

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
201	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase river flows in our region. It will hurt the local economy, the aquifer and agriculture.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
203	1	<p>Setting the flow standards on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta is a very significant policy issue in this time of drought.</p> <p>Nearly doubling the amount of water used for fish flows from our rivers and reservoirs/lakes when we should be primarily focused on conserving and creating more storage will be disastrous for the economy, ecology, agriculture and our rural communities.</p> <p>I am pleased that you have recognized the concerns of communities throughout our region and the negative effect of policies that put fish first over people.</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.
203	2	In February of 2015 the residents of the Copperopolis area were put on notice that a possible drawdown of Lake Tulloch would occur. This warning ignited significant response from the community. The media coverage has done by and large an excellent job of revealing the impact of failed environmental policy on our community. The Copperopolis community and communities throughout the Sierra foothill region of California are engaged. The Biological Opinion document by the federal government's National Oceanic Administration's Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service in 2009 along with the Endangered Species Act has led to the "fish flow releases" portion of this bad policy. What happened to conserving water in a drought, there seems to be no accountability for the negative consequences. The fish flows continued in 2015 even though we were in the middle of a serious drought and had serious ramifications. This region of nearly 1.8 million people is suffering from dangerous water policy that will damage all of us in the seven county 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.
203	3	These policies have also negatively affected the potential of increasing the salmon population. The Striped Bass were planted in the delta and are attacking salmon as predators. The planted Striped Bass have now been declared as a native fish. Striped Bass should be regulated to control this problems, where is the management. State regulators now want to punish agriculture, our communities, and region for bad policy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
203	4	The Lake Tulloch area, Ruolumne and Calaveras Counties is home to about 10,000 people. If we do not have a good rain and snow season in the Sierra, we are threatened as we were last year with the draining of Lake Tulloch our sole source of drinking water. New Melones Reservoir above Tulloch on the Stanislaus system was drawn down to just 10% of its capacity last year. Independent research found that 80% or more of the fish died because the water was too warm for the releases to be of any help. The fish flow releases are poor policy. Last year in May a release of 30,000 acre feet of water valued at approximately \$21 million was released to move nine fish downstream.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
203	5	<p>I hope that you take action and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact of these policies on the seven counties with a population of 1.7 million people with major agricultural production. These counties include Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador and Mariposa Counties.</p> <p>I urge you to take the following action steps for adequate public input by extending the public comment period from 60 to 120 days. We also request that three public hearings be held in the cities of Stockton, Modesto and Merced to provide adequate public comment.</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
203	6	We need to build more storage, additional surface and underground storage. The population of California has grown by approximately 42% since New Melones was built and state surface storage has only increased by 3%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
203	7	I support you in taking action to suspend anymore water releases for fish until it is known if there is adequate precipitation this winter in order to reasonably refill the reservoirs. I urge you to ask President Obama to have the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture and Commerce suspend the use of the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed responsible policy that considers the best interest of the agricultural community and the rural communities involved.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
204	1	Your unfair water grab has potentially devastating consequences for people and the regional economies in the valley where agribusiness directly contributes more than \$6 billion annually to Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties. It also would be bad news for the foothills, where New Melones and Tulloch reservoirs are located. The state estimates the economic blow to the region could be \$64 million a year. I think that's way, way too low.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
205	1	I am part of a fourth-generation family farm. Your proposal to increase flows on the Stanislaus River and others will have devastating financial hardship on our family. Without our current water supply, we will not be able to continue our farm operation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
206	1	Please do everything possible to ensure a 60% in-stream flow of water to the delta. We must preserve the fish. Agriculture is important but so are fish. When they are gone, they will not be back.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
207	1	I do not support your plan to raise unimpaired flows in our rivers. That water could be put to better use by farmers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
208	1	I agree with Assembly member Frank Bigalow that you need to make sure the ground water is not depleted in California. We are just as important as the fish and global warming.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
209	1	<p>As you are aware the State Water Resource Control Board recently released draft flow objectives for tributaries of the San Joaquin River, including the Tuolumne River. While we [The San Francisco Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club] applaud the SWRCB for taking these needed steps, these objectives do not fully provide for the flows needed to restore and maintain aquatic and riparian ecosystems of the San Joaquin watershed.</p> <p>We understand that SFPUC may be especially impacted under some interpretations of the 4th Agreement between the SFPUC and the Tuolumne River Irrigation Districts. Still, SFPUC customers have repeatedly demonstrated their ability to conserve and their desire to be good stewards of the Tuolumne watershed, the Delta and SF Bay. If you, and groups like ours, do effective public outreach and education we can meet human AND environmental needs for water. We urge you to express publicly and to the State Board SFPUC's support for environmentally responsible flow objectives for the Tuolumne and ultimately all California rivers.</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.
210	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and our other rivers. This country needs all the food our state can produce. If we short the farmers on water, we will eventually run out of food for all of us. We can't grow crops or grass for beef if we divert all our water elsewhere.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		It is time for common sense. Keep the water where it belongs for the good of us all.	
211	1	<p>It was with great concern that we received the initial revised draft substitute environmental document (SED) which outlines proposed changes by staff to the Water Quality Plan for the Bay-Delta Program. As written, this proposal has the potential to negatively impact communities and the economy in Merced County. I appreciate the State Water Resources Control Board's (Water Board) effort to coordinate a briefing for the Merced County Board of Supervisors at our board meeting on October 18, 2016.</p> <p>While this briefing will be a positive first step in opening initial dialogue between Merced County and the Water Board on the SED, it must be followed with a substantive public hearing in Merced County attended by each of the Water Board members. This will afford the Merced County community the opportunity to discuss with the Water Board the effects this proposal will have on the Merced River and the extended plan area in Merced County. Each of the three tributaries to the San Joaquin River is unique and the impacts of the flows proposal may have different consequences that need to be addressed by each community in separate public hearings.</p> <p>A proposal of this significance cannot be rushed through without appropriate time for local agencies to provide feedback and input, especially since our repeated requests for collaboration prior to the release of the revised document were denied. A sixty-day comment period is inappropriate for a 3,000-plus page document that took four years to develop. We strongly urge you to increase the public comment period on the revised SED.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.</p> <p>Please note that a public hearing was held in Merced on December 19, 2016.</p>
212	1	Please make decision wisely for future generations to enjoy what we enjoy today or improve on.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
212	2	I beg you to revise your targets to 60 percent of unimpaired flows percent that fisheries scientists agree are needed for ecosystem health.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
213	1	Thank you for setting instream flows, but please remember that the science demands that the flows be set higher to save the salmon. It's not just one fish. It's a choice between maintaining a healthy web of nature for all beings, including human beings, or creating a world out of balance, slipping toward extinction.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
214	1	<p>I'd like to comment on the ongoing battle over water with regard to AG demand and minimum flow requirements for the Sacramento/San Joaquin river Delta. I've followed the battle over water for decades now between those who would like to pump more and those who would like to have some sort of minimum flow requirements established. Back in the early 90's President Bush signed the CVPIA (Central Valley Project Improvement Act) that was supposed to help restore Salmon and other Anadromous fish species to certain levels. While a few things were implemented from that legislation, most of it has fallen on deaf ears. Since then AG use in the state has expanded and fisheries have suffered. The one thing that has been discussed for decades is setting minimum flow requirements for the Sacramento river. Once that was established then exports of water could be determined.</p> <p>That's never happened and AG crops in the state have gone from 40% permanent crops, 60% row crops to now the opposite. 60% permanent crops/40% row crops. The only flow requirements in the system that have been established have been in the San Joaquin river system. And that's only have this went to court for 15 years. Even now after this contentious agreement was finally agreed to by both sides, you have Central Valley Legislatures trying to</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>undo this.</p> <p>the State Water Board has the opportunity to stop the over pumping and establish minimum flow requirement. It's long overdue and now is the time to for the board to put some equality back into the system. It seems a few large AG growers are more concerned about how many nuts they can send overseas vs. preserving what we have at home for species that depend on water flow. I'm not against us growing our fruits and veggies. I am against what has occurred over the last two decades with ever increasing demands on Sacramento river water. Water is a finite resource but we can do more with less. Fish and Wildlife can't.</p>	
214	2	<p>This comes down to just plain Greed now. If the state would focus on updating EVERY sewage treatment plant within the state to Tertiary 3 levels we could recycle a lot of water and take pressure off the Sacramento river system. Build more desalination plants. Mandate that AG throughout the state invest in drip systems everywhere. The flooding of orchards in the central valley is now a prehistoric method of delivering water. I drive through the valley and still see rain birds shooting water 40 feet in each direction on 95 degree summer days to water a new orchard. That is unacceptable and should not even be allowed these days.</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.
214	3	I understand you have a chance to update the outdated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. When doing this, please do the right thing and establish minimum flows for wildlife before any additional water is granted to Corporate AG. It's high time balance is put back into the system.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
215	1	Those of us who depend on the water are more important than fish. We pay taxes, we vote and we live in the affected communities. very study shows the diversion didn't help last year and won't help this year. Think of the taxpayers or get your salary and career from 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.
216	1	I STRONGLY OPPOSE the new water proposal which directs water to leave our farmers without enough water for their crops!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
217	1	I do not support your idea to increase river flows in our region because of the negative impact locally and the apparent unfairness of the releases compared to other area reservoirs.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
219	1	<p>Your Amendment to plan has a very negative effect to the California Agriculture which generates 42.6 Billion Dollars to California's economy! The related Economic Activity generates over 100 Billion Dollars in related Activity.</p> <p>Has there been a independent study made on the effects to this vital contribution to our economy and the negative impact on employment and the 100 Billion Dollar related activity.</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.
219	2	<p>The environment is important, however it must be balanced with caution to negative impacts that may have much greater results than anticipated maybe even years of disastrous proportions.</p> <p>Bottom Line is your plan is too aggressive!</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.
