>I am asking that you implement a Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan that securely protects our most precious resource, our Public Trust, our source of healthy ecosystems which directly impact the health of each of us, our water.</p> <p>It has been scientifically proven that restoring our water flow in the lower San Joaquin to 60% of the unimpeded flow will prevent the catastrophe of a sixth mass extinction. Loss of entire species of fish, plant life, birds, plus dramatic loss of numbers of whales and other marine wildlife in our near ocean, can be stopped through your efforts.</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>This action is needed now, and requires known and accessible measures that can met through common sense shifts in water usage in our current agricultural methods and priorities.</p> <p>I urge you to hold the bigger picture at stake and take seriously the options presented by the experts who have already calculated what options will bring about the results that ultimately benefit us all.</p>	
115	1	<p>I highly support sending more water to helping sustain the environment, NOT more water to be given at minimal cost to an out of state tax paying corporate farms, and their 8,000 unsustainable jobs for illegal immigrants. I do not want you to send 50% more water down the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers.</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>
116	1	<p>I am opposed to your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers. Our ag business would suffer greatly. Agriculture is vital to our area and our state. Common sense legislation could do wonders with the right leaders listening to the people and not the lobbyists. This also applies to the fish and the fish being placed above our own people. Let's work together.</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>
117	1	<p>The Revised SED dramatically harms the nearly two-year effort by our local water agencies who are diligently working to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability goals outlined in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). If implemented, the SED will be the direct cause of groundwater reduction in our region, making it nearly impossible to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability.</p> <p>With the implementation of this measure, Hilltop Ranch would be forced to reduce its workforce due to 20 percent of existing farm land being put out of production. This would significantly impact the lives of the families that we employ, as well as the local economy.</p> <p>Before your board votes to harm our agricultural economy, our drinking water and community, please work with the local water districts (many of whom have peer-reviewed, most recent science) to look at non-flow measures that can accomplish realistic goals for the environment and the Bay-Delta before considering a flow-centric approach.</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>
118	1	<p>We here in the valley need the water for our crops so we can feed the world! And so the powers to be won't use the water for power trip games!!</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>
119	1	<p>We have added solar to our home to help with the power shortage and hired a gardener to reduce our water use in the sprinkler system to help save water. We have done this without complaint because we are part of this community. However, now I am presented articles in the local paper which we cannot handle without complaint. In the Modesto Bee today 9/28/16 was an article that indicates that the Modesto area will be turned into a "dust bowl", by the diversion of water from the Sacramento River to Southern California. This water will be back filled by water taken from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers to offset the salt water intrusion into the delta.</p> <p>We are but one family who live in the area. We are but one family that cannot start over again. We also still work and live in the area and we support our neighbors in agriculture who also cannot just move on and give up their family's multiple generations of work.</p> <p>Someone in Sacramento needs to listen to the concerns of the local people that are going to</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>take the direct losses that the Governments actions will cause. Losses covered in the paper estimate \$1.6 billion in economic losses. Also noted in \$167 million in farm production losses with another 6,576 jobs corresponding to \$330 million in wage losses. What will happen to the overall area economy? What will happen to our home and it's market value if no one lives here. Or another way to look at it no one lives here that can afford to support a home valued at \$400,000.00. The only answer I can see is a crash of the local community. This is the same community that we live in.</p> <p>Two of our children have already left this area saying there is nothing here for them. Nothing? I have a hard time arguing with them when I look at the current opportunities offered to young adults in this area. So now with all the hard work of our community leaders, Sacramento will take the water and in doing so destroy the local economy?</p> <p>Please Mr. Brown, listen to the local government and try not to destroy something that to us is a life's work.</p>	
120	1	<p>We support your 9/19/16 letter to the State Water Board on the minimum flow standards on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta. The State Water Board has proposed a dangerous water policy that will damage all of us in the seven county region (Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador and Mariposa Counties). This proposal to nearly doubling the amount of water used for fish flows from our rivers and lakes is disastrous for the economy, ecology and community. We are pleased that you have recognized the concerns of communities throughout our region about the negative impact these policies that put fish first, people second.</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>
120	2	<p>The Lake Tulloch Basin is home to about 10,000 people. Without heavy Sierra snows, we will be threatened as we were last year with the draining of our lake which is the sole source of water. New Melones Reservoir that feeds into Lake Tulloch was drawn down to just 10% of its capacity in the middle of the drought last year. Independent research found that 80% of the fish died due to too warm water. The fish flows didn't work. In May of last year 30,000 acre feet of water valued at \$21 million was released to move a only nine fish down stream.</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>
120	3	<p>We urge you to take action to insure that you and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact of these policies on seven counties with a population of 1.7 million people with major agricultural production. We urge you to insure adequate public input on by extending the public comment period to at least 120 days. We also request that three public hearings be held in Modesto, Stockton and Merced which provide for public comment from these seven counties.</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>
120	4	<p>According forecasts there may be limited precipitation this year. If draining of our reservoirs continues and we have inadequate precipitation to fill them, the policies of the State Water Board will make a bad position even worse.</p> <p>Therefore, we urge you to take action and suspend anymore water releases for fish enhancement until we have know if there is enough precipitation this winter in order to refill the reservoirs. We also urge you to request President Obama to have the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and Commerce to suspend the use of the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed a balanced plan that considers drought situations.</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
121	1	<p>I am opposed to increasing unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River. I believe it is a waste of water.</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>
122	1	<p>First of all, I would like to thank and commend you for engaging in the particularly complex process of determining instream flows to the Bay Delta ecosystem. As a long-time resident of the Bay Area (San Francisco and now Berkeley), the health of San Francisco Bay is important to me and my family, and we know that the health of this signature natural feature and the species within it is dependent in large part on adequate instream flows.</p> <p>However, I am concerned that the range of 30% to 50% that you have set is below the levels recommended by various state agencies, including the Department of Fish and Wildlife, which has based its recommendations for instream flows of 50% to 60% on scientific understanding of the freshwater flows required to restore chinook salmon in the watersheds that feed the Delta. I hope you will continue to insist on adequate flows for the health of our state's wildlife and watersheds.</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>
123	1	<p>Water Supply:</p> <p>While I compiled nearly 30 pages of excerpts and anomalies within the SED report, I have decided that the most important points that I need to address are related to the incorrect SED analysis regarding future anticipated flows down these 3 rivers. The SED chose to create a very simplistic model over a period of time that is not representative of today's situation, illustrated by the dismissive statement in Chapter 21 (the Drought Evaluation Chapter):</p> <p>"Therefore, although there were more dry years with less than average runoff during the last 12 years (8 out of 12), the severity of these dry year periods (i.e., cumulative deficits) were similar to other dry year periods in the historical period of 1922-2003 used for the environmental assessment of the LSJR alternatives."</p> <p>The model constructed for the SED does nothing to account for two clearly obvious and noted impacts in the SED report itself: the increased frequency of drought years, and the decrease of snowpack and precipitation which result in decreased water availability in all years--wet or dry, and the cumulative impact on water storage. The SED offers no analytics on the potentials for and impacts of such.</p>	<p>Chapter 21, Drought Evaluation, provides an analysis of the frequency and severity of dry years, using the annual (WY) percent of average runoff as the metric for identifying (and normalizing) the sequence of runoff for the past 94 years. The fluctuation in runoff from year to year is one of the major characteristics of California's rainfall and runoff. The runoff sequence for the SJR tributaries was quite similar; there were several years and multi-year periods (20 percent of years) with runoff that was less than about 50 percent of the average runoff.</p> <p>Table 21-2 shows the range of annual average runoff percentages, but does not indicate how many of these low runoff years were together (in sequence). The chapter does explain that the largest water supply effects would occur during a multi-year sequence of low runoff years, and the magnitude of a dry-year sequence was evaluated as the total deficit of water compared to the average runoff in each year. Several 3-year, 4-year and 5-year dry-year periods have been observed in the past.</p> <p>Potential future changes in the long-term average runoff, or the seasonal pattern of runoff (i.e., less snowpack and snowmelt) are certainly possible; however, these anticipated climate effects may not substantially change the annual fluctuations in runoff, nor the average length of dry-year sequences, which would still produce the largest water supply effects (i.e., substantial reductions).