From:Lesley StansfieldTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Trumps plan for a water tunnel in CaliforniaDate:Tuesday, February 4, 2020 11:14:15 AM

Don't doom the long term health of the Delta with a single tunnel. No tunnels!

From:	Kevin heldt
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Tunnel
Date:	Sunday, January 19, 2020 10:11:32 AM

Dear State Agency

Please require sound science as the Basis for deciding on whether to move forward with the single tunnel project .

Thank You, Kevin Heldt KDH construction 415-686-0911 From:Harry MashTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Tunnel ProjectDate:Thursday, January 23, 2020 1:48:06 PM

I AM A 70 YEAR RESIDENT OF SOUTHERN CAL. AND ASK THAT YOU PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE MOVE THIS PROJECT ALONG. THIS WORK SHOULD HAVE BEEN COMPLETED MANY YEARS AGO. DO YOUR BEST TO EXPEDITE THE PROCESS.

BEST REGARDS,

HARRY MASH 1516 MELODY LN FULLERTON, CA. 92831

<u>Lyn Roy</u>
DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Tunnel project input
Friday, January 17, 2020 2:58:19 PM

This single tunnel project should be proven to allow adequate fresh water supply to the Delta; and not allow salt water intrusion to upset the health of Northern California people, nor the plant and fish populations.

I'm old enough to remember the intrusions from drought years; it would be a gravely irresponsible decision to set that in motion again.

I want to see a specific plan developed to prevent this: mandatory agricultural conservation practices; added storage reservoirs; improved recycling practices.

Thank you for considering these thoughts; I'm sure there's thousands upon thousands of other citizens who feel just as strongly that independent scientific study needs to be applied to this before you make any decisions about going forward.

Paul and Lynda Roy Concord, Ca.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Randa Solick
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Tunnels
Date:	Monday, January 20, 2020 5:34:57 PM

I'm against one - or two - tunnels, which will negatively affect the species and plants in the Delta's ecosystem, according to scientists who live there. The Delta needs MORE water, not less. So the Governor's one-tunnel plan has to do both things, protect the Delta ecosystem and provide more reliable water for California.

Please use real science to counter Trump's threatened lawsuit. Stop this plan.

Thank you, Randa Solick from Aptos, CA

Victoria Tatum Wilson
DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
tunnels
Thursday, January 16, 2020 9:13:45 AM

Please stop wasting money on endless studies and presentations of an idea that was initiated decades ago and, thankfully, still has not materialized. Do not kill the Delta for the sake of big ag in the south Central Valley, where the ground is subsiding by 20 feet due to overdrawing of the aquifers, and where because more almonds are being grown than we can possibly eat in this country, they are being shipped to China.

From:	Betsy Wilde
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Date:	Sunday, February 9, 2020 7:17:22 PM

02/08/20 To Governor Newsom,

I hereby formally join my voice with the voices of California's Northstate Communities as well as the Yurok, Karuk and Hupa tribes who oppose the California Water Portfolio which includes the Delta Tunnel project.

This new plan and its short public commentary period is impulsive and contradicts the promises that you made, as governor, to stand up to corporate greed and faulty federal science. Many people who care and would have a voice are unaware of the proposal and it is flying fast under the radar. The Delta Tunnel project states it would divert water from the Sacramento River. This is deceiving, as the Sacramento pulls water from Whiskeytown lake in times of low flow. Whiskeytown Lake is filled by the Trinity River, a tributary into the Klamath.

Since 1964 the Trinity River has been dammed to create Trinity Lake, the third largest man-made lake in the state. There was tribal dissent against the dam at this time but unfortunately they could not win out. As much as 90 percent of the upper Trinity River watershed was then diverted for desert agriculture in the Central Valley. This diversion dramatically shrank the scope of the river and it's inhabitants. In 1991 environmental regulations were enacted, requiring a greater release of water to the Trinity River in order to protect fish. However, the use of Trinity River water remains a contentious issue, especially in years of drought.

In 2017 the Klamath and Trinity rivers witnessed the worst fall run Chinook salmon return in recorded history, leading to disastrous results for both the commercial and recreational fishing in California and Oregon. That year only 1,123 adult winter Chinook salmon returned to the Sacramento Valley. Though we have had **near** average precipitation in the last few years we cannot make a plan based on the assumption that this trend will hold out in the face of climate change. The fish cannot spare another drop and certainly not the 67,325 gallons a second your plan proposes.

It is nearsighted to argue that we, the people, wish to let our water simply run into the ocean for a mere fish. We, the people of the Trinity Valley see the fish as an integral part of our life, it is the canary in a coal mine for the health of all species in this ecosystem. Those who do not know this place cannot imagine the wealth a healthy river with adequate flows contributes to the ability of the sovereign nations of the Hupa and the Yurok to thrive.

The scope of your investigation into this plan's viability must include environmental impact studies on the Trinity River and the Klamath River. It is ill informed to say that it will not have an effect on our river system. Please invite scientific inquiry from outside the federal scope to determine the consequences for our lifesource.

Sincerely, One Water Protector, Betsy Wilde P.O. BOX 82 Salyer, CA. 95563

From:	Noel Eberhardt
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Use sound science!
Date:	Friday, January 17, 2020 8:49:16 PM

Dear Water Agency,

When deciding on moving forward with the single tunnel project, I insist you use sound science as a basis of your decision. The long term health and survival of the delta must take precedence over maximizing water diversion to the south.

Noel Eberhardt 21407 Krzich Place Cupertino, CA

From:	Mike Speckman
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Using Sound Science for Delta Project
Date:	Monday, January 20, 2020 8:34:11 PM

I urge you to protect our fragile delta and waterways. The political means do not justify the permanent damage the Delta Tunnel will create.