220	1	The water belongs to the people, not some political activated group. We also have a right to use the lake for fishing, and other recreational purposes, and at its present level it is almost	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		impossible. New Melones Reservoir was built for preventing flooding in high flow times and saving water for when there was lack of rain and snowpack, not for the greed of a few corporate farmers or to give cheap water to highly populated areas. STOP DRAINING THE LAKE. Don't raise flows on the Stanislaus River.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
221	1	Please save/store water for farmers to prevent hungers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
222	1	I am against this Plan Amendment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
223	1	<p>This letter represents only one of many concerned Citizens who reside within the boundaries in which your board is proposing to deprive of this much needed resource. Our water is needed for our human life and agricultural needs. It's also necessary for keeping things sanitary and keeping diseases at bay. The water in this region belongs here!! No one has the right to take away this vital resource for any reason! We will fight to keep our water, whatever that takes. We will not quietly lay back, and let you divert our resource elsewhere. We as Citizens, have the right to pursue what is necessary for our own preservation.</p> <p>And through our own preservation, can we help others. This is why I'm asking your board to rethink this proposal.</p> <p>All this will do is cause hardships on many in this region.</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.
224	1	I am writing to ask you to set water flows in the Delta at levels that scientific studies show are needed to protect the species and habitat of the Delta. Water has been used for human purposes without regard to their environmental impact for too long. It is time to base water flows on studies that take into account the reasonable needs of the fish and other species in the Delta. Please set water levels and releases at the amounts that are needed 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.
225	1	<p>The almond farmers in California are flooding their crops with thousands of gallons of precious water in order to make millions of dollars. Bigalow and McClintock are just fine with this, even if it kills off species.</p> <p>It's time to consider the consequences, not just the money.</p> <p>I live in the foothills. I conserve, because I am not selfish. I care about the survival of all species and my own need for water. Almonds are good, but I can live without them. (They have become too expensive anyway).</p> <p>I'm a voter and I'm not voting for the water grabbing politicians.</p> <p>Stop the water grab for special water wasters in California.</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.
226	1	<p>Water is a public trust resource that belongs to ALL Californians and we count on the SWRCB to protect our Delta now with increased flows in rivers!</p> <p>Please do not let agribusiness continue to rape the Delta of the 60% freshwater flows it needs to be a healthy ecosystem. Californians rely on you to protect our Delta for water quality, for local farmers, for fish and wildlife, and for enjoyment of natural recreation areas. Why would anyone want to visit northern CA to see a dying Delta and SF Bay? We have an</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>amazing estuary that we need to value and ensure it thrives. Have the words "Public Trust" become meaningless?</p> <p>Send a message to agribusiness that it needs to stop irrigating lands that should never have been planted and to stop expanding permanent crops in times of drought. Where is the common sense in such foolish practices. The continued rape of the Delta means a sad legacy for future generations. Even if the millions of dollars for future restoration can be found, the Delta may be so depleted and destroyed that it will never be recovered and restored.</p>	
226	2	<p>At what point do we recognize enough already and say NO to the gluttonous and constant demands of agribusiness. These wealthy owners do not live in northern CA and do not love the Delta. They do not care about our amazing estuary or our quality of life in this region. They do not feel joy at the sight of egrets, cranes and waterfowl as they drive along highways. Their hearts do not fill with wonder at the beauty of the bays and marshes at sunset and dawn. They care only about their money. Do not let them run the show because they can spend time at hearings and throw money at studies to support their will.</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>
226	3	<p>Most of us that live in northern CA are quiet about our love for the rivers and the Delta. We rely on the voices of a few environmental organizations. And we rely on the SWRCB honoring the role of protecting our public trust resources.</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>
227	1	<p>Please do not increase flows in our rivers. Doing so will lead to more pumping from our aquifers. In the long run, the increased flows already implemented are not shown to help the rivers in a significant way. Short heavy releases may help the fish but sustained releases merely defeats the purpose of our dam system.</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>
228	1	<p>I have been following with great interest your proposal to increase flows in the San Joaquin. I am a huge fan of the delta. It is a fabulous recreation area, rich in migratory bird life, boating and fishing. But more than that it is a rich agricultural area. The water flowing from the 2 rivers keeps the saline balance in the bay and protects fisheries which have been badly impacted by the lack of fresh water in the delta. In addition, many people who live in the delta rely on the drinking water provided by these flows. Driving down route 5 I see the signs 'Is growing food wasting water?' To that I say 'Yes, If it is here'. Much of the land under irrigation is unsuitable desert with poison runoff. The delta offers farmland which is rich and historically full of smaller farms, unlike the vast conglomerates of Southern California. Please keep to your plan - 60% of flow is a lot better than we have now, although I would prefer more. The delta and all it's residents need your protection.</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>
229	1	<p>Has sufficient study been made on the effects the flow proposal will have on the groundwater? Over drafting of aquifers will cause land subsidence which is irreversible. An experiment which may or may not give the desired results could have permanent consequences to the water supply of California. This is not the legacy that the members of the State Water Board wants to be remembered for.</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>
230	1	<p>Please don't allow Gov Brown to ruin agriculture in my area. Please rethink your idea to require more water to be taken from farmers.</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>
231	1	<p>I believe this water grab will not produce more salmon (getting rid of the predator bass would be much more helpful).</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
231	2	It will devastate farming in the most productive area of California and it will destroy jobs among the poorer agricultural groups of people who are already barely getting by. Try to think long term. Look for solutions that keep our water safe and honor longstanding contracts!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
232	1	<p>The economic impacts to this region related to your plan to increase unimpaired flows are much greater than the water board has estimated.</p> <p>I am a farm appraiser and the reason we have higher land values here than in the Southern SJ Valley is due to our best costly and more reliable surface water supplies. Take more water for unimpaired flows from our districts with senior rights, and farmland values in these three counties will decrease across the board, whether the ground is fallowed or continues to be farmed. That will mean lower taxes for the counties, some farms going bankrupt, Ag lenders who hold mortgages here seeing a value decrease in a significant portion of their portfolio, destabilizing the financial market and bringing forth a farm depression akin to the early 1980's.</p> <p>The ripple effects are far larger than imagined and devastating to our region, all to provide more water for a modest increase in fish levels when the state has no scientific evidence that more water will equal more fish. The water board needs to go back to the drawing board and come up with a plan that has a greater likelihood of helping native fish with less dire impacts on the folks who live here.</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.
233	1	Your plan to raise flows in our rivers does not make sense. Saving 1,000 salmon will end up costing about \$260,000 per salmon. Use a hatchery. Plus the loss of energy and water for farmers. Not 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.
234	1	As a Californian, I spend a lot of time outdoors: exploring, traveling and recreating in our great state. I care deeply about protecting our environment and believe that we have an important ethical obligation to protect our natural resources for the benefit of future generations. To this end, I support creating instream flow requirements that ensure that salmon recover in the tributaries of the San Joaquin River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
234	2	<p>I value hiking and camping in areas where I can observe, study and enjoy thriving ecosystems. I love the stories that nature constantly tells, and it gives me great pleasure watching ecological interactions happen in the wild. Restoring river flows would revitalize ecosystems along the San Joaquin and its tributaries, creating increased access to hiking and camping in these areas.</p> <p>I value fishing with my young son. I want to be able to take him on fishing trips to these rivers and show him the beauty and abundance of salmon, who are now dwindling toward extinction. I believe we have an obligation to protect these fish to secure their existence for future generations. The consensus of scientists is that the most important factor affecting the recovery of salmon populations is the amount and timing of instream flows in these rivers.</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.
234	3	I value increasing biodiversity in human-impacted ecosystems in order to create resilience for these ecosystems. Climate change is already forcing significant changes in the dynamics of these rivers' ecosystems. By bringing back salmon, a keystone species, we can increase the biodiversity and health of entire ecosystems. Healthy ecosystems are more able to safely absorb the impact of changes in climate than are weaker, less diverse ecosystems.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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>The benefit to salmon from increased flow rates will better help the entire San Joaquin basin better adapt to changing climate.</p> <p>I value the existence of salmon for their own sake. I believe that no organism needs to be pushed to extinction by humans, especially when we have alternatives that would allow us to not overuse resources to the point of causing organism extinctions.</p>	
234	4	<p>Increased flow requirements will require all Californians, not just agricultural communities, to do more with Jess water. I sincerely believe this is a challenge that we all need to take on, rather than avoid or postpone. My family is doing all we can personally to reduce our household water consumption. Agricultural producers have taken good steps in recent years to become more water efficient, too. But they have taken these steps not out of a sense of stewardship, but because of economic drivers, such as increased water scarcity and costs. I have no problem with this being their motivation. What matters to me is the fact that they have been able to successfully meet these challenges. This shows that they have the ability to continue meeting increased scarcity. Raising flow requirements will increase water scarcity, and agricultural producers will do what many other industries in our state are already accomplishing: do more with less water. We are a smart, well-resourced state. Furthering the water efficiency of California's agricultural community is one of the easier problems that our state can tackle.</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>
234	5	<p>I hope the Water Board takes seriously what the community of scientists has already unequivocally said: average instream flow requirements must be higher than 40% for salmon populations to be protected. I hope you will make the right call of raising the instream flow requirements to the scientifically-supported level of 60%. Making this decision will ensure that we give the ecosystems of these rivers the best chance to recover and thrive.</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>
235	0	<p>I believe we once had about 6 salmon runs. It is such a token amount left. Please, do nothing to damage what little is left. Think of your grandchildren. And future generations. The science says we need 50 -60% flow. Please heed the science. Ag can learn to conserve water even more and plant in wise places. Protect our 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>
235	2	<p>Removing water, killing the salmon and smelt, effects the habitat in profound ways as science is now learning.</p> <p>Please heed the science and protect our last salmon runs with 50-60% flow.</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>
236	1	<p>Please give LESS, not more, water from the Sacramento River to Big Ag: they are greedy and already use too much of this water they have no rights to. This removal has already damaged our SF Estuary, and moved the salinity zone miles upstream. We need MORE fresh water from the Sacramento to flow into the Delta, which is a key nursery for the whole SF Bay.</p> <p>Please say NO TO THE TUNNELS.</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>
238	1	<p>It is continually disappointing how mindsets seem to believe that more and more "growth" is the only future! Without profound foresight, long-term vision and constant use of our reasoning ability we doom ourselves to repetition of and enlargement of past mistakes in judgement! California has far more people than it has natural water sources yet we now allow fracking and other major pollution of a resource far more precious to ALL life than any</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for a discussion of groundwater resources and the approach to the analysis contained in the SED.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>one group’s interests. The stuck-in-the-past thinkers who press for more dams and reservoirs seem oblivious to the huge cost in both money and environmental destruction from building dams PLUS the fact that it then becomes polluted by motorized watercraft fuel, litter of all kinds and suffers tremendous evaporation losses! Replenishing our underground water tables appears to be the ONLY genuine method of regaining even a small part of “good” water which we have utilized AND squandered in many ways.</p>	
238	2	<p>Too many vineyards have replaced FOOD in this state though recently we did see a news piece about dry-farming and how well it works for some vineyards. (Personally, I am a table grape fanatic and hope grapes as FOOD do not diminish.) The Web of Life already in place before we arrogant humans began to think we could do everything better is repugnant!!! We are a link in the chain of life and as a wise person once said, when we remove or damage a link or links to that chain, we affect the ENTIRE chain. Many informed individuals try to tell us how we’ve damaged our earth and are met with business interests who care nothing about public and planetary health, only their own little circle and profit. Yes, all that matters however the BIG PICTURE MUST BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL LIFE!</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 as well as a discussion of the State Water Board’s authorities and the consideration of beneficial uses.</p>
238	3	<p>Perhaps the 40% increase (or return to what WAS more natural) in river flow is anathema to those thinking only of their situation so perhaps that could be lessened 2-3% in poor rain/snow years then allowed (or even increased) during good rain/snow years.</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>
238	4	<p>Nothing is set in stone despite our attempts we are here for a mere moment in time when infinity is considered so how dare we think we have the right to disrupt the Web of Life to such an extent that it then has unintended consequences for decades to come? The natural order of life on this planet has rivers emptying into oceans, replenishing various life forms, chemical balances, etc. If we are to interfere with these needs we should do so in the least harmful manner, perhaps reversing SOME of the rivers’ waters for crops but NOT if it contains the over-load of fertilizers and pesticides that amoral corporations have foisted on us for decades. Our actions to undo so much of the natural order is resulting in fewer pollinating insects, major decline in Monarchs, resistant “bad bugs” which then “require” stronger toxins, less food for our beautiful and intelligent native (and migrating birds), over 100,000 chemicals in our environment (residues of which get into all water supplies and any in us) and these are only some of the awful issues we face resulting from our attempts to “control” and “conquer” nature for our benefit.</p> <p>We in California are more fortunate than most states due to some forward-thinking and a higher degree of responsibility about our environment. Nonetheless, materialistic interests with no foresight or conscience – only profit-motives – continue to degrade our state whenever they can with little or no thought (or even the intellectual concept) of resulting problems!</p> <p>It is my fervent hope that, despite the recent turn towards short-term profit and hang- the- future attitudes, the wiser, better educated and informed will be given AT LEAST an equal seat at the table on these issues. PUBLIC AND PLANETARY HEALTH SHOULD ALWAYS BE CONSIDERED. NOTHING IS MORE IMPORTANT AND NO PERSON, CORPORATION OR GROUP SHOULD EVER BE GIVEN POWER TO OVER-RIDE THESE FACTS!</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>
239	1	<p>I am writing to commend highly your efforts, through the updated Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan, to provide desperately needed freshwater inflow to the San Francisco Bay</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, and to ask, in the strongest terms I can (without using profanity), that you stand absolutely firm in those efforts to ensure the Plan is enacted without compromise.	