</p> <p>Each tributary was evaluated in Chapter 21 with reference to the average annual runoff. Chapter 2, Water Resources, describes the water supply, reservoir storage capacity, and existing required releases for fish habitat as percentages of the average runoff. Large reservoirs (&gt; average runoff) are important facilities for preparing for future dry years; the tributary reservoirs would be operated in much the same way, regardless of the plan amendments. Chapter 14, Energy and Greenhouse Gases, Impact EG-5 discloses potential changes to the hydrology under climate change. Chapter 14, also summarizes and incorporates the hydrologic effects associated with climate change as described in the California Water Plan Update 2013, Chapter 3, California Water Today; Volume 2 regional reports for San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and Chapter 22, Ecosystem Restoration (The California Natural Resources Agency and DWR 2013). This information is also consistent with information contained in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins Climate Impact Assessment (USBR 2014, 2016). Section, 14.2.3 Climate Change: Climate Change Effects on State Climate Trends, acknowledges annual precipitation may experience a declining trend; however, there is a "high degree of scientific uncertainty that still exists with regard to characterizing future climate characteristics and predicting how various ecological and social systems will react to any changes in the existing climate at the local level." Chapter 14 (Impact EG-5) acknowledges a reduction in water supply and water supply reliability associated with climate change, based on the documents cited above. Chapter 14 also acknowledges potential decreases in snowpack and heavier and</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>warmer storms in the winter.</p> <p>Impact EG-5 addresses climate change as it relates to the plan amendments and the State Water Board’s responsibility to protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses. The analysis under Impact EG-5 determined that climate change would not significantly affect the LSJR alternatives, because adaptive implementation would allow agencies to respond to changing circumstances with respect to flow and water quality that might arise due to climate change. Furthermore, the required review and update of water quality control plans, accounted for in the program of implementation, continually accounts for changing conditions related to water quality and water planning such as climate change.</p>
123	2	<p>A quick analytic study of the 10-year decadal cycles illustrated in the SED Figure 2.4 shows both increasing frequency of dry years (fewer average or wet years between the dry years), and also, more importantly, an increase in computed slope of the decrease in total rim dam water storage when water years 2010-2015 are added. Assuming 40% flow requirement and projecting this slope over the next decade for the Stanislaus shows a probability of .872 of at least 1 year where the supply assuming all of Melones carryover plus 100% diversion would be under 400,000 acre feet (which would be far short of that needed for ag and downstream human water supply), and there would be no water remaining in the river.</p> <p>On just the Stanislaus River, reservoirs can hold a total of 2.85MAF of water. Quoting from the SED:</p> <p>"The carryover storage [of New Melones] was full (2.4 MAF) in 2011 and was reduced by about 500,000 AF in 2012, 2013, and 2014. The carryover storage at the end of Water Year 2014 was about 520,000 AF. The low runoff conditions again in 2015 resulted in reduced diversions (425,000 AF) and very low carryover storage (267,000 AF)." Note that this is considering diversions at current levels, and would be exacerbated if 40% or 50% flows were required in the preceding years to 2015.</p> <p>267 TAF is a critically low volume of storage, and in another dry year such as 2014 with less than 300,000 AF total runoff, meeting the needs of core beneficial uses such as water supporting human life and farming would require emptying of all storage on the river, and would place significant burden on groundwater pumping. Moreover, it would create a completely dry Stanislaus riverbed which I would guess would not be beneficial for the fish or delta salinity at Vernalis. Again, the SED offered no analytics or probability analysis of the potential for even more frequent dry years --only statements such as the following:</p> <p>"Annual precipitation may experience a declining trend, but remain highly variable, suggesting that the Sacramento Valley will be vulnerable to increased drought. Warmer temperatures will lead to increased precipitation in the form of rain, both of which will contribute to decreased snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. Such effects will translate into earlier snowmelt and increased potential for flooding."</p> <p>"As a result, reservoirs in the basin, including New Melones, New Don Pedro, and Lake McClure, are likely to fill earlier and release excess runoff [because these dams are also for flood control] thereby potentially limiting overall storage capability and reducing water supply (USBR 2014, 2016) [even in normal and wet years]. These changes have implications for water quality, water supply, flooding, aquatic ecosystems, energy generation, and recreation throughout the region (USBR 2014, 2016)."</p> <p>I will note here without further quotes from the SED, but all of this is supported by</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments regarding the programmatic scope of the SED, State Water Board approach to analyses, use of best available science, and response to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Please see, Chapter 21, Drought Evaluation, regarding the analysis of the frequency and severity of dry years, using the annual (WY) percent of average runoff as the metric for identifying (and normalizing) the sequence of runoff for the past 94 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.7, Greenhouse Gas [GHG] Emissions and Analysis, for information SED consideration of GHG emissions.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding carryover storage and the LSJR program of implementation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for discussion on the intended use of modeling for CEQA purposes and WSE model assumptions.</p> <p>Figure 2-4 is a Vicinity Map of Irrigation Districts and does not show frequency of dry years.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>statements in that document, that the overall impact of decreased water storage is a decrease in clean energy from hydroelectric plants, an increase in groundwater pumping which increases electrical demand, and both adverse impacts will peak during the hottest part of the summer and early fall when agriculture needs and air conditioning demands are greatest. Without hydroelectric power, electric plants burn gas or oil which increases the CO2 load and depletes our natural resources, and, of course, thermo-electric production is one of the greatest users of clean water. Finally, clean water for consumption and daily living becomes even more costly for those families who can least afford it.</p> <p>I would ask that the Water Board staff prepare detailed analyses of the cumulative water storage impact of implementation of the LSJR Alternatives 1-4, with and without adaptive Implementation, first showing what would have happened if those alternative flow requirements had been put in place in 2004 at the end of the last decadal cycle, and performing the analysis across water years 2004-2015, and then projecting over the next 10 years assuming 10% reduction in total rainfall in all years, and a continuation of the current trend of dry to wet years using the last 30 years (not 1922-2003).</p>	
123	3	<p>I'm sure that the Water Board has heard a lot about fish in the many hearing sessions, but I would just like to provide one quote from the SED by the Board's own hired expert reviewers relative to any program of increased flows:</p> <p>The Independent Review Panel concludes that "the very low recent survival rates seem unlikely to be high enough to support a viable salmon population, even with favorable conditions for ocean survival and upstream migration and spawning success for adults" (Hankin et al. 2010).</p> <p>The SED offered no probability analysis evaluating cost against the likelihood that even with increased flows and added pulse flows fish will not return in any significant numbers. Many people have stated in the various hearings that the economic impact numbers in the SED are far short of reality, and others have asserted that habitat and many other factors not affected by flows are also critical to repatriation of native fish. In fact, there has not been an objective measure of success established in the report--how do we even know that the effort and expense has been worth the cost?</p> <p>It would be useful to the Board's and public's understanding of the futility of trying to restore some unstated number of fish to create a probability model that provides cost-benefits across a range of realistic scenarios, and taking into account the expected destruction of habitat that dry riverbed would cause based on the suggested modelling above.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 20, Economic Analyses, Section 20.1, Introduction, and Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, for a description of how economics was considered in the SED and the tools used. As described in Chapter 20, "The purposes of and the analytical framework for these analyses are (1) to compare potential changes in surface water diversion-related economic effects of the LSJR alternatives, and (2) to describe the potential costs of compliance with updated water quality objectives for the southern Delta. Although the analyses conducted to address these two purposes are presented together in this chapter, this should not be interpreted as an attempt to compare relevant costs and benefits of the LSJR alternatives or of the SDWQ alternatives." Please see Chapter 20, Section 20.3.5, Effects on Fisheries and Associated Regional Economies, and Section 20.3.6, Effects on Recreational Opportunities, Activity, and the Regional Economy, for quantification and evaluation of the commercial and recreational benefits associated with the plan amendments. Finally, please see Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for a discussion regarding ecosystem services and potential benefits and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for the justification and description of the plan amendments for protecting fish.</p>
123	4	<p>Water Quality:</p> <p>On the subject of water quality for protection of southern Delta farming, the SED points out that current flows are maintaining reasonable salinity levels, so no added flows are necessary at this time. This is partially because (as pointed out in SED table 3.6) the combined CVP/SWP export ratio is based on the flow at Vernalis. I can only conclude, therefore, that the reason for including this objective is looking toward the future when the Governor, and I assume through actions of this Water Board, allow additional transports of northern delta water south through the CVP and SWP which today has pumping contracts totaling 8.34 Million Acre Feet (although they pump only about 3 MAF annually). It is certainly true that removing another 1.5 MAF from the Delta would require significant</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.3, Southern Delta Water Quality, regarding the protection of Southern Delta water quality and the obligations of DWR and Reclamation to meet salinity requirements. Please refer to Master Response 2.5, Baseline and No Project regarding VAMP.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information related to the California WaterFix.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>mitigation in southern delta flows to keep the salinity at levels conducive to crop production.</p> <p>On that subject, as an anecdote for consideration, I submit to you that the Governor's "Twin Tunnels" proposal would cost between \$20B and \$50B depending on the source of information. The Carlsbad Desalinization plant in SoCal cost just south of \$1B and produces 60,000 AF of clean water /year. Instead of tunnels which still rely on NorCal water, if the state was to build 25 desalinization plants like Carlsbad --their combined output would be nearly 1.5 MAF--equivalent to ½ of all water currently imported to SoCal and the Central valley today, and more than sufficient to satisfy the needs that the tunnels will supposedly fill. This alternative has the unique benefit of being independent of seasonal rainfall and virtually immune to climate change.</p> <p>California needs a greater water supply and not more creative ways to allocate and divert water. There have been several national and international studies on ways to produce clean water from desalinization, industrial discharge, and grey water, and the Board and public should be demanding that California move efforts forward toward increasing supplies and storage and quit playing the diversion game. The SED is silent on alternatives to increasing river flows which could greatly enhance water availability in the southern Delta.</p>	