Please allow the science and environmental sound practices be at the heart of your decision for us and our future children.

Thank you

Mike Speckman

Director of Endowment and Tuition Assistance 1885 Miramonte Ave. Mountain View CA. 94040 (650) 210-2426 (direct) From:Sue HigginsTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Water commentsDate:Thursday, January 16, 2020 6:57:28 AM

The water should come from the 2 abandon water distilleries in Pittsburgh CA distill water and send it south this would not effect our delta. And the govican have a pipeline to bring it south. Sincerely Sue Higgins Oakley Sent from my iPhone

From:	Geoff Coombes
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Water grab.
Date:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 3:44:15 PM

My child is 3 years old and loves fishing and the outdoors. You need to use real science to stop this water grab bc it can has a potential to destroy all that is amazing about the wild habitat we call the delta . We all plead with you to make the right choice that will not destroy our water ways and kill thousand of animals that need the delta water for survival . Use science not greed for money. Thank you

The Coombes family.

From:Ronny Van HorneTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Water supplyDate:Tuesday, February 4, 2020 10:44:05 AM

Why not more desalination in the southern California area?

Ron Van Horne 1731 w. Oak Ave. Fullerton, CA 92833

John Hayward
DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
NRM WINTU; Cyn Childress
Additional Scoping Meeting for Delta Conveyance Project
Saturday, February 15, 2020 11:47:34 AM

Dear Emily,

The Nor Rel Muk Wintu Nation is strongly opposed to the proposed infrastructure in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, otherwise known as Delta Conveyance Project. The Nor Rel Muk Wintu Nation will be in attendance at the meeting in Redding, Ca scheduled for March 2, 2020 at 6pm.

Thank you,

John Hayward Nor Rel Muk Wintu Nation Chairman Please see attached comments.

One Tunnel Too Many

Some may believe that One Tunnel is a compromise to the defeated Twin Tunnel "Water Fix" Project. It is not. The One Tunnel, "Delta Conveyance Project" is just a Water Fix/Peripheral Canal do-over.

It may sound like One Tunnel might be less expensive or less devastating to those in its path. It's footprint would be just as irreparable as the previous Twin Tunnel Project. There will still be:

Estimated 13 years of construction/destruction

- Same proposed intake location
- Same proposed closure of vital Delta waterways
- Relentless pile driving and heavy construction equipment noise
- Seismic impact in California Historic Communities
- Seismic impact adversely impacting native species
- Crippling traffic impacting all Delta Highways
- •
- Levees and levee roads crushed by the constant barrage of construction equipment
- Local Delta business will be decimated

The One Tunnel proposal solves nothing and poses all the same environmental issues. Endless construction/destruction to the most popular waterways. The Historic Communities of Hood, Locke and Clarksburg will become ghost towns after trying to live through the pounding of pile drivers through their front yards.

With all the destruction, the wildlife will desert the area. It will be uninhabitable. Do we think they will ever return? Will the people of Hood, Locke and Clarksburg ever return? All this expense and hardship, for what....

There will be no more water. This isn't a magic pill, creating more water for the almond growers, Big Ag or thirsty Southern California communities.

Better to create water storage reservoirs than flood control reservoirs. Better to prohibit Big Ag from growing thirsty crops like almonds and pistachios. We have no business growing things like almonds in a region like the Central Valley. Better to have controlled real estate growth, like other states. No plan for water, no building permits.

How many times will we have to fight this same fight? Diverting clean water from the Sacramento River will destroy an already fragile ecosystem. Too much money, too much destruction, too much hardship. Please end this conspiracy against the California Delta.

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan Simpson Cupertino, California Discovery Bay, California

From:	<u>Virginia Phelps</u>
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Comments
Date:	Sunday, February 23, 2020 9:38:07 AM
Attachments:	Delta Conveyance comments by me.docx

Good Morning,

Attached are my comments. Thank you for the opportunity.

Virginia Phelps

Delta Conveyance comments can be submitted:

By email: DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov

3 Concerns

#1 Legislative ignorance.

The February 20, 2020 Record Searchlight quoted US Representative Doug LaMalfa.

"For too long California water has been utterly wasted by sending vast quantities of it out to the ocean for no use,"

It is so sad that he has no idea how the ecosystems work. Is it possible for the State to hold ecosystem basics workshops for lawmakers?

It isn't just the fisheries and the environment that need freshwater flows. Without adequate freshwater flows through the Delta, export water can be too salty for agriculture, both in the Delta and south of the Delta. Apparently urban export users have also had to treat water that is too salty. Also, inadequate freshwater flows through the Delta cause toxic harmful algal blooms (HABs), which are a serious health issue in San Joaquin and other Delta counties.

#2 Native Aquatic ecosystems

As a second point of public input, I would like to ensure the State is informed about a series of water projects being undertaken throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys titled The Multi-Benefit Flood Protection Project. Its website can be found at <u>https://www.multibenefitproject.org/</u>. The projects are either planned or completed with goals of improving water quality, replenishing groundwater, expanding public recreation opportunities, increasing flexibility for reservoir operators, and strengthening resilience to extreme weather events due to climate change.

The Nature Conservancy is conducting a Multi Benefit Pilot Test groundwater recharge project in Colusa County next Fall.

#3 Where Does the State's Precious Water Go?

For fracking as suggested in the Jesse Dizard, CSU, Chico film?

Treading Water - YouTube

www.youtube.com > watch > v=u97G21eQGGE

To "California's water barons while everyday citizens endure a debilitating water crisis" as described in the National Geographic documentary "Water & Power: C California Heist"?

Wise use for equitable purpose is crucial. You have an enormous responsibility.