239	2	<p>It is, or should be, well known that no species – from simple plants to complex mammals – can survive, let alone thrive, on its own. All species are interconnected, and they all must have water. But humans, who like to fashion themselves to be the most advanced among earthly lifeforms, have been uniquely responsible over the past century, or so, for wasting and fouling – in unthinkable volumes – this most basic and essential life resource. And there are few ecosystems that show the devastating legacy of this perversity to any greater degree than the Bay Delta. You, yourselves have collected and reported many of the sickening data.</p> <p>It must stop. And, it must stop now!! For, if it doesn't, the rich biodiversity that graced and characterized this region for millennia might be lost forever. Economic arguments to weaken the Control Plan are easily debunked. But even if they weren't, they should have no bearing. There are many ways to mitigate and remedy losses in jobs and tax revenues. There are no ways to remedy the permanent loss of habitats, the extinction of species, and gaping holes in the food chain.</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.
239	3	Please, please, please! Know that you are not only in a position of serious responsibility, but one of profound, if not sacred duty: to preserve and start to heal one of Mother Earth's great vital organs - the San Francisco Bay Delta watershed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
240	1	We write today in reaction to the State Water Resources Control Board's revised Draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED) in support of Phase I of the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. We are deeply concerned about the impacts the plan would cause to our constituents.	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.
240	2	We are requesting that you extend your public comment period to no less than 90 days regarding the SED. It is vital that the farmers and communities involved in agriculture's ongoing harvest be provided adequate time to analyze the propose plan in order to develop responses.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
240	3	It is our understanding that the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) did not ever hold a public meeting in San Joaquin, Stanislaus or Merced Counties. This is unacceptable and we request the Board to hold public forums in each affected county, including San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Merced, so the impacted communities can have their input heard and considered.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that public hearings were held in Stockton (December 16, 2016), Merced (December 19, 2016), and Modesto (December 20, 2016).
240	4	It is our position that any water releases ordered meet critical human needs and the benefits of additional water releases above current operating standards be justified with scientific and ecological benefits defined prior to any changes. In order to ensure that outcome, it is imperative that the Board operate with full, open transparency and involve the local communities impacted by any proposed plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members. Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding critical human water needs. Master Response 1.1 also discusses the basis of the scientific data and analysis used in the SED. Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, discusses the biologically important and measurable benefits to native fish populations, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, discusses ecological benefits of the plan amendments. Additional economic benefits of the proposed plan amendments are discussed in Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations.
241	1	Human needs should always come before perceived needs of fish, insects, animals.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
242	1	<p>I have seen profound changes in the San Francisco Bay. From massive landfill projects that have created new cities such as Foster City and Redwood Shores while destroying that area's massive wetlands to the recent restoration projects such as the Bair Island, East Palo Alto Shoreline and South Bay Salt Pond. These projects like all of the San Francisco bay needs the fresh water from the Bay-Delta system.</p> <p>Please do everything in your power to protect and restore the Bay-Delta.</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.
242	2	<p>Phase I of the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan provides an historic opportunity to revive the largest estuary on the West coast, including the San Joaquin River and its tributaries that are the life-blood of the Day-Delta ecosystem from the south. As you are aware, the State Water board's own report, Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, determined that approximately 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June would be fully protective of the fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries. Therefore, it's disappointing that the draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED) for Phase 1 of The Bay Delta Plan proposes establishing February through June unimpaired flow requirements of only 30%- 50% for the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers.</p> <p>At Least half of the San Joaquin River's natural flow should reach the Delta during the first six months of each year, and flows in the summer and fall should be sufficient to maintain fish and wildlife, water quality and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Please take full advantage of this once-in-a-generation opportunity to advance a comprehensive, long-term strategy for restore the Bay-Delta ecosystem. Sufficient in stream flows must be central to your decision.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
243	1	These rivers have been screwed with enough!!!! You will not affect the salmon runs. That has been decimated beyond repair. The salmon that run now are all hatchery salmon and are more than plentiful.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
244	1	I am opposed to your proposal to increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River because I do not feel you have done enough to encourage our fish. Get rid of predatory fish and make the riverbeds more inviting to the fish. Then come to me talking water grab!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
245	1	I understand saving fish is important for an ecosystem but don't put us back into drought conditions trying to do this! Don't drastically drop the levels of our reservoirs that are finally getting back to where they should be! Can we please be smart about this for once!!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
246	1	The proposal for allocating additional water from the Sacramento - San Joaquin River system is poorly structured for several reasons. The current releases meant to improve water quality in the Delta, protect and re-establish salmon populations in the San Joaquin River, and protect the Delta Smelt fail in all categories. There is no sense in continuing, let alone expanding said releases.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
246	2	A real change or series of changes having a greater positive impact on the desired objectives would include improving the wastewater treatment plants for California cities that discharge to the river system, including immediately Sacramento, Stockton, and Tracy. Such	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		treatment plant upgrades would have an immediate positive impact on Delta water quality.	
247	1	The Sacramento River averages 30,000 cubic feet/sec. The San Joaquin River averages 5,000 cubic feet/sec. To expect the San Joaquin to flush the delta will be impossible. It seems that you (Board members) are wanting to "flush" the delta with the little river and export the large one to Southern Ca. The farmers built these dams for water and power, without being told they have no right to the water they collect, nor the power produced. The SWRCB should not be allowed to waste water for a theory.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
248	1	<p>I protest the Governor and State Water Resource Control Board's plan to greatly increase insert flows in the Stanislaus and Tuolumne Rivers at the expense of existing water right holders, communities and farmers.</p> <p>Further, if existing lawful water rights, in effect for over a 100 years, can be taken away or negated by an unelected single purpose agency, the holders of those rights must be compensated for their economic loss.</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.
248	2	<p>Environmental protections are necessary, but must be carefully balanced among competing uses, and can't be based on a single "purpose" no matter how worthy an individual or small group of activists think their cause is. Environmental protections are open-ended and there will never be enough water releases to satisfy the most extreme advocates. Many other factors affect fish populations beside just water releases, and there must be recognition that with over 35 million people in California, not every fish can be "saved".</p> <p>In addition, some groups are willing to manipulate the science of saving fish to further their owns selfish ends.</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.
249	1	It's simple: these hard times of drought put a hardship on everybody especially farmers. We have to do responsible things whether we like it or not. Do you really think these higher flows are responsible? I ask you this to think about it is it really responsible.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
250	1	<p>I am writing in support of the State Water Board's proposal to increase river flows to 40% of the unimpaired river flows that would naturally be in the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced Rivers.</p> <p>I live in Arnold, along Highway 4, and I frequent Calaveras Big Trees State Park frequently. The Stanislaus runs right through the park, and there is a bridge that affords a wonderful view of the river. Keeping river at levels that protect fish and wildlife and maintain appropriate temperatures is very important.</p> <p>I am pleased to see that the recently released proposal supports these important issues, and still leaves most of the water for agriculture, industry, and other uses. The extended drought we've experienced is putting stress on all of us, but we need to share our limited resources with the wildlife and preserve our natural resources.</p> <p>Thank you for supporting this proposal in the face of pressure from lobbyists and special interests.</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.
251	1	I cannot sit by and watch the devastation of the health of our state that I love through the ill-conceived notion of increased flows of water down our rivers. I am concerned about the water crisis in California and am alarmed to hear the possibility of letting 40% 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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		down our rivers, all in the name of protecting salmon and salinity of the Delta.	