123	5	<p>I would like to remind the State Water Board of their highest priority based on their authorizing legislation --the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which the SED cites as the authority for these decisions states clearly in section 106:</p> <p>"§ 106. It is hereby declared to be the established policy of this State that the use of water for domestic purposes is the highest use of water and that the next highest use is for irrigation."</p> <p>And, further, in section 275:</p> <p>"§ 275. The department and board shall take all appropriate proceedings or actions...to prevent waste, unreasonable use, unreasonable method of use, or unreasonable method of diversion of water in this state."</p> <p>Given the statements in the SED, and the summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in table 18-1 where "Significant" and "Significant and Unavoidable" impacts dominate the increased flows columns, it is clearly unreasonable to try to turn the clock back 100 years to a time when we guess that fish populated the rivers, although don't really know in what numbers, we don't really know what the flows were, nor do we really know the conditions leading to their survival, and we certainly don't know if any strategies we take today will bring the fish back.</p> <p>What we do know with absolute certainty is that climate change is here to stay, and its cumulative impact will be less water for California. If the State and its various agencies do not take action now to significantly increase the available clean water supply, and storage for that water, no water games the Board can play will save the State from disastrous economic consequences.</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>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process for information regarding the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and the authorities of the State Water Board under Porter-Cologne.</p>
124	1	<p>Please do not take water away from people and food production by increasing unimpaired flows on our rivers. Water is the first building block for life. Without it, everything 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>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		crumbles.	
125	1	This letter is written to state that I support the Plan Amendment's provision to increase flows in San Joaquin tributaries to 40% of unimpaired flows. I understand that this will be fought by irrigation districts. It is time for them to give a little for the benefit of the millions of Californians who live along these rivers, and for the creatures that have been extirpated, or nearly so, for the revenue of these irrigation districts and their customers. As a Californian and an American, I have an interest in these rivers, the people who enjoy them, and the creatures they support. The irrigation districts need to curb their abuse of the public assets and of the Endangered Species Act.	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.
126	1	I implore you; the people who "control" the destiny of water in California to heed the findings of our scientific community which has concluded that decreases of water diverted from the rivers are needed to prevent the continued decline of the Delta/S.F. Bay and increase their future viability. This requires increases of water that continues through the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta to San Francisco Bay and decreases in water diverted south through the pumps/canals. Stand up and do the right thing to preserve 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.
127	1	In the past our water was taken from our area and given to the LA area. We as citizens and farmers here have to conserve and fret, while those who have no requirements indulge in our water. That is happening again with these new regulations	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.
127	2	Government is making it extremely hard to be a farmer in one of the most fertile areas in our country. People want food but forget that it has to be grown and harvested. Due to our location we are blessed to be able to farm so many commodities. Government choices are going to cripple the industry if allowed to constantly divert our natural resources to other locations.  Please consider the Central Valley farming community when you are making these decisions. We have rights to our 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.
127	3	"Our region's leaders--supervisors, water district board members, employment officials, etc.--must be ready to refute poor analysis and correct any bogus data. With substantially less water, jobs will disappear, land values will fall and less will be collected in taxes. A congressional report already calls us the Appalachia of the West; with less water, we could be the Sahara."  The Modesto Bee, Jan. 22, 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.
128	1	I am opposed to increasing flows on the Stanislaus and other rivers because agricultural businesses need water to grow our food. A decrease in agricultural profitability in our area would cripple the economy in the Central Valley.	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.
129	1	I am also proud to be one of the millions of Californians who appreciate our magnificent environment and have, time and again, rallied to protect our resources by meeting and even exceeding calls to conserve water resources when a drought requires it. For example, over the past decade people who use Hetch Hetchy water have decreased their water usage by 30%. As Californians, we understand the importance of living in balance with the other species that share our natural world, and our state leaders are wise when they aim high and create policies that reflect this balance among competing uses.	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
129	2	The proposed 2016 update to the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan does not aim high enough. Scientists with the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife have determined that it's necessary for 50 to 60% of the waters flowing through the Delta, the San Joaquin, and its tributaries (the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus) to flow freely during the spring (February through June) in order to protect the fish and wildlife that depend upon this water for their survival. The proposed Plan only calls for a 40% flow rate during this crucial time each year, and this could drop to 30% under certain conditions. This is not acceptable.	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.
129	3	Reducing the water flow blocks fish passage, increases water temperatures, and concentrates toxic pollutants -- all of which will negatively impact the commercial salmon fishery that provides thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions in annual revenue.	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.
129	4	While the proposed rules would send more water to agricultural users in the Central Valley, there are other ways to maintain a vibrant farm economy in California. More efficient irrigation practices, replacing water intensive crops such as alfalfa with higher-value, less thirsty crops, and better management of snowmelt are among the options that would maintain an adequate Delta flow rate.	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.
129	5	Californians have demonstrated that we are willing to do our part to protect the balance among various beneficial uses of our precious water. It's time for the policy makers to step up and give us a set of rules that we ALL can live with. Please set the Bay Delta spring flow rate for the 50%-60% that's needed to maintain a healthy California 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.
130	1	Based on everything I have read, it appears the State Water Board wants to increase the flow to the rivers but refuses to look at other scientific solutions which may help the salmon by first eliminating predators.	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.
130	2	I am a lifelong Democrat who has voted for Jerry Brown and supported all his policies. I do not support this water plan. It has the potential to devastate the community I live in which is dependent on ag business. I am not a farmer. I live in a residential neighborhood in Salida, where I have seen our tract home value decrease due to the lack of landscaping (dead now after 4 years of drought) and our neighborhood looks like a wasteland due to the lack of 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.
130	3	The decision in a vacuum the Water Board makes will have far-reaching impacts on both farming and communities. This goes way beyond the well being of fish.  It is my expectation as a taxpayer, Democrat and supporter of Jerry Brown that the State Water Board work as hard as is necessary to find a solution and compromise with area water districts where we can all win. There are solutions there and you smart people should be able to come up with a win-win for all. To do anything less is insanity and I will then assume there are ulterior motives to play fast and loose with our 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.
130	8	I understand that you must develop policies that benefit all of California. I do not see how the SED proposal as written can benefit all Californians as a whole.	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.
131	1	Please, when you make decisions, remember that our grandchildren and their children will be drinking the water we protect today.	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.
132	1	Thank you for working to preserve and enhance our endangered fisheries and waterways.	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
		Thank you for increasing water for our rivers.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
133	1	Concerning the Stanislaus River, why haven't you pursued more options in raising the limit of catching bass fish or look into predator suppression programs?	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding comments that make recommendations without explanation or supporting information.</p> <p>Non-flow measures were considered in Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions, Section 16.3, Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives – Non-Flow Measures.</p> <p>For responses to comments regarding the need of flow in protecting fish and wildlife, and a detailed clarification of predation as the non-contributing factor to salmon population decline, 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>
134	1	Your plan to increase river flows will devastate our area economically.	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.