Virginia Phelps, Palo Cedro, CA 96073 phelpsvirginia@yahoo.com

From:	bobpyke@attglobal.net
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	Ryan Hernandez; "Richard Denton"; Diane Burgis; Jennifer Barton
Subject:	Consideration of Alternatives to the Currently Proposed Delta Conveyance
Date:	Monday, February 24, 2020 6:07:21 PM
Attachments:	NDCARES.pptx
	Pyke comments on BDCP PDEIR-EIS - with Addendum.pdf
	WDIC White Paper.pdf

I spoke briefly at the public hearing held in Brentwood on Thursday 20th February and mentioned that on behalf of a team of my colleagues I had described an alternative to the then BDCP or Twin Tunnels at a meeting in early 2011 with John Laird, Jerry Meral and Karla Nemeth that was held in the office of Assemblymember Joan Buchanan in the State Capitol. As I recall, Secretary Laird said that it seemed like we had some good ideas but we were 18 months too late. Hah, hah, hah! I had previously served for eight years as a member of a reasonably high level review panel on the Yucca Mountain Project and our response to criticisms was generally that there was no time to obtain better data or do a proper study because certain deadlines had to be met. The deadlines were of course never met and eventually the project collapsed under its own weight, just like the BDCP.

Anyway, I am attaching some materials relative to an alternative solution to the ongoing problems in the Delta that I believe complies with the co-equal goals of the Delta Reform Act. This alternative, for want of a sexier name, is usually referred to as the Western Delta Intakes Concept. The description that I am providing is now 10 years old so that it might need to be updated in some respects but I believe the basic principles are still sound. The WDIC was briefly considered as an alternative in the BDCP EIR/EIS but whatever junior staff at the DWR wrote it up did not speak to the team that developed it and appeared not to understand what it was. I therefore wrote some responses which I am also attaching. I am hoping that you might take the statutory requirement to study comparable alternatives more seriously this time around and would be happy to provide further information and/or to meet with you.

Regards,

Robert Pyke Ph.D., P.E., G.E.

Robert Pyke, Consulting Engineer 1310 Alma Avenue, No. W201 Walnut Creek CA 94596

(925) 323 7338

Robert Pyke, Consulting Engineer

May 26, 2014

Comments on the BDCP Public Draft EIR/EIS

1. The content of the Plan and the EIR/EIS is inconsistent with the stated objectives, purpose and need. While these are comments on the EIR/EIS, not on the Plan itself, the "project" that is described in both the Plan and the EIR/EIS, has not been demonstrated in the EIR/EIS to achieve the stated objectives, purpose and need.

In Section 2.3, Projective Objectives, (under CEQA) it is stated:

DWR's fundamental purpose in proposing the BDCP is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.

This statement of purpose is followed by three project objectives:

• Respond to the applications for incidental take permits take related to: 1. The operation of existing SWP Delta facilities and construction and operation of facilities for the movement of water entering the Delta from the Sacramento Valley watershed to the existing State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) pumping plants located in the southern Delta;

2. The implementation of any conservation actions that have the potential to result in take of species that are or may become listed under the ESA, pursuant to the ESA at §10(a)(1)(B) 10 and its implementing regulations and policies; (3. is no longer applicable.)

• To improve the ecosystem of the Delta by:

1. Providing for the conservation and management of covered species through actions within the BDCP Planning Area that will contribute to the recovery of the species; and 2. Protecting, restoring, and enhancing certain aquatic, riparian, and associated terrestrial natural communities and ecosystems.

3. Reducing the adverse effects to certain listed species of diverting water by relocating the intakes of the SWP and CVP;

• Restore and protect the ability of the SWP and CVP to deliver up to full contract amounts, when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient water,

1310 Alma Avenue, No. 201, Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Telephone 925.323.7338 E-mail bobpyke@attglobal.net Web http://rpce.us

consistent with the requirements of State and federal law and the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements.

And by five "additional project objectives" which include:

To make physical improvements to the conveyance system that will minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a major earthquake that causes breaching of Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas in which the SWP and CVP pumping plants operate in the southern Delta.

The three project objectives that are cited above are not met on the basis of the voluminous material presented in the Plan and the EIR. In particular, it seems unlikely that the first objective, which has to do with the granting of incidental take permits, will be met in view of the failure to date to produce an effects analysis that convincingly shows that all listed species will be lifted far above jeopardy with the potential for them to be delisted. The most recent peer review panel assembled by the Delta Science Program at the request of the BDCP¹ concluded that the current effects analysis is incomplete and inconsistent and an independent review conducted for The Nature Conservancy and American Rivers reached similar conclusions².

The additional project objective that is cited above is in fact a red herring, as will be discussed in more detail subsequently, but the notion that an undefined major earthquake could cause widespread breaches of Delta levees appears to rely largely on the Delta Risk Management Strategy, whose conclusions were also discredited by another peer review panel assembled by the Delta Science Program. To the extent that there is any risk to the Delta Levee System posed by earthquakes, this can be addressed more effectively and more cheaply by implementing the recommendations of the Economic Sustainability Plan of the Delta Protection Commission³. As noted below, this is just one of the actions that are likely to occur in the Delta within the next 50 years independent of the BDCP that should have been described and discussed in the No Action Alternative.

¹ <u>http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/science-event/10163</u>

 $[\]label{eq:linear} ^{2} \underline{ http://mavensnotebook.com/2013/09/19/this-just-in-american-rivers-and-the-nature-conservancy-release-independent-review-of-the-bay-delta-conservation-plan/} \\$

³ <u>http://forecast.pacific.edu/desp.html</u>

The Project Purpose (under NEPA) detailed in Sections 2.4 is generally similar to the Projective Objectives described under CEQA, although earthquakes are not mentioned. The companion Project Need detailed in Section 2.5 is more propaganda than a true statement of need and must be rewritten in order to be consistent with both the facts and the project that is actually described in the Plan and the EIR/EIS.