251	2	What about our farmers and the crops, not to mention jobs they produce in our community? I am proud to live in the fertile central valley surrounded by agriculture, but am saddened to see the difficulty they are having with the recent drought. After being so hard hit the last few years, how is it even possible that you would consider allowing much needed water to just flow out to sea to raise the water temperature for fish? Most of the salmon we eat is from hatcheries anyway.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
251	3	Please protect our beautiful reservoirs Lake Tulloch and New Melones that provide water to the surrounding communities as well as the economy based upon its use for recreation. Further draining of these reservoirs will damage property values, local employment and eliminate one of the few resources/attractions Calaveras County has to attract visitors and boost the 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.
251	4	I urge you to protect the valuable water so vital to our area. Do not allow it to be wasted by releasing it down the river. I beg of you to honorably represent your constituents in protecting and preserving 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.
252	1	Your proposal to take more water from our rivers is nothing more than a water grab and will have little effect upon saving a few fish. It is time to stop wacko environmentalists from harming jobs, people, farm production and the good of population as a whole. Please reject this nonsense! Thank you. And please build more dams and reservoirs.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
253	1	I strongly urge you to maintain water flows at the 50-60% level to fully protect salmon and the ecosystem.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
253	2	We are in a drought that requires long term solutions. Butte County, where I live, is agricultural and I am very aware that farmers need water for almonds and growing rice, for example. I know many farmers personally from weekly shopping at the local farmers markets. We need strong conservation efforts to make sure farmers have enough water to grow our food. Taking too much water from the river flows is not the solution.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
254	1	We are writing on behalf of our community, neighbors and ourselves to request deeper thinking about the impact about the impact of the water releases that have been requested from our sole water source: The Lake Tulloch Basin. We appreciate your consideration of our request to consider people over fish, which will protect the well-being of nearly 1.8 million Californians.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
254	2	Thank you [Gov. Jerry Brown] for writing your recent letter to the State Water Board regarding the minimum flow standards from the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta. We encourage you to take even further action to protect our region of nearly 1.8 million people from the damaging water policy recently proposed by the State Water Board. We applaud you for your recognition of the communities throughout our region regarding the negative impact of these policies because the recommended doubling of the amount of	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water used for fish flows from our rivers and lakes is disastrous for the economy, ecology, and community.	
254	3	<p>The Lake Tulloch Basin in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties is home to about 10,000 people. Our concern is that if we do not have a significant snowfall in the Sierra, then we will be threatened with the draining of our lake which our sole source of water. We urge you to suspend water releases until there is adequate precipitation to substantially refill our reservoirs.</p> <p>New Melones Reservoir was drawn down to just 10% of its capacity in the middle of the drought last year to support the fish flows. However, independent research found that 80% or more of the fish died because the water was too warm.</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.
254	4	We ask that you [Gov. Jerry Brown] take action to ensure that you and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact of these policies on Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador, and Mariposa Counties by extending the public comment period from 60 to 120 days and holding three public hearings in Modesto, Stockton, and Merced to provide the appropriate opportunity for public comment from these seven counties.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
254	5	We also urge you [Gov. Jerry Brown] to ask President Obama to have the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and Commerce use their power to suspend the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed a workable and balanced 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.
255	1	My ag well went dry just over 10 years ago and I depend on irrigation water from TID for 100% of my water needs. I barely survived last season with only 1/3 of my normal allotment due to drier than normal weather for the last several years. My trees are still trying to recover from the reduced water I get from Don Pedro Reservoir. Any further reductions would probably put me out of business. With only 20 acres of trees, I cannot afford to have a new ag well drilled. Barely paying my bills now!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
256	1	We replaced our front lawn with drought tolerant landscape. This was at considerable expense to us and no real return on investment. Part of our reason for doing this was to conserve water for our rich farmland. Now I hear water is being wasted in the millions of acre-feet. We all need to do our part in conserving the precious little water in California. Do let it go wasted into 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.
257	1	As the Executive Director of the Manteca Chamber of Commerce, I would like to strongly oppose an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River. The impact it would have on our economy, agriculture and our entire community would be devastating. We ask you to reconsider your plan and come up with something that is more likely to help the fish without hurting our community and the surrounding 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.
258	1	<p>I do not fish. Love to eat them, though. But my family and I always felt the magic of seeing a trout or other fish in the Stanislaus. They were here before us and they cannot speak or send emails, so I will speak for them. Give them the water sufficient for them to swim in from the ocean. You have our okay to do this.</p> <p>I save water from my sink, to put in a toilet, I wash less, I lecture kids and others on the power of water. It is life to us and to the fish. Do the ethical vote for these gentle swimming creatures that never kill. We do the killing and the restricting of their habitat. Please speak</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
		for the trout and salmon and others. Show the world that we care for the creatures. Sincerely, a mother of three sons in their 50s, a grandson in his teens and a great grandson of 2. I urge you for our generations to come.	
260	1	<p>Certain facts are undeniable. The Delta smelt and Chinook salmon populations are sensitive to water issues. Too little water in the rivers and streams that feed the Delta means drastic population reductions for those fish, as well as damage to the ecosystem of which they are a part. As an avid hiker in our wilderness and an avid rafter of our rivers, I have personally watched the salmon populations decline over the last 15 years. My understanding is that they have become extinct or near extinct in some rivers and streams, and are in danger just about everywhere else.</p> <p>We cannot continue to ignore those facts while the Central Valley continues to attempt to farm areas without adequate water supply and Southern California continues to draw water to support its expanding population. Only when water becomes scarce or limited in those areas will their inhabitants adjust their style of living and farming to be more compatible with their available amount of water. Only then will their local governments adopt policies that are compatible with their available amount of water. Only then will private enterprise become profitable enough to help solve their water issues.</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.
260	2	We don't have sufficient water to meet the needs of Southern California and the Central Valley and the needs of the ecosystem of Northern California. That is another undeniable fact. If we keep supplying them water and damaging the Northern California ecosystem in the process, we will (they will) never make progress on water issues and we will be left with irreparable damage.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
260	3	For those reasons I pray that you will listen to the science and set flow levels for the project at no more than 50%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
261	1	<p>We have been fighting drought conditions here for at least a decade and measures during last summer were never lower, and this county is dangerously close to becoming a Dust Bowl like back east almost 80 years ago.</p> <p>We have not recovered enough to worry about steelhead trout and salmon at this point when releasing more water is almost never a solution in a drought state. Instead, destroy the natural predators like bass to increase numbers dramatically instantly.</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.
261	2	We in this valley need summer release for utilities and cannot afford summer energy bills to be any more than they already are. Releasing more in winter means even less when we need it most.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
261	3	If you go forward with this, I with many more citizens in these valley communities will blame the state and will leave no incumbents in state-elected official posts for bankrupting our community, who has rights to this water for at least the last 100 years predating this state's interest in natural waterways and endangered species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
261	4	We are humans and we outweigh the needs of lesser species; they should not thrive as we lose our livelihood and residences in this crisis. Wait at least 2 to 3 years to see if this drought subsides before we spend water we simply don't have.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
262	1	We support Assemblyman Bigelow’s position on this proposal. He has given careful and balanced consideration to all aspects of this issues. We support his approach and urge you to do likewise.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
263	1	Flows must be gauged to preserve Salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
264	1	<p>I strongly support the SWRCB proposal to require that flows in the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced Rivers be increased to at least 40% of unimpaired flows from February through June. The increased flows will much more closely imitate the natural variability of flows in San Joaquin River tributaries needed to support native fish like salmon and steelhead and for which they have evolved. The increased flows will also improve the water quality and temperature of the rivers.</p> <p>I note that the Delta Flow Criteria Report concluded that requiring 60 percent of the unimpaired San Joaquin River inflow to the Delta from February through June is necessary to preserve a natural, variable river ecosystem to which native species are adapted and urge the Board to attempt to increase flows closer to this goal in the future.</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.
265	1	We stand with Assemblyman Frank Bigelow in opposition to the above proposal, which will allow a large amount of water flow from the Sacramento River watershed to literally wash out to sea.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
266	1	I am submitting comments to the SWRCBs Proposed Flow Standards for the Central Valley rivers and streams. The waterways include some of the most important rivers which sustain the dwindling salmon and steelhead populations south of the Sacramento River. The low flows released in the past have in part allowed these species of salmonids to decline to very near extinction. I join a large number of learned scientists, many from state agencies, to suggest that a minimum of 60% flows of unimpaired water, especially during the sure to come, drought years and months ahead, is necessary to sustain these species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
266	2	This consideration will likely be compared to the so called economic cost of delivering less water to the central and southern portions of California. These economic costs in reality mean not depriving the agricultural families of hard earned income but balancing their ever increasing demand for more, unfettered income, (not their status quo), to sell their product not only outside California but outside this country. The billboards and signs along Interstate 5 through the Central Valley suggest that sharing what water is available with other California interests, whether those be recreation or another industry, is robbing the citizens of California of their supply of food. This is absolutely false as the recipients of the majority of food produced in the Central Valley is sent to foreign countries. So, I deduce that this additional income the farmers are receiving has nothing to do with depriving Californians nor citizens of our USA of food; it has everything to do with lining their pockets at the expense of our fellow Californians.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
266	3	<p>The rest of the citizens in California need to have their voices heard and considered when you make this decision on the flows necessary not to just maintain the fisheries, but also to help them regain some of the recent losses they have suffered. By way of extension, those losses the fisheries sustained have a direct correlation to the losses the citizens of California (and other visitors to the state) have sustained.</p> <p>The science regarding sustaining the fisheries has been developed by your agency scientists</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>and by a number of Non-Profit groups as well, including Trout Unlimited. So on my behalf, and on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of like-minded anglers (which include ~10,000 members of Trout Unlimited in California), we request that the flows be established at 60% unimpaired flow. Hopefully there will be sufficient rainfall this year to supply as much water through the Central Valley rivers as the fisheries and the agricultural community need.</p>	
267	1	<p>I could easily go on page after page of what I feel is wrong with what is being told to the public and what is really at issue. If</p> <p>the fish are what need to be saved, then do all that is possible to save them, not just saying they need more water. I see it that the Board is using the fish as a crutch to get more water. Why not remove all predatory fish from the tributaries? Why is a fish like the Striped Bass still protected with daily limits. This is a fish that was not native to California until it was introduced as a sport fish in the early 1900's. Go to Oakdale and talk to the longtime residents that fish the Stanislaus. They will tell you the best way (not legal way) and most effective way to catch a trophy 40 lbs. striped bass is to first catch a small (6-12 inch) trout and use it for bait. It's not rocket science. Go on Youtube and watch as bass fishermen (using Rapalas that look like salmon fry) catch bass. If you want to save the salmon, get rid of the predators. The way I see it, salmon being on the endangered list allows for more water flows. It seems like keeping them endangered is an easy way to keep asking for 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>
267	2	<p>I've seen water being wasted from Folsom Dam the past 2 winters with releases that go straight to the ocean. Why can that water not be diverted and saved? Find a way to use either existing canals or irrigation ditches or "Tunnels" to get Folsom's water to another area. Even if that area is where the water can be absorbed into the ground. Send Folsom's extra water to Southern California and start filling their reservoirs and stop losing it to runoff out 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>
267	3	<p>As for the absorption of water into the ground, more can be done to make it 10 to 100 fold each winter. I've watched for the past 3 winters water being lost into gutters to creeks that run to rivers to the delta to the ocean. Find a way to slow that flow and allow the water enough time to percolate into the ground. I know last year UC Davis was studying the possibility of flooding fields with excess water during the winter to allow the aquifer to replenish in the valley. Go to Briggsmore Avenue in Modesto and see how the water is slowed in the ditches and allowed time to drain into the soil. Use the extensive network of irrigation canals to move water in the winter when those canals are usually empty.</p> <p>Maybe use the arroyos that flow from the Sierras to the valley as an example of an area that can be renovated and used to hold excess water and slow it down at certain times to allow for water percolation. Drive from Madera to Visalia and look at all the arroyos that are bone dry after every major storm. Renovate those areas and force excess water into them to allow that water to replenish the valley groundwater. Isn't the largest reservoir in CA underground?</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>
267	4	<p>I watched Lake Tulloch release water last spring "for the fish" and was baffled why it came from the surface of Tulloch and not the "cold water" outlets. If the fish need cold water, then why did it come from the open spillways and not the lower generation outlets? Why do the flows tend to correspond when the delta tide is high? Is it released to keep the fish moving or to keep the brackish water away from the Aqueduct pumping station in Tracy/Mountain House? Don't get me wrong: there is a part of me that sees 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>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Tunnels as an asset especially at times when Folsom is releasing and it needs to go to another reservoir.	