134	2	Reasons to oppose the plan include: Chinook salmon are not on the endangered species list; you are not addressing predation by non-native bass; there are no wild Chinook salmon left as they are all hatchery fish; build more hatcheries if you want more 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.
135	1	The economic impact your plan to raise unimpaired flows will have on the Central Valley will devastate my town and county where my family has been farming and ranching for decades. Please leave our rivers alone.	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.
137	1	Stop taking our water so that you can have beautiful green golf courses in So Cal. This is a water grab, and you are killing the Central Valley's ability to feed the world with our agriculture, not to mention the economic damage to the already 3rd most impoverished area in the state and the most drought devastated area in the state. For God's sake, STOP! LEAVE OUR WATER ALONE. Reclaim the vast salt water for consumption and non-potable issues.	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.
138	1	It's not right to take the water from our farms and lakes as you propose to do by increasing flows in our rivers. We depend on our water for living.	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.
139	1	This is our home. Our communities depend on the water to work, eat and live. Please rethink your plan to increase river flows in our region.	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.
140	1	It is becoming clear that the State Water Resources Board has an agenda and is not taking into consideration the economic impact this proposal to raise river flows will put on our area, nor are you considering scientific data produced by OID, SSJID, MID and TID that shows opposing views to your proposal. Hearings are being held, but no to avail; the Water Board is not listening. As I stated, there's an agenda here and it's the Water Board's way or the highway.	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.
141	1	The plan will not restore the native salmon population. For whatever reasons – probably related to predatory non-native species in the Delta – the salmon population is already gone. All fish coming up the Stanislaus River (and those are previous few) are planted salmon. No native salmon have come up the river to spawn this year. This means that the insane water management policies that have release millions of acre feet of water since this program began in 208 have accomplished exactly nothing in terms of saving 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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		population.	
141	2	The plan would flush even more millions of acre feet of precious water into the rising oceans to the tremendous detriment of agriculture and all of the local economies dependent on agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley. The Water Board's estimate of \$64 million in losses to agriculture is so grossly underestimated as to barely dignify a response – and the reason is that the Board cynically responds that farmers can merely pump water to make up the losses from surface water, all while the State pushes forward with efforts to monitor and eventually regulate how much water farmers can pump from aquifers under their own land.	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.
141	3	The plan is the product of an arrogant state agency which has deigned to shove this down the throats of growers - hard-working families like ours who have been raising crops in California for over 100 years - simply because they are answerable to no one, including the voters or even elected officials.  Stanislaus County Supervisor Bill O'Brien had it right when he said, "This is not about fish. This is about the twin tunnels, and Jerry Brown's hell-bent strategy to leave his legacy."	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.
141	4	I urge you to reconsider this terrible plan. If you insist on moving forward, you will be met with resistance like you have not seen before, for you are now encroaching on the livelihoods and very existence of thousands of farm families - and we will not go down without the fight of the century.	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.
142	1	This water grab of yours will destroy our local economy and related jobs.	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.
142	2	It will eventually destroy the aquifer because farmers and cities will be forced to pump to replace 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.
142	3	Try some other ideas like reducing the non-native striped bass.	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.
143	1	California communities and industry need a reliable water supply. Allocating hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water for unestablished environmental goals to the detriment of all other water users is unacceptable. A decade of simply increased water flows for temperature control, salinity mediation and other reasons has done little to improve the environmental conditions of the fish species. In addition, this approach does not have substantial public support.  Any plan should have a majority of public support within the plan 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.
144	1	Your proposal to cut Central Valley water is misguided. We have enough "wild caught salmon" served in high end restaurants. Let us continue to feed the rest of the Nation with milk, pork, beef, vegetables, fruit, and other healthy and inexpensive foods.	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.
145	1	Your proposal to let more water from the Tuolumne and Merced rivers into the ocean is flawed and will hurt more people that it will help. Large and small farmers will have to drill wells to replace the lost water. Smaller farmers will find it impossible to finance wells large enough to replace the lost water. Well permits are difficult and slow to get. Government	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
		may restrict well permits as water tables are reduced.	
145	2	It is questionable that more water will help the salmon industry. Do we need more restaurants offering "wild caught salmon"? We believe that the production of milk, eggs, vegetables, fruits and nuts is more important to 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.
146	1	<p>The state of California is very unique, it is rich in natural resources, a diverse ecology, strong food producer and an abundance of water that supports all that I have mention and them more a very strong bountiful agriculture, beyond our boundaries. The sun connects us to plants, plants feed us (directly or indirectly), the soil provides what the plants need and the water connects the soil to the plants- If we intend to feed the people, ourselves of this nation and beyond we have to think about providing the farmers of this fine state with the necessary resources they need to produce. This only addresses the social and moral responsibility that we have in this country. Agriculture is our number one industry in this state now and will be- perhaps!</p> <p>We have farmers, many generations deep in agriculture, that are now facing their ability to produce the very food that we all need. This is not a "fish" issue it brought to us by a very self-serving group minority of environmentalist that are probably at the public in many other ways. These very same people have no clue how to feed themselves, let alone how to those in need.</p> <p>Governor Brown, has shown his personal agenda now and long standing since his first elect many years ago- We as state are the cornucopia of this nation and perhaps the world we have a responsibility. We provide food- food that is needed by many- this is not about making farmers rich it is about "Food"!</p> <p>The farmers on the east side of this valley will have to resort to pulling water from the ground, costly and hard to find, but they will survive but the "savings account" of the ground water will soon be gone - then what?</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.
146	2	I believe the politicians of California are wrong to be cutting these types of resources measures "behind closed doors", with the help of the self-serving Governor of this state. Put the right people in the room to make the correct decision for now and our mutual benefits of mutual future- politicians need to ground themselves in the real issues of this state, not a bullet train that serves little! Do your jobs!	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.
147	1	Please set Delta Water levels at a level appropriate for our native salmon. We as humans have a responsibility to sustain habitat for other creatures.	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.