In Section 2.5.1, Delta Ecosystem Health and Productivity, actual data on the decline of native species could and should be cited rather than offering slanted speculation on the causes of these declines:

Most of the original tidal wetlands and many miles of sloughs in the Delta were removed by channelization and levee construction between the 1850s and 1930s. These physical changes, coupled with higher water exports and declines in water quality from urban and agricultural discharges and changes in constituent dilution capacity from managed inflows and diversions, have stressed the natural system and led to a decline in ecological productivity.

This language makes it sound as if higher water exports and urban and agricultural waste water are merely contributors to the current decline of the Delta ecosystem, rather than prime causes. While undoubtedly hydraulic mining, channelization of the rivers for flood control purposes and reclamation of the Delta irreversibly changed the River-Delta-Bay ecosystem, salmon runs measured in the millions persisted even after the first dams were built on the rivers. It was only when water exports started to be ratcheted up that salmon populations declined dramatically. Getting real about the causes of the problem might shine more light on possible solutions⁴.

Section 2.5.2, Water Supply Reliability, concludes with the following statement:

The current and projected future inability of the SWP and CVP to deliver water to meet the demands of certain south of Delta CVP and SWP water contractors is a very real concern. More specifically, there is an overall declining ability to meet defined water supply delivery volumes and water quality criteria to support water users' needs for human consumption, manufacturing uses, recreation, and crop irrigation.

⁴ See <u>http://www.fixcawater.com/problem.html</u> generally, and

http://nebula.wsimg.com/f672fc67a1a44a62e65fcf57c1b65829?AccessKeyId=AD7307F3D4020EDFF747 &disposition=0&alloworigin=1 specifically.

This heart-rending language should be replaced with an evaluation of how much water surplus to Northern California and environmental needs is actually available for export under various scenarios. It is acknowledged that there will never be complete agreement on how much water is needed for environmental purposes but it is relatively easy to make calculations of how much surplus water is available for export making a range of assumptions regarding Delta outflows and pumping locations and operating rules. Such basic calculations do not appear to have been done but they are necessary to see whether it is now feasible to approach full contract amounts for exports even with favorable hydrological conditions when the diversions from the Northern Rivers that were to supply as much as 5 maf per year when those contract amounts were agreed to are no longer available as a result of State and Federal policy changes.

Section 2.5.3, Delta Hydrology and Water Quality, is remarkable for defining a need that the Plan does not address which includes both salinity intrusion and :

Additionally, other water constituents of concern in the Delta have been identified through ongoing regulatory, monitoring, and environmental planning processes such as CALFED, planning functions of the State Water Board, and the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of state water bodies that do not meet applicable water quality standards. In June 2007 (with updates in February and May 2009), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave final approval of a list of 18 chemical constituents identified in the Section 303(d) list for impaired Delta waters (State Water Resources Control Board 2007). Included in this list are dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) and other pesticides, mercury, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and selenium.

Although there is a clear need for addressing in-Delta water quality issues, none of the alternatives considered except Alternative 9 are geared to address these issues and the CEQA preferred alternative, Alternative 4 in conjunction with Operational Scenario H, actually improves export water quality at the expense of Delta water quality! BDCP staff and consultants have admitted that it is not possible to address the projected decline in Delta water quality while sticking with this preferred alternative! That the preferred alternative does not address a stated need, but in fact aggravates the situation, is not only indefensible but laughable.

In summary, the principal objectives, purpose and need that are detailed for purposes of compliance with CEQA and NEPA are not met by the preferred alternative, or any other alternative that is described in the Plan or the EIR. There is no convincing evidence of any overall improvement in the Delta ecosystem - there may be marginal improvement in expectations for Delta smelt but expectations for salmon are made more problematic

Page **5** of **56**







Figure 2 – Monthly Delta Exports for High Outflow Scenario

- and there is no expectation that the SWP and the CVP will deliver up to full contract amounts under any hydrological condition – the interpretation of the results buried in the EIR/EIS by the BDCP staff is that exports will be maintained at present levels, plus or minus 10 percent, except that exports may have to be reduced if species recovery goals are not met, a circumstance that appears to have a high probability of occurrence. In fact, even the projection of maintaining exports at something like present levels is a fiction. Figures 1 and 2, kindly provided by Richard Denton, show that in order to achieve this overall level of exports, it is necessary to resort to more pumping in drier months than is the case at present. It is not easy to trace the effects of this through the present effects analysis, but this might be one of the reasons that the effects analysis does not show sufficiently positive results to justify the granting of incidental take permits. If the operational rules were to be changed so that the effects analysis suggests more positive results for salmonids, the volume of exports would immediately be reduced. These figures also show that it is ludicrous for BDCP proponents to talk about taking a "little sip, big gulp approach", that is to take more water at periods of high flows and little of no water at periods of low flows. The BDCP does not in fact include the necessary physical components to do that. It should also be noted that it is unclear whether the aqueducts can presently carry the combined maximum exports of 14,400 cfs shown in Figures 1 and 2 because of subsidence caused by excessive pumping of groundwater, so that it is doubly questionable whether the planned level of exports can actually be achieved.

There are two reasons why the present Plan and EIR/EIS cannot be consistent with the stated objectives, purpose and need. One is that a "project" defined by its sponsors as being contained wholly within the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (the Delta), cannot possibly solve the present conveyance and storage problems that limit water supply quantity and reliability to areas south of the Delta, nor can a "project" or "plan" that consists solely of actions within the Delta restore the ecosystem of what is inescapably a linked Rivers-Delta- Bay ecosystem of which the Bay-Delta estuary is an important component. Another is that a project that is basically a grab for the better quality water in the North Delta, that further reduces the flows through the Delta, cannot possibly reverse the conversion of the Delta from an estuary to a weedy lake nor make any significant progress on restoring the ability of the SWP and the CVP to deliver full contract amounts, even when there are favorable hydrological conditions.