267	5	I run a small campground on Lake Tulloch and I've dealt with well water problems for the past 4 summers because of the drought. By adding more storage for well water, I've been able to go from buying water (\$500 per load) mid-summer trying to make it through a busy weekend to having enough saved to make it past the high usage days. I see that as a model (miniature model) to how CA should address the water issue. More Reservoirs are needed or keep the existing ones full. Last year Melones only made it to roughly 600,000 acre feet. 40% of that would be 240,000 acre feet for unimpaired flow. So if Melones were to fill up to 2.2 million acre feet, why on earth would you need to waste 40%. That would release 880,000 acre feet when 240,000 could work. Its much better than 125 years ago (no dams) when the Stanislaus would never have water running in drought years during the months of Aug, Sept, Oct when Salmon are starting to migrate.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
267	6	CA either needs more reservoirs, more recycling of water, more restrictions on lawns that are "cool season" grasses, more penalties for water wasters, less fish restrictions for predatory fish (no limits), etc. I'm tired of driving to Southern Cal in the summer and seeing water being wasted while I've turned my lawns off for the past two summers to save 70% on my water usage. Yes, 70%! There are so many ways to fix this problem and I know that every homeowner that has property or homes that rely on the water from New Melones or Don Pedro or McClure are willing to do what it takes to work with the Water Board as long as the truth is the truth and not just smoke and mirrors.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
268	1	Please don't TAKE our water. I farm in the Modesto Irrigation District. The landowners before me invested heavily in money, time and labor during challenging times to provide us with the water infrastructure we have today. Their fore site to save water during time of drought is remarkable. Now, the WRCB are proposing to let that storage be depleted. We are here. Our towns have grown. Jobs have been created. Land has been developed. We cannot go backwards as the WRCB is proposing. Our water districts have spent millions studying this fish issue. Please work with them to be good stewards of our precious resource.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
268	2	It has been reported that the SED would benefit 1,103 fish at a economic cost of \$58,000.00 per fish. Unbelievable but those are the SED numbers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
268	3	It's been reported that surface water depletion can be supplemented by pumping ground water. With water table issues and the salt that would be pumped, that is totally unsustainable.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
268	4	Being a first generation farmer without the financial help from others. Our sacrafices to make it happen are unimaginable. Through hard work and every dollar going back into the farm for at least the first 20 years. I cannot imagine the thought of our livelihood going down the drain (river).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
269	1	Merced has received, and begun the process of reviewing and developing comments on the revised and recently re-released Substitute Environmental Document for the State Water Resources Control Board's ("SWRCB") revision to its Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan (the "SED"). This letter comes to you as Merced's formal request to extend the public commenting period under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") until February	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		10, 2017. As explained herein, the requested extension is necessary and essential in light of the length, extent and details of the SED, and to avoid prejudice to Merced and other entities that will be significantly impacted by the matters addressed in the SED.	
269	2	The revised SED sets forth the SWRCB staff proposal to require the release of 40% of the unimpaired flow of the Merced River, with an adaptive management scheme of between 30-50% unimpaired flow between the months of February through June, each year, downstream for the purported benefit of fish species and their habitat as well as water quality in the Bay Delta. The proposal would have a substantial negative impact on Merced and its operations, and Merced accordingly must have sufficient time to study, review and comment on the proposal and the apparent impacts of the proposal, as set forth in the SED.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
269	3	Upon an initial cursory review, it is Merced's opinion that the revised SED is substantially different in many ways from the December 2012 draft SED. So different in fact, that the revised SED is essentially a completely new document from its previous draft with new criteria for flows and reservoir operations, among other things. Further, it is Merced's position that the SED has a number of substantive mistakes, incorrect base assumptions and conclusions that are either unsupported, misleading, or patently wrong. Merced must have sufficient time to identify, study and describe such matters, in its comments to the SED.	<p>Substantial changes were made to the 2012 Draft SED in consideration of the large number of oral and written public comments received, and in light of additional information. Please refer to Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis, Section 4.2, Recirculated SED, for a summary of those major changes.</p> <p>The commenter makes a general assertion that the SED has many substantive mistakes, including incorrect assumptions and conclusions, but does not specifically identify those mistakes, or present evidence. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding general comments on the SED and the approach to the analysis.</p> <p>The comment period was extended to for a total duration of six months in order to allow commenters sufficient time to review the SED and supporting materials and provide comments.</p>
269	4	One of the incorrect conclusions of staff in the SED is the magnitude of impacts that implementation of the new flow regime will have on the local and regional communities not just in Merced, but in the entire San Joaquin Valley. It goes without saying that the flow releases required by the SED would represent a substantial change in Merced's operations, an integral piece to this state's water supply system.	The full range of CEQA environmental resource areas were evaluated for the SED for the plan area and extended plan area. Environmental resources such as Aquatic Biological Resources, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Groundwater Resources, Agricultural Resources, Recreational Resources and Aesthetics, Service Providers, and Energy and Greenhouse Gases were determined to have significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of the plan amendments. The commenter is correct that there will be impacts to the local and regional communities. These impacts have been fully evaluated in the SED. Please see Chapter 18, Summary of Impacts, for a complete list of impacts. In addition, please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to general comments on impacts associated with the plan amendments.
269	5	With all due respect, the existing timeline to develop comments on a document that is almost 2,000 pages long, too more than 10 years and cost more than \$70M to develop is simply inadequate given the magnitude and severity of "unavoidable" impacts on Merced and local communities that are already disadvantaged. It will take considerably more time for Merced to review, thoroughly analyze and study the measures proposed in the SED, and the impact of such measures on Merced, Merced's water system, local communities, the inter-connected Bay Delta water system, the San Joaquin River and the tributaries to the River, as well as the local and state wide environment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.