148	1	<p>I believe the SWRCB has an obligation to not only increase river flows in the Tuolumne and Stanislaus to protect native salmon fisheries, but also to decrease the salinity of the Bay Delta. This is not just for the benefit of the survival of native aquatic species like salmon, but will also raise the groundwater tables along these rivers and the Delta, in particular, and help recharge these groundwater levels in the Central Valley that are vulnerable to saltwater intrusion. The Central Valley's agribusiness and sprawling have over-drafting their groundwater, leaving these underground cavities dry and subject to saltwater intrusion, particularly in the Delta.</p> <p>Historic, hydraulic gold mining, and hydroelectric and reservoir dams and agribusiness have decimated an ancient and sustainable food source for California – the massive salmon runs.</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>It's time to put agribusiness on strict water conservation techniques like drip irrigation, and restrict increased Central Valley sprawl, and prioritize salmon recovery before they become extinct. While at the same time, prioritizing the ground water recharge of the riparian corridors with these increased river flows. Agribusiness would make every single aquatic species go extinct, and let every river turn into an algae-contaminated canal, because they have an insatiable economic need that can only be stopped by forward-thinking, State Water Resources Control Board regulations to increase river flows. Thank you SWRCB for thinking of the environment that has been systematically destroyed since the Gold Rush. Because modern humans only stop the destruction, when we're forced to.</p>	
149	1	<p>What use is it to waste all this water and money on some harebrained idea about saving the salmon, when we all know what this is all about. Jerry Brown wants the extra water flow to meet federal mandates for salinity in the delta, so he can build his tunnels and ship our water south to his cronies. Meanwhile, we will be losing our jobs, farmers will be losing crops and businesses will be failing. And we won't have any more salmon than we have right 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>
149	2	<p>If you really want to increase salmon, try getting rid of non-native species such as striped bass that devour young salmon before they have a chance to reach the sea. You can easily do this by increasing catch limits and decreasing size requirements. And it won't cost a dollar or lose a job or business or farm. And it will make money by increased fishing license sales. Now there is a win-win idea. Oh and we'll actually have some water to fish in.</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>
150	1	<p>I am strongly in favor of the Water Board proposal to increase, to at least 40% of unimpaired flows, the river flows from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers. The fish and wildlife need the additional water to survive and flourish.</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>
151	1	<p>I do not agree with your plan to increase river flows. It will rob us of our water rights.</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>
152	1	<p>It appears to me that policy for pulse flows and unimpaired flows is ahead of science. I would like to see unimpaired flows and pulse flows to be reduced immediately, allowing time for the science to catch up and either refute or confirm this policy.</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>
153	1	<p>Sending our fresh water into the ocean when we need it in the valley for agriculture and human consumption needs is not helping the salmon and is hurting the valley. Any water from our watershed should be allocated first to our valley for our needs. Waters sent south should only be our excess water. When our development is limited due to lack of water, while development continues in the south using water from our valley, is criminal and simply unfair.</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>
154	28000	<p>I urge you to increase the flows into the delta to at least 50% of the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced, and lower San Joaquin natural flow rates.</p> <p>Please make the right decision to make our rivers healthy again -- this is a huge step towards long-term sustainability of our water systems and the wildlife and humans that depend on them.</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>
155	1	<p>I consider myself as one who cares about the environment, but this water and "save the salmon" thing has gone too far already! To say that we have to listen to science, have more water flows and that will improve our ecosystem is totally false. We have been sending</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>more water out to the ocean the last years and our fish population has not improved at all! The fishing industry and environmentalists do not pay for any of this water that we just send out to the ocean. They should have to pay what cities and farmers have to for this water, and maybe then they would look for more realistically at the problem. A lot of people are hurting because of what this does to our economy.</p>	
156	1	<p>Keep Delta water here.</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>
157	1	<p>I find this deplorable. This does not develop a legacy for our grandchildren or assist in maintaining the waters of California. These changes are to develop an ecosystem that puts human beings second. California cannot continue to be an experiment for religious environmentalism. We need common sense that puts food and humans first.</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>
158	1	<p>I want you to know that I support efforts to keep the Delta healthy and restore salmon habitat on the tributaries of the San Joaquin River. Instream flow standards must be set.</p> <p>The Water Board should listen to the fisheries scientists and biologists and set the bar higher. I urge you to set the instream flows at 60% to ensure the salmon and the Delta ecosystem survive.</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>
158	2	<p>With scientists warning that California will get less rainfall in the future due to global warming, it is also time that coastal cities incorporate de-salinization plants into their municipal water districts. Alameda Water District has a de-sal plan in Newark, California where wind and solar panels could produce three times more than they produce now and not just from brackish ground water. The de-sal plant in Carlsbad, California is the model of a true answer to fresh water needs all up and down the California coast leaving plenty of water to maintain the 60% flow of our natural rivers, while supply to the agricultural needs of the state could be met with the rest. This could also be the answer to replenish our ground water aquifers because surface water could be used instead of pumps deep in the aquifer. The problem is "cheap water" from our streams and rivers and the cost of de-salinization infrastructure and energy costs without wind and solar power. Alameda County Water District found that, during the drought, when water costs went up, de-sal was cheaper than purchased water from surface water based Hetch-Hetchy.</p> <p>With sea levels rising, and our 700 mile coast line, sea water converted to fresh water using renewable energy provides a never ending supply of water while allowing the fifth largest economy in the world to keep attracting business and supplying the abundance of agricultural products even if we experience extreme climate change conditions. You cannot build a bigger reservoir than the Pacific Ocean.</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>
159	1	<p>On Oct. 9, the Modesto Bee ran an article titled "Alarming findings on SF Bay Health".</p> <p>Scientists from the Bay Institute and UC Davis explained how the SF Bay and Estuary have been damaged and "is being choked by a lack of fresh water" due to water diversions and recent drought. The effects of this are not just felt by salmon, but by all organisms in the ecosystem, and these effects are far-reaching.</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>
159	2	<p>I have hiked, canoed, swam, inner-tubed, and backpacked along most of the Tuolumne River. I have drank water fresh from Lyell Glacier. I have marveled at Water Wheel Falls in the Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne. I have watered my garden and fruit trees with water</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>from the Tuolumne. In most places in Modesto I can open a tap and drink water from the Tuolumne. The Tuolumne River is very precious to me. The health of the river and the downstream estuary is important to the entire State of California. I hope that all of us living in this part of California can find some common ground, to include an increase in the flows and health of our local rivers.</p>	
160	1	<p>If we take the drought that we are living through as seriously as Australia took their drought, we would already be doing much, much more. There is so much about our water system that we could reform. If these reforms took place, we could restore flows to the Delta.</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>
161	1	<p>I am opposed to your proposal to raise unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River because it will impact the farming community.</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>
162	1	<p>I believe it is critical for us to protect habitats by maintaining as much water flow for wildlife -- including salmon and other species -- as possible. This is not just an aesthetic issue; our existence on the planet is more and more precarious as we change the natural environment and divert water away from ecosystems. The chemistry of the Delta is changing in dangerous ways and producing neurotoxins that can sicken people and destroy plankton and other wildlife, and pollutant concentrations that threaten our health as well as that of the waterways.</p> <p>I would like to ask that water flows be sufficient to inundate floodplains, which are important habitat for juvenile salmon and fish, and for there to be better snowmelt management, with fewer water intensive crops. Water use in the Hetch Hetchy area decreased by 30% between 2006 and 2016 as a result of water conservation, and I believe that by working together and thinking differently we could see similar great results here.</p> <p>Please work to ensure that water use management protects our natural environment for years to come.</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>
163	1	<p>As a Central Valley dairy farmer, without water, our dairy and farming operation would not exist. Our employees would be out of work and the ripple effect would reach countless other companies who depend on our business--towel service, tractor sales and service, fuel, feeds, veterinarian, semen sales and breeders, accountant, banker, insurance companies, dairy equipment sales and repair, electric and power companies, pharmaceuticals, tallows, hoof trimmer, pump and well service, trucking, and many, many more.</p> <p>All of us will be affected, not just as farmers, but as residents of the state of California. This will challenge our food safety and the price of food will increase dramatically, as without water, supply will not be able to meet the demand. Please consider your families and your trips to the grocery store--where many take for granted the safe, healthy, bountiful food supply that awaits us each time the door slides open--before making such drastic decisions.</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>
164	1	<p>Your proposal to increase river flows doesn't make any sense. The dams were there for our benefit -- farm, recreation and flood control. That is our valley's life blood -- water. Water for our drought years and water stored for flood control. Water saved for our community. The biggest scam is the theft of our water to serve communities hundreds of miles away. It certainly is not about the fish. We have predatory fish eating the native salmon and rainbow trout. Stop the predatory fish, work with our water districts. But it is not about the fish, is it?</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
165	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase flows on the Stanislaus and two other rivers because it will devalue all the farm ground in the San Joaquin Valley, cause food shortages and crumble the economy of the whole valley.	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.
165	2	This is a form of taxation without representation. The water board is appointed, not a true representation of the people who have lived in the valley for generations. Please listen to the informed input of the irrigation districts and towns that are affected.	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.
167	1	Water is scare during a drought, and what if we have an extreme drought and we have let the water out for the fish, where does that leave the humans? If we had an extreme drought that lasted for an extended period of time, we won't have sufficient water sorted for humans.	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.
167	2	I have had a few conversation with some of the biologists from FISHBIO and they tell me their study shows that releasing more water did not help increase the fish, specifically the salmon 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.
167	3	<p>This season we have had great amounts of rain and the river is flowing almost at capacity even while New Melones Reservoir fills up. Spring rains and snow melt should be enough to fill New Melones and keep water flowing down the river, so why the need to release more water?</p> <p>I am against releasing water for "the fish" when it doesn't impact the fish and puts humans at risk.</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.
168	1	I am writing to you to express my strong support for the current proposal to increase flows on the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced rivers to at least 40% of the unimpaired flows under natural conditions.	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.
168	2	My Grandfather and Great Grandfather farmed in the Central Valley, using water from the Stanislaus river for their crops, and I understand the need for irrigation water in this semi-arid State. However, I also recognize human ingenuity and our ability to adapt, and I feel strongly that we can correct the heavy impact we have had on the streams in California. I support keeping more water in the rivers for fish, improving the water quality and keeping the water temperatures closer to normal levels. I support your plan to keep more water in the rivers!	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.