What then is required to address the stated objectives, purpose and need?

Consideration of the water supply reliability question has to start with recognition that not only does two-thirds of the precipitation in California fall in the northern half of the

Page **7** of **56**



Figure 3 - Delta Inflow and Outflow

State while two-thirds of the population live in the southern half of the State, but also with recognition that in California precipitation is not evenly distributed over time but tends to come in bunches of wetter than normal years and then bunches of drier than normal years (droughts), as may be seen in Figure 3. This is just as important as the geographical distribution of precipitation. It may be noted in Figure 3 that earlier last century a decent amount of water passed out of the Delta to the Bay and the Ocean even in dry years (the green bars). But now in periods of drought very little water passes through the Bay to the Ocean. While there are other stressors on the Bay Delta ecosystem, it is inescapable that the lack of Delta outflow in dry years coupled with the cross flow within the Delta that leads to millions of fish being captured and subsequently dying in the fish salvage facilities associated with the South Delta pumps, has had a major adverse impact on both the Bay Delta ecosystem and the viability of salmon runs that have existed for 7,000 years or so through mediaeval warm periods and the Little Ice Age but are now threatened with extinction.

These basic facts lead to two fundamental principles:

DCS117

Page **8** of **56**

1. That natural flows through the Delta should be restored to the maximum practical extent, both in terms of quantity and the pattern of flow;

2. That much less, or zero, water should be extracted at periods of low flows, and that greater amounts of the water available during periods of higher flow that is surplus to the needs of Northern California users and the Delta ecosystem can be extracted for export.

Preliminary calculations of the annual and average yields, of the kind that have not been made as part of the development of the Plan or the EIR/EIS, suggest that with the necessary plumbing in place to allow export of much greater amounts of water in periods of high flow, with the surplus over current needs South of the Delta being stored, primarily as groundwater, that average deliveries could not only be maintained at present levels but that they could be readily maintained through a three year drought and possibly through a six-year drought. That would constitute real water supply reliability, not false hope of water supply reliability.

A project complying with these two principles might require some re-operation of the existing reservoirs and definitely would require that additional South of Delta storage facilities be constructed by the recipients of the exported water, but the principal facilities would all be in the Delta as is the case with the BDCP.

The current "project" complies with neither of these principles and therefore cannot possibly meet the stated objectives, purpose and need. No amount of phony effects analyses or archaic water balance and water quality analyses can show that it does!

If the "project" were to redefined as a project whose principal purpose is to provide better water quality for SWP and CVP Contractors at the expense of in-Delta water quality, then the current findings of the EIR/EIS would be consistent with the objectives, purpose and need, but the current findings are not consistent with the currently stated objectives, purpose and need and, moreover, the public draft EIR/EIS is just as incomplete and inconsistent as the existing effects analysis.

In summary, the current public draft of the EIR/EIS does not describe a preferred alternative, or indeed, any alternative, that meets the stated objectives, purpose and need. Either a preferred alternative that will actually meet the stated objectives, purpose and need must be described and analyzed or the stated objectives, purpose and

DCS117

Page **9** of **56**

need must be changed and in either case a new draft EIR/EIS must be released for public review and comment.

2. The EIR/EIS does not include consideration of alternatives which better address the stated objectives, purpose and need and does not even seriously evaluate a No Action Alternative.

With the exception of Alternative 9, the current EIR/EIS evaluates only variations on the common theme of adding an isolated conveyance from the North Delta to the existing export facilities in the South Delta. The reason for this is clear - the proposed project is driven by the desire of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for better quality water to blend with their salty Colorado River supplies coupled with the ire of the Westlands Water District at exports from the South Bay facilities sometimes being limited by arbitrary limits on the take of Delta smelt. But, as aggravating as those arbitrary limits might be to the westside farmers, their prospects are much more limited by the fact that they are farming in the rain shadow of the Coast ranges and, absent the past inflated and illegal diversions from the Trinity River and the lack of development of other diversions from the Northern Rivers, there is insufficient water available in the CVP for them to survive in dry years without pumping the groundwater ever lower. If the stated objectives, purpose and need of the BDCP are to be achieved, a much more serious study of alternatives is required, not just to demonstrate that the preferred alternative is superior to other alternatives but to find one or more alternatives that actually provide water supply reliability, restore the Delta ecosystem, and improve water quality for both exporters and in-Delta users. Basically that requires developing one or more solutions that comply with the two principles delineated in the previous section.

As noted above, no long-term plan to address California's water management issues can succeed unless the wide variation in precipitation from year to year is addressed. This creates a problem in discussion of possible alternatives to the BDCP because the BDCP does not really address this point and formal legal challenges to the BDCP EIR are limited to projects that include the same stated purposes as the BDCP. Thus, since the BDCP does not include any actions outside the Delta such as additional storage or measures to make existing water supplies go further such as conservation, recycling, stormwater capture and desalination, all of which are needed to better survive droughts, alternatives that rely on these measures do not necessarily constitute valid legal alternatives to the BDCP under CEQA. For instance, a "limited action alternative" that simply improves levees to further reduce seismic risk and reduces exports but compensates for that with increased funding for conservation, recycling, stormwater capture and desalination may not meet the legal test for being a valid alternative because the purpose of the BDCP is to provide reliable exports at around existing levels and to obtain incidental take permits to cover those exports. However, the claim that the BDCP consists of measures entirely within the Delta is fallacious since at least some re-operation of SWP and CVP reservoirs is likely to be necessary to meet bypass flow and Delta outflow requirements and restoration of the aqueducts in the San joaquin Valley is likely necessary in order to convey as much as 14,400 cfs south from the Delta, as is proposed at present.