269	6	Given the length of time that this document has already been in development, allowing additional time for the development of substantive public comment will not unduly harm the fish species or impair water quality that the SED is intended to protect. Yet conversely, the rights of thousands of individuals directly represented by Merced, and tens of thousands of Californians that indirectly benefit from the water resources managed by Merced, will be irreparably and unjustifiably harmed without the time needed to completely and thoroughly review and study the SED and develop substantive comments.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
269	7	<p>Merced joins with its sister agencies on the Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, and community leaders at both the local and state levels, in requesting an extension to the commenting period provided under CEQA. Merced requests the commenting period be extended through at least February 10, 2017.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the public outreach process and the comment period. Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months.</p>
270	1	<p>The Merced Irrigation District (MeID) is continuing to review and prepare comments regarding the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Substitute Environmental Document (SED) relating to and in support of the SWRCB's proposed amendments to the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. The proposed amendments, and the SED, would impose significant substantive changes to water flow requirements on tributaries to the San Joaquin River during the months of February through June each year, including the Merced River.</p> <p>The SED indicates that the SWRCB prepared the SED "in lieu of an EIR," and that the SED "fulfills the requirements of CEQA and the State Water Board's CEQA regulations to analyze the environmental effects of the proposed Bay-Delta Plan update, as well as requirements of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and other applicable requirements." (ES-2.)</p> <p>The SED explains that "the assessment of environmental effects in this SED was conducted at a programmatic level, which is more general than a project-specific analysis." (Id.) The SED further states:</p> <p>"The State Water Board's adoption of amendments to the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan will not result in direct physical changes in the environment. Rather, it is through the implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan that physical changes in the environment potentially may occur. Accordingly, all potential environmental effects evaluated in this SED are indirect effects associated with implementation, which would occur later in time and would be subject to project-specific environmental review, in compliance with CEQA." (ES-2, 3.)</p> <p>Finally, the SED states:</p> <p>"This document does not evaluate specific projects undertaken to implement the Bay-Delta Plan in sufficient detail to support a project-level approval for any project because the nature and extent of any environmental effects will depend in large part on the project-level actions taken. This SED, however, does evaluate the indirect effect of the project (plan amendments), including reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of the methods of compliance and impacts associated with actions that people may take in response to the project." (ES-2)</p> <p>At a recent workshop on the SED in Modesto, Les Grober of the SWRCB stated several times, in response to a variety of questions about potential local impacts related to the amendments to the Bay Delta Plan, that because the SED was intended to be programmatic, such local impacts had not been analyzed or modeled at this stage.</p> <p>MeID finds the above statements from the SED, and the comments from Mr. Grober, highly confusing. It is not clear from the SED, and from the comments at the recent workshop, whether, how, and when specific local impacts from the amendments to the Bay Delta Plan, and the SED, will be reviewed and analyzed. It is not clear whether, and to what extent, MeID should comment on the SED's discussion of impacts on MeID and the Merced River. The comments of Mr. Grober did not clarify or address those questions, but only added to</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the programmatic analysis in the SED, the difference between program and project level analyses, and for information regarding the impacts evaluated in the SED.</p> <p>Programmatic analyses are by their nature broader and less detailed than project level analyses. This is because the details that are needed to conduct a project level analysis are not known and cannot be described in sufficient detail in which to appropriately analyze.</p> <p>The most common types of EIRs do examine the impacts of specific development project(s) (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15161). This type of EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment resulting from the development project and examines all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15161). The plan amendments are not a development project and are not a project-specific action. They are amendments to an existing water quality control plan. As identified by the Certified Regulatory Program, the State Water Board is not required to conduct a site specific project level analysis, which CEQA may otherwise require of those agencies who are responsible for complying with the plan or policy when they determine the manner in which they will comply (Title 23 Division 3, Chapter 27, Article 1, Section 3777).</p> <p>Furthermore, the degree of specificity in an environmental document corresponds to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity which is described in the environmental document (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15146). As acknowledged by the State CEQA Guidelines, an environmental document disclosing the impacts of a construction project will necessarily be more detailed than those evaluating a plan because the effects of the construction can be predicted with much greater accuracy (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15146(a)). An environmental document analyzing a plan need not be as detailed as an environmental document on a specific construction project ((State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15146(b)). Finally, as identified by the State CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is an EIR which may be prepare on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either geographically or in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168). The plan amendments are related geographically because they are all contained within the San Joaquin River Basin and they are connected by the issuance of regulations and plan (the Water Quality Control Plan).</p> <p>In order to conduct the analyses of the plan amendments disclosed in the SED, the State Water Board made reasonable assumptions regarding the implementation of the plan amendments as it relates to reservoir storage and potential reductions in water supply. However, depending on the unique circumstances of each tributary and the irrigation districts using surface water on each tributary, the exact project-specific impacts cannot be identified. This is because, as identified in the Certified Regulatory Program, CEQA may otherwise require of those agencies who are responsible for complying with the plan or policy when they determine the manner in which they will comply. The State Water Board has incorporated flexibility in the plan amendments such that irrigation districts may decide to comply in different ways than those assumed in the SED. The fact that the analyses is programmatic in the SED does not negate the ability of commenters to provide comments on the analysis. As identified in the State CEQA Guidelines: an EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes into account of environmental consequences (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15151). An evaluation need not be exhaustive for commenters to provide comments or for decision makers to make a decision. In addition, as identified by the State CEQA Guidelines, persons and public</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>our confusion.</p> <p>MeID is writing this letter at this time, in advance of it submission of comments to the SED, to request that the SWRCB explain and clarify these issues, and to address the scope and timing of the review of the specific project level impacts on MeID and the Merced River. In particular, MeID respectfully requests that the SWRCB explain, in advance of the due date for comments to the SED, (1) whether project level impacts on MeID and the Merced River, associated with the Amendments to the Bay Delta Plan are analyzed in the SED, and (2) if not, when, how and in what document will the SWRCB review those impacts?</p>	<p>agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. The adequacy of an environmental document is determined in terms of what is reasonable feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project (Section 15024(a)).</p> <p>As identified in Appendix K, the Executive Summary, and Chapter 3 of the SED, the State Water Board intends to implement the plan amendments through water rights actions or water quality actions, such as a water rights hearing proceeding or the 401 Water Quality Certification process in applicable FERC re-licensing by 2022. At the time of this type of implementation, the State Water Board, or other lead agencies, may choose to tier from the programmatic analyses contained within the SED. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an environmental document prepared for a policy or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another policy or program of lesser scope, or to a site specific EIR or negative declaration (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(b)). Tiering does not excuse the lead agency from adequately analyzing reasonably foreseeable significant environmental effects; however, the level of detail contained in a first tier document need not be greater than that of the plan or policy being analyzed (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(b)). As such, between the adoption of the Water Quality Control Plan, and 2022 additional environmental or economic analyses may be conducted to determine more project-specific impacts to water users on each river, as appropriate, under the State CEQA Guidelines.</p>
271	1	Your plan to increase flows on the rivers hurts agriculture a lot more than it will ever help a fish. Please don't do 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.
272	1	I believe sustaining the agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley is more important than any other thing the water will be used for. For that reason, I am opposed to your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced 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.
273	1	I would like to urge the State Water Board not to send even more water from the San Joaquin river out to the ocean on the pretense to save fish. It is clear that the agenda is to decrease food and crop production in this area. These decisions is already contributing to over pumping of ground water and will promote the increase import of foreign food that is not under the same requirements for pesticide use and probably is not as healthy. Please reconsider policy to allow more, not less water for irrigation 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.
274	1	The unimpaired flow plan has been scientifically proven to be ineffective! Even the state admits their plan will cause significant harm to farmers, businesses and cities. There are more effective, less costly methods of supporting fish populations. The costs and the befit are completely out of proportion. The impact on the economy goes much further than our farming operation; it has a negative affect on our employees, land values, consumer food cost, and municipal water supplies. The economy has potential to collapse due to the thousands of lost jobs in farming, trucking, food processing and other related industries. I oppose an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
275	1	Scientific data indicates that thru flows of 100% is what created a health delta, one that once supported 16 salmon canneries.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
276	1	I write to correct some misinterpretations that have been brought to my attention regarding the Bay Institute's (TBI's) presentation and the presentation by Drs. Sturrock and Johnson at the State Water Resources Control Board's November 29 workshop to consider the Draft Revised Substitute Environmental Document in Support of Potential Changes to the Water	The State Water Board staff cannot comment on how the presentations by members of the public at the November 2016 public hearing were interpreted. However, for a complete transcription of the dialogue, including comments and remarks given during public presentations, please refer to the index of commenters in Volume 3 to locate the material from the November 2016 public hearing, which is identified by the

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Quality Control Plan for the Bay Delta: San Joaquin River Flows and Southern Delta Water Quality (SED).</p> <p>My understanding is that our presentations may have been misinterpreted as suggesting that protecting and restoring San Joaquin basin fish populations is not possible, even with higher flows, due to lack of physical habitat for spawning and rearing. In fact, our findings show the opposite: higher flow regimes utilize existing habitat very effectively, and the acreage that will need to be restored in order to achieve equivalent habitat availability increases significantly under low flow regimes.</p>	<p>person's name and is assigned a letter number.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-flow Measures, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding non-flow measures and their relationship to the plan amendments.</p>
276	2	<p>The Bay Institute's analyses have examined the relative effect of different flow regimes between 30% and 60% of San Joaquin basin unimpaired flow (UIF) on restoration of fish and fish habitat in the basin and south Delta. Some have characterized the 60% UIF bookend as an "optimum" level of flow or fish production- this is inaccurate. The Board's 2010 Flow Criteria report found that 60% UIF was the minimum flow necessary- not the optimal, or most favorable- to fully protect public trust resources of the Delta ecosystem. Flows below 60% UIF were found to be unable to achieve doubling of salmon populations as required by state and federal law. In addition, the Board's 2010 60% UIF criterion referred to the entire San Joaquin watershed, not just the input from the three tributaries that are the focus of the Phase I SED.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the Delta Flow Criteria Report.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding the salmon doubling objective.</p>
276	3	<p>Since 2010, The Bay Institute has worked to identify ways of protecting public trust resources that could require even less flow. Shallow habitat restoration and flow shaping (i.e., intentional deviation from a strict 7-day running average approach) are two of the methods under consideration to reduce the amount of flow needed to support state and federal requirements for salmon populations. Our presentation to the Board on November 29th explored the potential for applying those techniques under different flow prescriptions. The most basic point of that presentation is that the feasibility and efficacy of both flow shaping and habitat restoration increase as the availability of water for environmental purposes increases; below a certain level of flow, neither technique will benefit San Joaquin basin fish populations.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, regarding adaptive implementation and deviation from a 7-day running average to maximize benefits of the plan amendments. See Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-flow Measures, regarding the role of non-flow measures and how they relate to the plan amendments.</p>