169	1	Your proposal to increase unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers is a waste of our water used for recreation and irrigation. It's also just another made up EPA cause.	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.
170	1	We have witnessed massive degradation of the SF Bay Delta habitat, with the greatest damage done by large irrigation projects such as the system of export aqueducts leading into the desert of the Central Valley. It will be heartbreaking for Gov Brown to realize that his father's and his own greatest legacy will be the destruction of California's greatest fish and wildlife preserve, if these water transfers continue.	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.
170	2	My Stockton Smith Canal waterfront property experienced annual turbulent swarms of feeder fish followed by flocks of cormorants as recently as 1999, but today the water is too low in oxygen, and too rich in algae blooms, as a product of farming and low water flow. Beaver, otter, birds, and fish cling to a precarious existence due to lack of water habitat My property value has dropped, but you insult me, as a taxpayer, to fund a corporate farm	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>scheme that will do little more than fill the pockets of billionaire farmers. If citizens in Los Angeles and San Diego understood the true cost and damage done by irrigation water exports, this Tunnels Project would be quickly voted down and forgotten.</p>	
170	3	<p>The health of the SF Estuary habitat is worth far more than what low wage enterprise can grow in the desert. If these corporate farmers are willing to invest to cover their true business expense, they must retain, conserve, recycle and pump solar desalinated sea water, probably at Moro Bay. Meanwhile, citizens of Los Angeles and San Diego need to rebuild their relationship with nature by focusing on their own program of 100% water recycling and retention of existing water resources, before importing from another part of the state. Stable water delivery begins with supplies not subject to drought, so spending billions on yet another water export project from surface water supplies is a huge mistake.</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>
170	4	<p>Please upgrade the SED to current standards of the scientific community, making a sincere effort to improve, not degrade, the habitat of the San Francisco Bay Estuary. Business farming enterprises south of Tracy must be served notice that water deliveries from Northern California watersheds simply cannot be ensured.</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>
171	1	<p>The fisheries experts have testified to the collapse of the state's largest wetland ecosystem. Now is the time to act and save the most valuable water resource in California.</p> <p>As a community, Smith Canal residents have worked hard to clean and improve our previously derelict Stockton waterway. But, pulling out shopping carts and mattresses isn't enough. We need fresh water flow. I have observed first hand from my boat dock, water quality decline, invasion of warm water oxygen consuming plants, decline of feeder fish and birdlife. These have virtually disappeared over the last 20 years that I have watched from my boat dock.</p> <p>You as the Water Board must peer into the future and consider your own personal legacies as well as your current responsibility to this great state. The scientific community predicted the ecological disaster caused by the California Aqueduct built in the 1960's, and you are well aware of data presented today that has led to the current collapse of the delta fish and wildlife population. We now also are facing Climate Change drought conditions and of course expanding population, so there are many unknowns for what the future holds, but it's likely less, not more water supply.</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>
171	2	<p>I am familiar with the low wage economy of Central Valley farming. I have observed anecdotally massive expansion of corporate export agriculture in all parts of the state even during these drought years. There is a reckless disregard for ground water resources in the south Central Valley that is heavily dependent on Delta water exports. There is less regard for air and water quality in south Central Valley region, and there is a strong expectation in Los Angeles, Fresno, and Bakersfield, that Stockton and 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>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Delta residents should pay for and support these cities unsustainable economies.	
171	3	<p>If there is to be balance, the Water Board must include all water supplies in South San Joaquin catch basins and groundwater supplies. No further water diversion construction nor increased flows in Northern California should be contemplated until the Los Angeles Watershed is completely restored, catch basins expanded to meet maximum flow capacity so water can be tapped and treated for drinking water supply.</p> <p>I really think that the Board needs focus on localizing water supply to improve Delta habitat and water quality to build its legacy.</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.
172	1	I strongly support the Bay Delta Plan, which calls for higher unimpaired flows of at least 40% from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced and lower San Joaquin Rivers to the Bay- Delta. It is absolutely necessary that we protect our natural environment.	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.
172	2	<p>I've read that the SFPUC is opposed to this measure and claims that we, SFPUC customers, will see a 42% reduction in water allocation during drought years. I expect that we WILL face some cutbacks in our water allocation but believe their calculations are off, as shown by the Tuolumne River Trust. The recent drought has shown that cities can cut back on water use without great harm to our economy.</p> <p>As individuals, cities and farms, we can all do our part to "Make every drop count" and protect our beautiful rivers -- an important but perishable part of our ecosystem and, our children's birthright.</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.
173	1	Please do not force our farmers out of business by reducing their water flow by 40%! I don't live in the valley, but I realize that California needs our farmers to remain a vital cornerstone of our 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.
174	1	With increasing drought a sobering reality, we must do all we can to mitigate the effects of reduced water resources in our watersheds. The survival of species is of critical importance	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.
174	2	Please listen to science and set water flows to 50 - 60% so that salmon and the salmon ecosystems can survive.	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.
175	1	I'm tired of our water being wasted to save some stupid little fish. I'm tired of the dogooders around here. We need that water. Please do not increase flows in the San Joaquin tributaries.	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.
176	1	Water for farming is more important than the delta 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.
177	1	Please protect the Delta's water. No more should go to unsustainable agriculture. We need the Delta to remain healthy.	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.
178	1	<p>After sitting through the public hearing with the State Water Board in Stockton, my opinion that we are in big trouble prevails!</p> <p>I came out of the meeting thinking that nanny people and even the State Board was not aware of how the river systems are being operated. The benefit provided through the years</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>on the flows is that it runs all year long, and how moving forward with their idea of unimpaired flows will devastate the State economy.</p> <p>Not really respecting historic rights of the river with an assortment of other problems on facts that the Board is using, gives me little hope that the farming and rivers best interest will be served do to a minority influence.</p> <p>Please table this, save water, and work with the districts that know the river systems before destroying the economy future of Northern San Joaquin Valley for all times.</p> <p>Maybe you should look at what you will be doing to the Human race. . .</p>	
179	1	<p>This continued socialist madness will turn us into a 3rd world basket case. I grew up on a small dairy farm and worked in the wine industry for 40 years. I have seen how liberal policy over the years has destroyed everything it touches. Wasting precious water on fish is not the answer. I urge you to stop this madness before it is too late.</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>
180	1	<p>To whom it may concern: I vehemently oppose the legislation to take 50% and more of the Sacramento River water for the greedy Farmers and the L.A. area.</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>
180	2	<p>The sneaky tactic Diane Feinstein used to get this passed will go down as the most dastardly dead ever done by our so called representative in Washington. She should be expelled for doing this the people of Northern California. I used to support her, but this cuts the cake I will do everything I can to get this repealed and this ancient dinosaur of a congresswoman out of office. She is well connected to the farmers and water people who would ruin the most important estuary on the West Coast. Tell her this. Diane you are a traitor to the very people who support you. Time for this ancient cow to leave office.</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>
183	1	<p>I disagree strongly with the notion now being pitched by corporate-farm and regional growth advocates that any fresh water running to the ocean is "wasted." It is natural and desirable that California rivers run to the sea, and that they do not become just the sum total of all the pesticide and herbicide-laden farm runoff and sewage outfalls from the cities and farmland along their banks.</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>
183	2	<p>Central Valley and Sierra water consumers (and I am one of those) must understand that it is time to live within their means, water-wise, that it is time to end water demand for continued urban growth and corporate farms expansions.</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>
183	3	<p>The "irreversible damage" to his district claimed by Representative Bigelow for increased river flow is actually the irreversible damage caused to the Central Valley underground aquifer caused by over-pumping it faster than it can ever be replenished. Over-pumping is permanently destroying the water-carrying capacity of this aquifers, which is a finite resource that has been, and is, grossly overused.</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>