Moreover, the 2009 Delta Reform Act sets the following as a basic goal of the State for the Delta: Achieve the two coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place; and it subsequently charges the Delta Stewardship Council to accept the BDCP in to the Delta Plan if, and only if, the BDCP has studied a reasonable range of conveyance alternatives, amongst other things. These are broader requirements than the self-declared purposes of the BDCP and if the BDCP does not meet them, it cannot be included in the Delta Plan and it will otherwise be non-compliant with State law.

Of the various alternatives that have been proposed to date in public, but not studied seriously as alternatives in the BDCP, there are two that do appear to satisfy the stated purposes of the BDCP and in varying degrees address the broader, longer-term problem. These alternatives can be thought of a minimum approach and a maximum approach to exporting surplus water from the Delta. *Both assume that as economics dictate, growing use will be made of conservation, recycling, stormwater capture and desalination but they do not spell out the details of this. Both allow the construction of additional upstream and south-of-Delta surface storage, but do not specifically call for it. The "maximum" alternative, however, specifically calls for much increased groundwater storage obtained by using big gulps in wet year to recharge the groundwater basins in the San Joaquin Valley that are presently overdrafted. The minimum approach would likely require significant retirement of irrigated lands in the San Joaquin Valley, but the maximum approach might not.*

DCS117

The minimum approach would essentially be a valid "no action alternative" in terms of the BDCP. The present public draft of the BDCP EIR/EIS gives short shrift to the No Action Alternative. Indeed at the open house held in Walnut Grove on the public draft, BDCP consultants freely admitted that in the current draft the No Action Alternative is not evaluated in the same detail as other alternatives and, laughably, gave "space limitations" as an excuse for that!

In Section 9.3.3.1 it is stated:

The No Action Alternative assumptions also include projects and programs that are permitted or are assumed to be constructed by 2060.

However then, in Section 9.3.3.1.1 the current draft says:

Ongoing and reasonably foreseeable future projects in parts of the Delta are expected to upgrade the levees to a "flood-safe" condition under the 100-year return flood elevation. However, these projects would provide very little levee foundation strengthening and improvements directed at improving the stability of the levees to better withstand ground shaking, liquefaction, and slope instability.

This language is purely political and does not reflect the reality that the Economic Sustainability Plan of the Delta Protection Commission recommends future improvement of most lowland Delta levees and other Delta levees that may be susceptible to damage resulting from liquefaction even though they meet the PL 84-99 standard to a new standard popularly called the "fat levee" standard. This has been widely discussed both in official meetings and in the press. It has been confirmed by recent improvements made on Jones Tract, as a result of outstanding cooperation between EBMUD, the local reclamation district, the DWR and CA Wildlife, that such "fat" levees can be constructed at the reasonable cost of \$2-3 million per mile. Improvement of 600 miles of Delta levees to this standard would thus cost less than \$2 billion, a small fraction of the estimated cost of the BDCP. The DWR, the Delta Stewardship Council and the DPC are currently collaborating on outlining legislation that would create a Delta Flood Risk Management District that will take over funding of such improvements once current bond funding has been exhausted. It can easily be projected that the Economic Sustainability Plan recommendation will be fully implemented by 2060.

The "fat" levees recommended in the Economic Sustainability Plan are specifically designed to allow the planting of vegetation on their water side in order to provide shaded riparian habitat for various listed species. Further, if supplemented by additional conservation measures including measures that are already being planned such as those at Prospect Island and Dutch Slough, that are properly located, instead of being wrongly located as is the case with the BDCP5, what is still a no action alternative in terms of conveyance would be marginally capable of meeting the stated purposes of the BDCP in terms of CEQA and NEPA. Such a "no action alternative" would likely allow the SWP and CVP to deliver up to full contract amounts, when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient water (that is in wet years), although, as with the BDCP, full contract amounts would not be delivered in normal to dry years and no additional storage or groundwater recharge would be created in order to help the SWP and CVP Contractors survive periods of drought. This might force retirement of some irrigated acreage in the San Joaquin Valley or, at a minimum, necessitate restrictions on the planting of permanent crops. Under this minimum approach the pattern of flow through the Delta would still be unnatural and significant numbers of fish would still be caught in the "salvage facilities" in the South Delta and not survive subsequent transport and release, but such a conveyance alternative with appropriate operating rules, would still have a better chance of qualifying for HCP and NCCP status than the existing BDCP.

The Maximum Approach would comply with the two principles enunciated above. The Western Delta Intakes Concept (WDIC) which is mislabeled as the "Pyke Proposal" and poorly described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.11.4, serves as an example of an alternative conveyance and ecosystem restoration solution that complies with these principles. The WDIC is not necessarily the only solution that complies with these principles and a serious effort should be made both to seek other solutions that do and to develop them to the point that a valid comparison of alternatives can be made. This is required not only to satisfy the requirements of CEQA but more importantly to develop the optimum solution to the problems or needs that the BDCP is supposed to be addressing. No-one disputes that these problems or needs are real. But what is needed is a solution that actually addresses them, rather than 40,000 pages of mumbo jumbo which do not.

A detailed response to the inaccurate description and evaluation of the WDIC that is included in the public draft EIR/EIS is attached at Appendix A to these comments and more detailed description and references can be found at <u>http://fixCAwater.com</u>.