276	4	<p>Failure of or limitations on the efficacy of alternative methods for improving fish production on the tributaries does not mean that fish survival cannot be increased substantially or that the state and federal salmon doubling production targets cannot be met; it means there are limits on the ability to exchange habitat restoration or aggressive flow shaping for the overall volume of flow committed to protection of public trust resources. Thus, our analyses demonstrate much higher likelihood of attaining doubling targets for San Joaquin salmonids when flows are $\geq 50\%$ UIF; attainment of those targets is very unlikely when flows are $\leq 40\%$ UIF. This is true because:</p> <p>a) In-channel temperatures are vastly better under the 50-60% flow regimes than they are when less water is reserved for environmental protection.</p> <p>The SED shows that temperatures in the three tributaries decrease (improve) with increases in the percentage of UIF prescribed. Our analyses show that when the SED's modeled water temperatures are compared to well-documented biological thresholds for Chinook salmon, the 50% UIF scenario results in temperatures that will open up many more miles of useful salmon habitat for one or more months as compared to the 40% UIF (or lower) flow alternatives. In short, the 40% alternative is likely to reproduce the flow-mediated carrying capacity limits that Drs. Sturrock and Johnson report finding on the Stanislaus River. Not</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding modifications to the plan amendments, and see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, related to the water quality control planning process and the need for balancing and reasonable protection of beneficial uses.</p> <p>When comparing the plan amendments to existing conditions on the Stanislaus River, considerations such as the value in the proposed adaptive implementation approach for maximizing the benefits, and the benefits of synergistic effects of flow being provided by all three tributaries should be recognized. Refer to Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for more information on adaptive implementation. Additionally, see Chapter 2, Water resources, Table 2.15 for more information on how erratic and random flows have been on the Stanislaus River historically. It is correct that median values (see Table 2.16 in Chapter 2) have been approximately 40% unimpaired flow, but the within year variation and between year variation in flows have been dramatic as shown in Chapter 2, Table 2.15 and 2.16. Having more flow consistently within February through June in each year will provide a benefit to native fish.</p> <p>See Master Response 3.1 for additional discussion of benefits anticipated from implementation of the plan amendments. Also Refer to Master Response 2.1 and Master Response 3.1 for response to comments that suggest higher flows are needed than are proposed in LSJR Alternative 3.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>coincidentally, median flows from Feb-June on the Stanislaus have been 40-43% of unimpaired.</p>	
276	5	<p>b) Availability of inundated off-channel rearing habitat increases significantly under 50- 60% UIF regimes, reducing the need and likely cost of needed habitat restoration.</p> <p>Within the confines of other habitat parameters that define suitable incubation and rearing conditions for salmon (e.g., the temperature analysis), generation of additional shallow off-channel rearing habitat is one of the tools that might improve salmon productivity at lower flow levels. However, flow is causally tied to the availability of inundated salmon rearing habitat; as the SED results demonstrate, the area inundated by a river increases as flows increase.</p> <p>Our analysis put the need for such habitat improvements in the context of the habitat area that a restored population will need. We studied how different flow prescriptions perform relative to estimated habitat needs for target salmon populations developed for the Conservation Strategy of DWR's Central Valley Flood Plan. Our preliminary findings showed that under the 60% UIF flow alternative there is likely to be enough water to achieve the inundated rearing habitat needed in the lower San Joaquin River mainstem. Achieving biological objectives that define "viable" salmon populations at lower flows will require some mix of (a) additional habitat that will inundate at lower flow prescriptions, and (b) significant shaping of the hydrograph (moving of water from one period to another within the Feb-Jun timeframe). Our analyses show that it will be difficult to implement "b" at flow levels below 50% without producing poor conditions in the time period from which water is "borrowed" to produce the desired inundation.</p> <p>Our analysis showed that rearing habitat targets upstream cannot be inundated given the current conditions on the tributaries. I emphasize that this does not mean that the doubling target is unattainable. [footnote 1: Indeed, the San Joaquin tributaries attained the AFRP production doubling target in the early 2000s (sec slide #3 of TBI's March 20, 2013 presentation), so the notion that the AFRP doubling targets are "unattainable" is contradicted by the available data.] Rather, it means that attaining the doubling targets will require some combination of (a) habitat restoration upstream, (b) additional habitat restoration and improved migration conditions downstream; and (c) better in-channel survival between upstream and downstream. Flow levels associated with the 50% UIF alternatives contribute significantly to each component of this solution. [footnote 2: Furthermore, there are significant benefits to other beneficial uses of water that will result from protection of flow levels 50%, including reduction in the frequency of harmful algal blooms and low dissolved oxygen conditions in the lower San Joaquin River and southern Delta.]</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures, regarding the incorporation of non-flow measures. See Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding using adaptive implementation to move water within and outside of the February through June time period to maximize benefits. See Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding balancing in the water quality control planning process. See Master Response 3.1 regarding the expected benefits of the plan amendments, including discussion of floodplain inundation and water quality improvements. Also Refer to Master Response 2.1 and Master Response 3.1 for response to comments that suggest higher flows are needed than are proposed in LSJR Alternative 3 and for discussion of the relationship of the salmon doubling objective and the LSJR flow objectives.</p>
276	6	<p>The Bay Institute analysis reveals some basic truths of the balance between flow and inundated acreage. In general, under higher flow prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More habitat will be inundated - Less habitat restoration will be needed - Less flow shaping will be necessary to achieve the desired inundated habitat acreage and duration (resulting in less risk that the hydrograph will be modified in a way that produces 	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-flow Measures, regarding the incorporation of non-flow measures such as habitat restoration. See Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding using adaptive implementation to move water within and outside of the February through June time period to maximize benefits. See Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding balancing in the water quality control planning process. See Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, and Master Response 3.1 for further discussion of the expected benefits of the plan amendments.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>poor conditions for migrating or rearing juvenile salmon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The availability of potential restoration sites will increase (because a greater range of elevations inundate under higher flows) - The cost of needed habitat restoration will decrease and the time and resources needed to complete the necessary habitat restoration will decrease. <p>It is critical that the Board consider the interaction between flow prescriptions, their effect on inundated habitat availability, and their effect on in-channel habitat quality (e.g., temperatures) in amending the Vernalis flow objectives in the update of the WQCP.</p>	
276	7	<p>Improved flows are needed throughout the February-June period identified in the SED.</p> <p>There is growing consensus that the diversity of life history strategies (e.g., time and body size at migration) present in annual juvenile salmon cohorts is integral to population growth and resilience. Indeed, as discussed in The Bay Institute's previous comments to the Board, life history diversity is considered to be a key element of population viability for salmonids (see for example, McElhany et al. 2000, attached). Research by Drs. Sturrock and Johnson (and see also Zeug et al. 2014, attached) emphasizes (a) the contribution of multiple life history types to subsequent returns of spawning adults on the Stanislaus River and (b) the strong relationship between production of life history diversity and both flow magnitude and flow variability. Dr. Sturrock's research also demonstrates that under higher flows, the tributaries are able to produce more individuals of different life histories.</p> <p>This has important implications for the application of flow shaping. Humans are not good at picking winning and losing life history strategies in salmon populations and neither are the salmon—that is why the observed variation in life history strategies is so important to maintaining salmon populations. Specifically, Dr. Sturrock emphasized in her presentation that winter flow magnitude and variability were strongly associated with production of fry-sized fish that later returned to spawn on the Stanislaus River [footnote 3: Dr. Sturrock's work also demonstrated that increases in cumulative flow reduced or eliminated carrying capacity constraints on three different juvenile salmon life history types.] Flow shaping operations that involve taking water out of the February-March period for use later in the season are likely to reduce flow magnitude and variability during months that are critical to production of this key life history type and this is especially true when the overall block of water is limited. This does not mean flow shaping is not a potentially valuable tool, it means there are limits to its efficacy; the SED does not acknowledge these limits and puts few if any limits on the use of flow shaping.</p> <p>Our analyses show that on average June temperatures on the tributaries will become challenging or unacceptable for juvenile salmon production. However, this should not be interpreted to mean that June flows are unimportant to the success of any of the SED's flow alternatives. First, the temperature analysis is very coarse and reflects temperatures averaged across all days of each month and all years in the temperature record. Cooler and wetter years will have better temperature conditions and earlier parts of June will have cooler temperatures than the monthly average presented in the SED (and thus, in our analysis); these days and years represent important opportunities to generate more juvenile salmon and particular life history types (e.g., smolt-sized fish). During drier and warmer years, it may be desirable to "shape" flows that are projected to occur in later June into larger flows that produce specific habitat benefits in earlier June or even May, but that</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for further information about flows during the February through June time period.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>is a decision to be made in particular years in the service of biological objectives (the Stanislaus SEP 2016 report includes important guidance regarding how this decision might be made, which I am happy to discuss with you and Water Board staff). However, the volume of water represented in June unimpaired flows will be critical to the success of such flow shaping [footnote 4: As noted above, improved flows are necessary to provide benefits to public trust resources in addition to salmon and the need for improved flows to support these other public benefits increases when river temperatures rise above Chinook salmon tolerance limits. Thus, river flow levels in the warm parts of June will serve important functions, even if water is too hot for juvenile salmon.].</p>	
276	8	<p>[ATT 1:] Response of juvenile Chinook salmon to managed flow: lessons learned from a population at the southern extent of their range in North America.</p> <p>S.C. Zeug, K. Sellheim & C. Watry, Cramer Fish Sciences, Auburn, CA, USA</p> <p>J.D. Wikert, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lodi, CA, USA</p> <p>J. Merz, Cramer Fish Sciences, Auburn, CA, USA</p>	<p>The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
276	9	<p>[ATT 2:] NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-42</p> <p>Viable Salmonid Populations and the Recovery of Evolutionarily Significant Units</p> <p>June 2000</p> <p>U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service</p>	<p>The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
277	1	<p>It is important that the SWRCB is addressing the water quality issues of the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, San Joaquin and Merced rivers. For too many years the quality of the water in the rivers has taken a backseat to the needs of agricultural and industrial users. The long history of abuse started with the gold rush and continues to the present. The rivers cannot continue to accept abuse forever. If the quantity and temperature of the water is wrong the quality of the river will decline. This will cause the fish and animals living in and around the river to suffer.</p> <p>A related consequence is the unsatisfactory recreation for folks like me who like to canoe and picnic on the river. I used to paddle among the salmon during the fall run and see more salmon. Now if I go it is exciting to see one or two. Humans have caused these rivers to suffer for decades and it will take humans to begin to restore them to a more natural condition.</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>
277	2	<p>Your own report calls for 60% flows to help create a more natural flow. To have this flow from February to June may start to restore the river for the fish, critters and people. Listen to the scientists and their report instead of agriculture and industry who have a terrible history of exploitation of the river.</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>
278	1	<p>We need to maintain at least 60% of river flows to the SF Bay to maintain salmon populations. I grew up on bay in Point Richmond spending much of my childhood on the beach there. I can tell you from first hand experience that the intertidal zones are now dominated by ocean species that have replaced brackish water species which formerly</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
		dominated the beaches. I know first hand that the bay needs more fresh water to mat in its estuarine ecosystems.	
279	1	Please take an action not allowing the additional diversion of Delta inflows to unsustainable Big Agriculture. As an alternative, please direct your efforts to the maintenance of our natural resources and the development of ways to more efficiently utilize our existing resources.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
280	1	Our farms are very important to the Valley. We know what you are up to. Take our water away and we have to import our vegetables and fruit, cattle, chicken and pork. You are part of the destruction of America. Leave our water alone. The fish as in anything else that is alive will take care of themselves and if they don't, we don't need them. Most of you on the raid the water detail have never walked a farm or gotten dirty. Stop this insanity. Leave the water 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.
281	1	As a wholesale customer of SFPUC that purchases 100% of its potable water supply from the San Francisco Regional Water System, water supply available to NCCWD [North Coast County Water District] under the SED proposal could be reduced more than 50% under drought conditions for multiple consecutive years.	Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers.
281	2	NCCWD [North Coast County Water District] has made significant strides in water conservation since 2000. Residential per capita water use decreased 32% from 85.35 gallons per capita day (gpcd) to 57.9 gpcd.	The State Water Board acknowledges North Coast County Water District's water conservation effort and ongoing commitment to demand management. This comment does not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments. Please see response to comment 281-1.