183	4	<p>Upstream water consumers must understand that their water demands will have a negative impact on downstream consumers: farmland lost to salinity, destruction of wildlife habitat and wildlife, loss of human recreation, etc. Water is a very finite resource and what is demanded and taken by one group of users will now negatively affect others. There is no free lunch.</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
183	5	<p>Every area wants more than its share of water these days, whether it is to fuel continued urban growth or for corporate farm expansions. I do not doubt that Central Valley/Sierra water consumers will keep demanding more and more San Joaquin River water until its flow is nothing more than the sum of all the farm runoff and sewage outfalls from the cities along its banks.</p> <p>To reduce flows in the river introduces salinity to the farmlands further down along the river, putting those farmers out of business. It also impacts all the life downstream along the river: animal, plant, and human. I suppose the State Water Resources Control Board is trying to find a balance to all the competing demands. It ain't gonna be easy. . . . Somewhere along the line we have to say enough is enough, and try and live within our means.</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>
184	1	<p>The current outdated plan allows more than half the water needed for the Delta's ecological health to be diverted away for unsustainable Big Agriculture on the west and south San Joaquin Valley. A permanent reduction of exports must happen to protect the Delta. And if the beauty and economy--including ag, tourism, etc.--of the Delta are not in and of themselves are not worth protecting, then surely the influence of the Delta on the entire SF Bay and broader region are. This is a vital ecosystem and a vital life giving resource to several inter-related ecosystems regionally.</p> <p>Ironically those who wish to kill the Delta ecosystem to bolster unsustainability elsewhere, are in the long run only killing themselves; and in the short run, they'll kill a lot else 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>
184	2	<p>What is the true efficacy of this update to SJ flow standards if water exports from the Delta are not going to be dealt with? The San Joaquin River must reach Chipps Island in order to restore, protect, and preserve the entire estuary. Further, water quality standards must be protected for agriculture, drinking water, municipal discharge, fisheries, and ground water recharge.</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>
184	3	<p>You members of the Board must also consider environmental justice communities in terms of drinking water and domestic use. As it stands, Phase 1 Recirculated Draft SED fails to consider environmental justice communities in chapters 5 and 9 (hydrology/water quality and groundwater).</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>
184	4	<p>I urge the board to do what is right--sustain the Delta! In so doing, you are sustaining a wonderful, life giving estuary that we are blessed to call our own and you are securing a vital part of California's future sustainability.</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>
185	1	<p>I do not think taking more water from the region's rivers is a good idea. It will greatly impact our groundwater, our agriculture and our economy! Many of our neighbors have already had dry wells and trees that have suffered due to our water being cut back!</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>
186	1	<p>I'm very concerned that you are even contemplating release of Lake Don Pedro and Lake McClure water, the lakes are for the first time looking like lakes in years! The rivers are flooding and you want to release my drinking water? I've had many of my trees die due to water restrictions unable to plant vegetables that we would eat. What if we get no rain next year? The year after? With all due respect leave our water alone, do not release our water!</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>
187	1	<p>You have the difficult job of balancing the wants and needs of all water users. There will be winners and losers. How do you decide?</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>You should be guided by the California Constitution. The Public Trust Doctrine is "an affirmative duty of the state to protect the people's common heritage in navigable waters for their common use." Court decisions have broadened this principle to include natural habitat protection. (Retrieved from <a href="http://www.slc.ca.gov/About/Public_Trust.html">http://www.slc.ca.gov/About/Public_Trust.html</a> on Jan. 13, 2017)</p> <p>Your priority should be to make sure the needs of a healthy habitat for the aquatic species living in and around our waterways. These life forms cannot write you a letter. They have needs for survival versus the wants of people. Human beings are very adaptive and have modified and found solutions for their water needs and wants for years. Wildlife and plants do not have alternatives for their habitat as they cannot move. They cannot adapt in the short time span that humans can alter water flows.</p> <p>The Public Trust Doctrine requires us to be the stewards of the habitat needs of aquatic species and should have priority over our human wants. Accordingly, aquatic species need 60% of the natural flow in order to survive. They should receive what they need to survive. We humans can find alternatives for meeting our water wants.</p>	
188	1	<p>I. California Can Expect More Droughts in the Future:</p> <p>As I am sure you are aware, California is now in the fifth year of major drought. You also know that severe droughts have occurred cyclically since 1900 and in the previous 400 years before that.</p> <p>II. Many farmers in the San Joaquin Valley have been forced to forego planting crops for the last few years, and water use is tightly regulated .</p> <p>III. California also has a severe energy shortage.</p> <p>A. More than 90 percent of all natural gas used in the state is imported in pipelines from Canada and the Rocky Mountain states.</p> <p>B. Many of the coal burning electrical generators in Nevada and Utah transmit much of their energy to California along power lines. Soon these plants will no longer be allowed to sell their coal sourced electricity to California.</p> <p>IV. Water and energy shortages can be reduced with the same new technology.</p> <p>A. I have completed research and testing on ways to recover dissolved natural gas that resides at great depths in saline aquifers.</p> <p>B. A feature of my patent-pending Sand Bed Methane gas production process is the requirement to pump saline ground water to the surface prior to separation of dissolved gas.</p> <p>C. My original plan was to return virtually all of the produced water to the same aquifer from which it was produced in order to guard against surface settlement. However, if the water is produced from deep, consolidated rock aquifers, settlement is unlikely.</p> <p>D. Much of the saline water could be treated economically.(using a small portion of the associated dissolved gas for the energy source) and made available for irrigation 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>western counties of the San Joaquin Valley.</p> <p>E. For example, if only half (50%) of the produced water from 100 wells, each pumping 500 gallons per minute, were captured for treatment and sale, then the daily amount of "new" water would be:</p> <p>about 40,325 acre-feet per year</p> <p>F. If each of the 100 wells produced 400 thousand cubic feet (MCF) of dissolved gas per day, the annual production of gas would be <math>(100) \times (400 \text{ MCF}) \times (365) = 14.6 \text{ Billion Cubic Feet (BCF)}</math>, worth \$47,450,000 at a likely gas price of \$3.25 per MCF.</p> <p>V. Quantities of Saline Ground Water in Place</p> <p>A. Hard "bedrock" sandstones penetrated in oil and gas wells from about 4,000 feet to 8,000 below ground level (BGL) near Patterson in Stanislaus County average at least 25 percent porosity. That is, about 25 percent of the bulk rock volume contains holes that are saturated with saline water and dissolved gas.</p> <p>B. The net sandstone thickness in that same interval is approximately 3,000 feet.</p> <p>C. Each township (36 square miles) around Patterson contains approximately 17,000,000 acre- feet of saline ground water in the interval from 4,000 feet to 8,000 feet BGL, awaiting capture as "new water." That is water that has never been developed, and water rights are not yet assigned.</p> <p>VI. Recharge to the Deep Aquifers</p> <p>A. A potential problem to consider is dewatering of the deep saline aquifers. However, the same layers of rocks that are deeply buried near Patterson are exposed at the surface in the mountains of the Diablo Range west of the Great Valley.</p> <p>B. Long term average precipitation in the mountains varies from 10 to 20 inches per year, dependent mostly on elevation.</p> <p>C. The area of the Diablo Range underlain by the same bedrock formations that are prospective for dissolved gas in the San Joaquin Valley is about 20 miles wide (east to west) and 200 miles long (north to south), allowing an area for recharge by precipitation of 4,000 square miles.</p> <p>D. A conservative average annual precipitation is about 15 inches, or 1.25 feet per year. The average annual amount of precipitation (P) available for infiltration into a portion of the Diablo Range would equal the amount of water in feet times the area in acres (one square mile contains 640 acres).</p> <p><math>P = (1.25 \text{ feet}) \times (4,000) \times (640 \text{ acres}) = 2,560,000 \text{ acre-feet per year}</math></p> <p>E. Recent publications on ground water recharge into bedrock of semiarid mountainous terrain have concluded that approximately 10 percent of the annual precipitation is absorbed into fractures and pore spaces of rocks exposed on the surface. Water will then flow through the shallow vadose zones into saturated aquifers.</p>	