Briefly, the WDIC would relocate the principal point of diversion for exports from the South Delta to the West Delta. Water surplus to upstream and in-Delta needs and the Delta outflow required to sustain fisheries would be extracted through permeable embankments on Sherman Island that would constitute the world's largest fish screens. Because Sherman Island is located in an area of large tidal flows, the water extracted would only be a small fraction of the total flow at that point. The principle objective of this relocation would be to restore more natural flows through the Delta both in pattern and quantity in order to reverse the gradual conversion of the Delta from an estuary into a weedy lake choked by invasive plants, but it also has the merit of making the extraction of water for exports self-regulating, because any attempt to over-extract water would result in saline water being sucked into the pumps. Water extracted at Sherman Island would be transported to the Clifton Court Forebay in large tunnels, similar to those proposed in the BDCP, but half the length. The existing South Delta pumps would be retained both to lift water into the canals going south, but also to extract water directly from the Old River through new state-of-the-art fish screens on the very limited occasions when there are high flows in the San Joaquin and Old Rivers. When the South Delta pumps are extracting water from the Old River, water from Sherman Island that cannot not be moved south right away would be stored temporarily in a further enlarged Los Vaqueros Reservoir⁶ and/or a new Brushy Creek Reservoir. The objective or this rearrangement of conveyance facilities is to allow the extraction of as much as 30,000 cfs during the limited periods of high flows in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Without such a rearrangement it will never be possible to extract enough water during periods of high flows to make up for the need to reduce or eliminate extraction during periods of low flows. In the absence of other longer-term solutions, water quality in the South Delta would be maintained by re-circulation as necessary from the export canals to the San Joaquin River.

Again, the WDIC actually addresses the stated objectives, purpose and need of the BDCP whereas the BDCP does not. It was first outlined in an Op-Ed in the Contra Costa Times on Christmas Day, 2010. I subsequently met with Under Secretary Meral on May 11,

⁶ Potential use of Los Vaqueros Dam is only conceptual and would require negotiation with the Contra Costa Water District. Los Vaqueros is presently restricted to local use only.

2011, and then with Secretary Laird and Under Secretary Meral on February 29, 2012. There was ample time after these meetings for the BDCP to conduct a proper evaluation of the WDIC, but that was not done. Apart from one phone call to chase down a reference, neither I nor the team that has worked on developing the WDIC have been approached by BDCP staff or consultants to discuss any aspect of the WDIC. As can be seen from my detailed responses in Appendix A, the evaluation that is included in the public draft EIR/EIS is ill-informed and incorrect.

As has been correctly noted by the Delta Independent Science Board⁷ "the project (meaning the BDCP) is encumbered by uncertainties that are considered inconsistently and incompletely; modeling has not been used effectively to bracket a range of uncertainties or to explore how uncertainties may propagate." It will be true to some extent that there will be uncertainties involved in any solution to the water export reliability and ecosystem restoration problems facing the Delta, but the solution is not just better analysis but also to come up with robust solutions that show substantial improvements over the current conditions, rather than improvements which are at best marginal, as is the case with the BDCP.

In summary, the current public draft of the EIR/EIS does not contain an adequate comparison of alternatives and is misleading and inaccurate in its description of the Western Delta Intakes Concept. A proper analysis of alternatives that will actually meet that stated objectives, purpose and need, including but not limited to the Western Delta Intakes Concept, must be performed and then a new draft EIR/EIS must be released for public review and comment.

3. All the material in the EIR/EIS regarding the threat posed to reliable water supply by earthquakes is a red herring and must be revised or deleted.

The language of the Executive Summary and of Chapter 2 on Objectives and Purpose and Need, cite the "the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a major earthquake that causes breaching of Delta levees" as one of the reasons for

^{7 &}lt;u>http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Attachment-1-Final-BDCP-comments.pdf</u>

needing the BDCP. However, the EIR/EIS includes no formal evaluation of the impacts of earthquakes on water supply and water quality and therefore does not show that the preferred alternative is any better than the no action alternative.

In particular, Sections 2.5.2 on Water Supply Reliability and 2.5.3 on Delta Hydrology and Water Quality say nothing about earthquakes. Unless the implied threat to water supply and water quality can be justified by something more substantial than reliance on discredited and outdated studies such as the Delta Risk Management Strategy, and the impacts quantified in Sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3, all the scattered references to the imagined threat to the Delta levee system posed by earthquakes should be deleted. These scattered references are detailed in Appendix B. To the extent that any discussion of this subject is retained, reference should be made to the Economic Sustainability Plan of the Delta Protection Commission which includes an updated appraisal of the vulnerability of the Delta levee system to earthquakes and an explanation of the flaws in the DRMS study.

In summary, the current public draft of the EIR/EIS does not show any compelling evidence that earthquakes are a significant threat to water supply reliability or water quality nor does it reference the latest authoritative study on the vulnerability of the Delta levee system to earthquakes, namely the Economic Sustainability Plan of the Delta Protection Commission. These flaws must be corrected and then a new draft EIR/EIS must be released for public review and comment.

4. Chapter 9 on Geology and Seismicity and Chapter 10 on Soils are not rational contributions to this EIR/EIS and the one real construction risk with consequences for the environment, namely loss of ground as a result of tunneling activities leading to levee failures, is ignored.

Chapter 9, Geology and Seismicity, is misnamed. The geology and seismicity of the Delta region is what it is and will not be impacted by any of the considered alternatives or by doing nothing. The chapter is actually about the impacts on people and property of various natural hazards, including earthquakes, and how they might be affected by the considered alternatives relative to doing nothing. It would make more sense for Section 9.1, Affected Environment / Environmental Setting, along with Appendix 3E, to be combined and inserted as a an additional chapter early in the document as

background to the subsequent evaluation of impacts in various categories of environmental impacts. Likewise, an intelligent and up-to-date discussion of the vulnerability of the Delta levee system should be inserted much earlier in the EIR/EIS as background to the subsequent evaluation of the impacts of the project.