281	3	Based on NCCWD's [North Coast County Water District] 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, this significant cut to water supply would force NCCWD to take a number of significant actions including instituting Stage 4 rationing that would limit per capita water use to approximately 30 gallons per person per day. At this usage level, NCCWD customers would face extreme hardship. At 30 gallons per person per day, all NCCWD customers would need to install rainwater cisterns and graywater systems to simply water any plants, flush toilets, or wash pets. This is unacceptable when alternatives exist to prevent such hardship.	Please see response to comment 281-1.
281	4	Since outdoor use represents a relatively small proportion of NCCWD's commercial, industrial, and institutional account water demand, commercial, industrial and institutional customers generally have fewer opportunities to reduce water use without changing their operations or incurring significant economic impacts.	Please see response to comment 281-1. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding economic considerations, growth effects, and demand management.
281	5	In lights of these aforementioned impacts as well as those articulated in the BAWSCA and SFPUC comment letters incorporated here by reference, NCCWD [North Coast County Water District] strongly requests that environmental and economic impacts of any shortage on the San Francisco Regional Water System, and the associated lost jobs and delayed development, be fully and adequately analyzed as part of the SWRCB's proposed flow alternatives. Such full and adequate analysis should be given at least equal weight with all	Please see responses to comments 281-1 and 281-4. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		other elements of the SWRCB's subsequent deliberations and decision making.	
281	6	The Governor has indicated his strong support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues. NCCWD [North Coast County Water District] requests that the SWRCB provide adequate time for voluntary agreements to be reached amongst the stakeholders prior to any action on the SED. Please give this settlement process a chance for success instead of expediting implementation of the current proposal. NCCWD shares BAWSCA's commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.
283	1	We need the water to grow food. This is the richest agricultural valley in the world. Without water, it will revert to almost a desert-like condition. It is irresponsible for this to be allowed. This overreach is not why you were placed into office. You need to work for the common good of humans. We voted you in and we can vote you out.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
284	1	The farmers and residents of Stanislaus, San Joaquin and Merced counties need water to keep their crops. Which is their means to support their families and to give this community fresh fruits and vegetables. We the residents of these counties are paying for our water while you sell it and the people you sell it to do not have any restrictions for the use of that water, as we do. Stop trying to make more money at our expense.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
285	1	The Stanislaus River is not being managed correctly. It is important to realize that salmon are not being saved by increasing river flows. The Central Valley of California and the farmers need to water their crops. Without water for our main economy in the valley, every single other industry in California will be impacted financially.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
286	1	I am continually disappointed by the policies set forth by the California Water Control District. Why? Because there is little consideration for the opinions of the people actually affected by the policies. It appears as though your decisions are often prescribed by special interest groups, who provide facts and figures regarding fish populations, water sheds and vegetation concerns. These facts and figures often are results of studies, which can be manipulated to demonstrate desired end results.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
286	2	I am not saying that fish and fowl are not important. That said, there has to be ways to meet and satisfy all concerns regarding water. In our area, water storage is of great concern. We have droughts and then years of rainfall in abundance. There are not enough storage facilities for our water. There are ways to meet both fish and agricultural concerns. Yet, the decisions made by your agency rather forget the latter.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
286	3	<p>I find that government has forgotten the reason they exist: By the people and FOR the people.</p> <p>Please take into consideration the needs of your agricultural and rural community opinions. Our representatives are seldom taken seriously, and we as community voices are seldom heard.</p> <p>This is specific to the Delta Plan, and also extends to water storage which is continually placed on the back burner.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this.</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
287	1	<p>The lives of so many organisms start in the brackish water of our very special Bay-Delta, the West Coast's largest estuary. These in turn feed more than 500 species of wildlife, many of which, like salmon, are keystone species in an immense ecological food web. It is a major stopover for the Pacific Flyway and the conduit for salmon, steelhead and sturgeon moving from the Pacific Ocean to spawn in inland streams and rivers.</p> <p>Our organization, Bay Visions, is made up of members of 6 garden clubs in the Bay Area who have banded together around our efforts to restore and protect the bay ecosystems. Our clubs all have projects at various places around the San Francisco Bay and Elkhorn Slough where we propagate and plant native plants in the transition zone above the wetlands. While working on these projects, we have come to appreciate the beauty and importance of the habitat as well as recognizing how much of the natural wetlands crucial to bay health have been lost to development. The time to restore the bay is now. We have seen how easy it is for nature to return and thrive when it is just given a chance. If we can just allow enough fresh water to flow into the bay to sustain the fish and other wildlife, the entire ecosystem will thrive. Fish will return in abundance and move back into the rivers to spawn. When they die, their bodies will provide fertilizer and nutrients for the plants and other animals hundreds of miles from the bay. Over 100 species depend on salmon. We need to restore the balance to this elegant natural system. The simple way is to just let the water flow. As gardeners, we recognize that agriculture needs water as well. However, it may not need as much as it is using. Certainly thirsty crops could be replaced by others that don't need as much water and may even produce more food per acre. We are all doing this in our gardens. Water efficient irrigation like drip systems are much more effective than overhead sprinklers. We are all replacing our lawns with drought tolerant plants. Surely agriculture, which uses the majority of the California's water, could embrace conservation at the same level that we do.</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>
287	2	<p>The recent passage of measure AA in the San Francisco Bay area shows the result of us all working together to collaborate on a solution to the pressing problem of bay restoration. The State Water Board in its 2010 report recommended that 60% of unimpaired river flow between February and June would fully protect fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries. We urge you to do as much as you can to increase the flow during this crucial time.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
288	1	<p>I commend the State Water Board for releasing its updated Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan which calls for 40% of unimpaired flows between February and June on the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries, of which the Tuolumne is the largest.</p> <p>However, I believe that at least half of the natural flow from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced and lower San Joaquin Rivers should be allowed to flow to the Bay-Delta in order for the delta to continue to give us a diversity of creature life. Also, the flows in this system must be sufficient to inundate floodplains, which serve as critical habitat for juvenile salmon and other fish. Our salmon populations are in peril as are the livelihoods of an entire fishing industry.</p> <p>Without sufficient water, entire ecosystems and all related critters will parish. We must not let this happen. Through conservation, we citizens of towns and cities can and have saved water, and farmers also need to do a better job of conserving 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>
288	2	<p>I believe that the Board should follow the Tuolumne River Trust recommendation of at least 50% unimpaired flow from the Sierra to the Delta in order to restore our river ecologies and</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the Bay-Delta.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
289	1	<p>I am requesting the board does not approve letting double the amount of water release from our lakes specifically Lake Tulloch for fish. You will be ruining our quality of life, lowering our property values and drying up our wells.</p> <p>The fish come back, we have dry years and wet years in California. The fish come back.</p> <p>Please stop taking our water without just cause.</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.
290	1	Water is life. Leave our water where it is. Our reservoirs should remain full. For that reason, I oppose your plan to increase flows in our 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.
291	1	As a farmer, your proposed 40% unimpaired flows objective will be devastating to my business as well as my family and employees that depend on our farm as well. While I understand the need for a healthy river and fishery, I believe the water board's proposal to be overreaching and short-sighted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
291	2	<p>Our local water district (TID) has diligently worked to find solutions to the problems facing the salmon in the Tuolumne River. I would encourage the members of the water board to engage TID as well as the other water districts, counties and cities that will be affected under the proposal.</p> <p>I believe that a solution can be found that protects the environment as well as the people that live, work and farm in our region. This can only happen by working together and is only sustainable through local control.</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.
291	3	As currently written, your proposal will cost jobs and min the economy without guaranteeing any improvement in the fish population. People will be hurt by this, especially the poor and working people of our area.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
292	1	Please keep the water on the farms. Do not let this proposal go through.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
293	1	I have watched the Water Board of California create a devastating Drought that has affected us in horrible ways. Studies have shown that giving more water to save "Fish" has not made much difference, they have survived on their own naturally. Because of removing water to help our Crops, jobs and livelihood, has been a long needed change, I Personally ask , that you consider giving the water back to us, the people of Central California, so that we may get back to producing much needed crops that create job security and food security for us. We are the "BREADBASKET OF THE WORLD, and when all the changes that you have made, has created devastating consequences for us. Please consider making the changes so that we can be: " BREADBASKET OF THE WORLD " again.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
294	1	Put humans before fish. That's why I am against your plan to increase river 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.
295	1	I am very much against your plan to increase flows on the Stanislaus River. It will devastate our local economy. This is not yours to take.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
296	1	Keeping the Central Valley bountiful is important to our food chain. I live in the Bay Area and always try to feed my family fresh, local, seasonal produce from California. I would like to keep the fresh local supply chain and not be forced to consume food from Mexico or shipped far from other states.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
297	1	I want to let you know how devastating this water grab will be to my family. Not only to my immediate family, but my extended family who farm in Stanislaus County. If you take away our water, we will lose the farm as we will not be able to farm. I implore you to look at the science of this and not take away our livelihood. Not only will this affect my brother and me, it will also impact our employees, the water master, the farm supply store and the others in Stanislaus County who depend on farming for their livelihood.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
298	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase flows on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers. There needs to be other solutions exhausted before taking such drastic measures that will economically devastate The 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.
299	1	Marin Conservation League commends the State Water Resources Control Board for its efforts to improve the health of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary by increasing inflows from the rivers of the San Joaquin basin. We are, however, concerned that the initial 40% standard would be inadequate to restore the Bay's diminished habitat. We thus urge you to raise the bar to 60%, a standard aligned with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's conclusion that this level is needed to maintain ecosystem functions and protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses that were established in the 2006 Plan for the Bay-Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
299	2	<p>We recognize that the Board is charged with balancing the many competing uses of the public's water resources, but the health of the estuary's ecosystem is essential if it is to continue to support these uses in San Francisco Bay, where it is a major driver for the Bay Area economy. The estuary's health – its water quality and aquatic habitat – has declined gravely under the current regimen and substantial change is needed to reverse the damage wrought by years of excessive diversions.</p> <p>If the Bay is to continue into the future to provide its many services, it is essential that the Board's judgment be based on the findings and recommendations of scientists from fish and wildlife agencies and other informed sources. These findings indicate that the 40% standard, while an improvement, will not fully protect the Bay's habitat. Fish and the entire supporting ecosystem require nutrient-rich freshwater inflows that tributaries in the Bay Delta are able to provide, but more than our estuary now receives. We urge you to make the health of our Bay a priority goal of the water quality standards you are considering.</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.