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Recharge into the aquifers is about 256,000 acre-feet each year</p> <p>VII. Comparison of Water Production to Annual Recharge</p> <p>A. The amount of water that could be recovered for treatment from 100 wells (40,325 acre-feet per year) is about 16 percent of the likely annual recharge to the bedrock aquifers from the Diablo Range.</p> <p>B. Therefore, if all of the calculated Diablo Range recharge were to be produced from wells scattered along the west side of the Great Valley, water from more than 600 wells (241,950 acre-feet) could be made available to drought stricken farmers without equaling the likely average annual recharge of 256,000 acre-feet to the bedrock aquifers.</p> <p>C. In the very unlikely case of no recharge to the saline aquifers, production of 241,950 acre-feet from 600 wells located in five townships along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley would develop water in place of at least <math>(5) \times (17,000,000) = 85,000,000</math> acre-feet. That amount of water, produced at the rate of 241,950 acre-feet per year, would last for 351 years!</p> <p>VIII. Proposed Reduction of Agricultural Water Use</p> <p>WQCP1.0188</p> <p>A. California's farm acreage is about nine million acres, while farm water use is about 31 million acre-feet. That gives a statewide average irrigation of about 3.44 acre-feet per acre of farm land.</p> <p>B. The projected reduction of withdrawal of waters from the San Joaquin River system for fisheries protection ranges from 30% to 50% of flow, with a starting point of 40 percent. Under the 40% unimpaired flow (UF) proposal, average annual in stream flow from Feb-June would increase by 288 thousand acre-feet (TAF), or 26 percent. That amount of new restriction to farmers would result in approximately <math>(288,000/3.44) = 83,721</math> additional acres of land that must either be fallowed in dry years or required to find alternative water supplies.</p> <p>C. Estimated unmet agricultural surface water demand would include the projected increase in shallow groundwater pumping (105 thousand acre-feet), along with the predicted range of "increased unmet agricultural water demand" of 137 to 182 TAF/yr.</p> <p>D. The highest estimated shortfall that must somehow be met would then be <math>105 + 182 = 287</math> TAF/yr. That is virtually equal to the amount of the proposed increase in annual stream flow (288 TAF/yr). In other words, every increase in stream flow would be a gain for the fisheries, but an equivalent loss for the farmers.</p> <p>IX. Summary and Conclusions</p> <p>A. Most of the water to be produced along with dissolved Sand Bed Methane gas from relatively shallow zones in the San Joaquin Valley (2,500 feet to 4,000 feet belowground</p>	

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>level) should be injected back into the same aquifer(s) from which it was produced. The purpose of disposal into the same aquifer(s) is to maintain aquifer properties and to avoid surface settlement caused by collapse of subsurface loose sands and clays.</p> <p>B. In contrast, half of the water produced from deep, bedrock aquifers may be retained for use without fear of settlement. That water will be replaced annually by recharge of the same aquifers under the Diablo Range mountains, and the volumes of pore spaces within the rocks will be preserved by naturally occurring cements such as quartz, calcite, and siderite (an iron carbonate).</p> <p>C. As much as 256,000 acre-feet of "new water" can be made available each year to alleviate drought conditions in the San Joaquin Valley of California without reducing the quantities of water present in the saline aquifers.</p> <p>D. Sale of the annual production of dissolved gas from only 100 wells would be sufficient to repay the investment required to drill the wells and construct water treatment facilities in less than three years.</p> <p>It is time to get started developing saline ground water and associated dissolved gas in the western San Joaquin Valley.</p>	
188	2	[ATT 1:] Full Scale Test Dissolved "Sand Bed" Methane Production from a Saline Ground Water Aquifer Gill Ranch Gas Field, Madera County, California	This attachment was included with the comment letter. The attachment does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue.
189	1	You are wasting our water by flushing it into the ocean. Use some common sense. People are more important than a few fish. We need the jobs that the water creates. Farming creates more jobs than fishing. So stop this madness! Do not increase unimpaired flows.	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.
190	1	I absolutely oppose your plan: Believe it is simply a long term ploy to make up for lost Sacramento river waters due to the twin tunnels (if/when installed) diversion; will be even more extremely harmful (to people, not hatchery planted fish) than your current "fish flow" policies.	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.
191	1	We are writing to request you would reconsider the facts and have an open mind to the findings the TID and the MID have presented to your office as a solution to the water issues.	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.
191	2	I understand that you are doing what you think is the best for the environment and I commend you for that. But, we as a farming family feel that we have been good stewards of the land and realize that you have all the power to change our lives forever. So, we are asking you to reconsider and work with us and not against us, that we could all live in this farming community and help to preserve the rivers for everyone's good.	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.
192	1	Please conserve our precious water and not let so much flow out to the ocean.	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.
193	1	Sending the majority of the Sacramento River water to the ocean will deprive farmers of the water they need to grow crops. Farming is a multi-billion dollar industry in California. Curtailing water deliveries to farmers will harm them financially, but more importantly it will significantly negatively impact tax revenue to the state of California. This will impact the entire state. This is a bad idea.	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
194	1	I commend the water board for announcing the plan to save our Central Valley fish populations; however it falls short of the science based flows needed to do so. I am asking you to reconsider after examining the science.	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.
194	2	<p>I am asking the water board to review agricultural growing regulations which need to be updated due to the shortage of water available for the burgeoning population in the state. I would suggest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Crops grown in the desert like conditions, along the I-5 corridor below Fresno, be limited to low water required produce.</li> <li>2. All new crops in CA must be irrigated by drip and existing non-drip applications be subject to a 5 yr. replacement of overhead watering with drip systems. The state should have a program with rebates for such practices if they don't already exist.</li> <li>3. The State of CA should create an agency to replace private water contractors as many are making money from selling water as well as growing their crops.</li> </ol>	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.
194	3	We at North Bay Trout Unlimited have worked over the past 40 years to provide habitat for Coho salmon and steelhead trout. For the past two week we are excited about the early runs which haven't been seen in over ten years. The prime mover has been more 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.
195	1	I highly don't approve of any further destruction of California's farming operations by the diversion of this winter's small water predictions. This plan needs to be scuttled. The people in favor of wasting anymore water on non-benefitting fish should be recalled from office, including moonbeam brown. The only thing to happen will be all non-aggressive workers forced to make up taxes generated by the farming industry and I for one am sick and tired of paying for this government's stupidity.	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.
196	1	<p>In the past years I have irrigated pasture for my cattle operation. I believe it is very important for the ground water situation that certain steps be taken to assure drinking water to those residences that rely on wells.</p> <p>Leave as much water behind the dams which will force water into the aquifers and stabilize well levels.</p> <p>Use as much surface water as possible on farmland to deter the use of wells for irrigation.</p> <p>These wells often pump out 2,000 gallons per minute. That is a lot of water that could be used by households.</p> <p>Put a moratorium on drilling new wells in dry land areas.</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.
196	2	<p>For the salmon:</p> <p>There were more salmon spawning in the Stanislaus River this year than there were spawning nests available.</p> <p>Remove any fishing limits on Striper Bass in the delta. They are invasive and eat many of the salmon fry as they try to get to the ocean.</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
		I often wonder how the salmon fared during droughts before there were dams to hold water to enable them to come up stream.	
196	3	Begin cutting the amount of water sent to southern CA and build dams down there to store water for residential use. Each year less water should be sent south as they adapt to water saving landscaping and storage of their own water. In addition, there is a need for more R&D and building of desalinization plants for all coastal communities.	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.
197	1	I can't figure out why you want to waste so much water. Please stop this madness and support water conservation.	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.
198	1	I am in my late 60's, and have been fishing the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers since 1974. During this time I have witnessed a significant decline in the number of spawning Chinook salmon. The decline has been gradual and persistent long before the current crisis draught. The decline followed the construction of New Don Pedro and New Melones Dams. New Don Pedro in particular caused a substantial reduction in spring outflows in the Tuolumne.	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.
198	2	I fully support the decision of the Board to increase outflows into the Delta. However, I feel that at least 50% of the natural flows should be released to flow to the ocean. This is based upon the 2010 study Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem that determined that release of 60% of the unimpaired flow from February to June would fully protect the riparian and riverine environments.	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.
198	3	Local agricultural interests will scream and moan that any water released is water wasted. They are the same folks who expanded almond acreage during a drought and have caused precipitous drops in the water table. It's time for big agriculture to play a more responsible role.	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.
199	1	<p>I am on the side of science and data. Therefore, I would like to go on record as vigorously opposing this effort to waste the water that those, who came before us, have carefully and with much fore site provided to us with our current reservoir system.</p> <p>Also, the timing of the decision to increase water flows reveals an ignorance and arrogance from the members of the water board. If no reservoirs existed, how much water would be available for the fish then? Maybe this cycle is critical for the ecosystem.</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.
199	2	I am somewhat glad that the board overstepped the boundaries of common good and rational thought as this is probably the most effective way to defeat such elitist attitudes in our state government.	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.