The remainder of Chapter 9 follows some cookbook formula and includes mention of hazards such as debris flows, tsunamis and seiches which have no relevance to the Delta. This material should be rewritten to focus on impacts to people and property resulting from natural hazards that are applicable in the Delta. The treatment of liquefaction in this chapter is not only outdated and incorrect but misplaced. Again, this is background material that should be covered earlier in the EIR/EIS.

The subject of liquefaction of sands in earthquakes is relevant but the treatment of it in the EIR/EIS is overly conservative, as detailed in Appendix B. Nonetheless, the conclusion that the hazard to the BDCP conveyance facilities posed by any potential for liquefaction of sandy soils in earthquakes can be addressed in design or otherwise mitigated, is likely valid, just as it is for other elements of the built environment in the Delta including the levee system. The treatment of this subject needs to be rewritten to put the hazard in perspective. The hazard being low, it is possible to address it in design or otherwise mitigate it.

However, the one real construction risk with consequences for the environment associated with construction of the proposed conveyance facilities (as opposed to cost and schedule), namely loss of ground⁸ as a result of tunneling activities leading to levee failures, is ignored. Only a minor loss of ground when tunneling passes under river and slough crossings could lead to breaching of levees, flooding of the adjacent islands and tracts, and even flooding of the tunnels themselves.

Similarly, the soils in the Delta are what they are and will not be substantially impacted by any of the considered alternatives or by doing nothing. It is true that over time the surficial soils in the proposed "habitat areas" might become more organic rich, but that is secondary relative to the negative impact on agricultural-based economy of the Delta and the possible, but dubious, ecosystem benefits.

⁸ http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/tunnel/pubs/nhi09010/07a.cfm
In summary, the treatment of natural hazards in the current public draft of the EIR/EIS is poorly organized, is misleading as to the hazard due to liquefaction in earthquakes, and this draft omits critical discussion of the possible effects of loss of ground due to tunneling operations. That possibility should be addressed elsewhere along with other impacts on the people, property and environment of the Delta. These flaws must be corrected and then a new draft EIR/EIS must be released for public review and comment.

Appendices A and B form part of these comments and the errors, omissions and misstatements that are noted in them must also be addressed in a revised draft EIR/EIS that is then submitted for public review and comment.

Coburt Pylie

Robert Pyke Ph.D., G.E.

Dr Robert Pyke is an individual consultant on geotechnical, earthquake and water resources engineering. He was born and raised in Australia and received his bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Sydney. He then worked for the Commonwealth Department of Works in Canberra on various water resource projects before attending graduate school at the University of California, Berkeley. At Berkeley he conducted original research for his Ph.D. under the guidance of the late Professor Harry Seed and formed a close relationship with Professor Seed with whom he subsequently worked on a number of consulting assignments. Since 1977 Dr Pyke has worked principally as an individual consultant on special problems in geotechnical, earthquake and water resource engineering. While at Cal he also studied for a minor in Environmental Planning with Professor Robert Twiss and he has had a life-long interest in solving engineering problems in a way that is consistent with broader community values. Dr Pyke served as an expert witness in litigations that followed the 1982 breach of the McDonald Island levee and the 1986 breach of the Yuba River levee, the latter becoming well-known as the Paterno Case. He is one of the principal authors of the 2011 Economic Sustainability Plan of the Delta Protection Commission. Details of his publications and resume and some of his writings can be found on http://rpce.us.

From:	Heather Howland
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	FW: DCA Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting Reminder
Date:	Tuesday, February 25, 2020 9:23:21 AM

From: Denise Louie <denise_louie_sf@yahoo.com>

Date: Monday, February 24, 2020 at 11:38 AM

To: Department of Water Resources <deltaconveyance@water.ca.gov>

Subject: Fw: DCA Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting Reminder

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am unable to attend Delta Conveyance meetings. Will you kindly accept my email message and put it in the record as community input?

My message is simply that any water exports to SoCal and construction of the Delta tunnel must abide by California's Biodiversity Initiative, which mandates protection and restoration of habitat for local native plants and wildlife that co-evolved with them. Delta smelt, for example, have been imperiled for decades, as have salmon runs that depend on cool, clear, unimpaired freshwater flows. California is a biodiversity hotspot, meaning we are blessed with an abundance of diverse species, many of which we humans have brought to the brink of extinction. San Francisco and the Bay are named for St. Francis, patron saint of ecology. It is our moral imperative, our ethical obligation, to protect species other than our own. Because all species lives matter.

Thanks, Denise Louie San Francisco Member, Center for Biological Diversity

This is the United Nations' Decade on Biodiversity

----- Forwarded Message -----From: Department of Water Resources <deltaconveyance@water.ca.gov> To: "denise_louie_sf@yahoo.com" <denise_louie_sf@yahoo.com> Sent: Monday, February 24, 2020, 11:21:48 AM PST Subject: DCA Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting Reminder

DCA Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting Reminder

The Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Delta Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) is holding its next meeting at 3:00pm on Wednesday, February 26 in Rio Vista. The meeting agenda and additional location information are available <u>here</u>. The Committee was formed by the DCA Board to gain insight from Delta residents, business owners and other stakeholders as the DCA explores engineering and design proposals. For reference, the summary from the February 12 DCA SEC meeting is available <u>here</u>.

The DCA is a joint powers authority created by the public water agencies. Working under the oversight of the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the DCA will assist with the design and construction of a proposed Delta conveyance project. DWR – as the owner and operator of the State Water Project – is leading the environmental review and permitting process.



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES CONTACT US | WATER.CA.GOV/DELTACONVEYANCE © 2010-2020 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences

From:	Rory Stewart
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	LABC Support for the Delta Conveyance Project
Date:	Tuesday, February 25, 2020 10:38:16 AM
Attachments:	image001.jpg
	Delta Conveyance Support Letter.doc

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please see the attached letter of support from the Los Angeles Business Council for the Delta Conveyance Project. Do not hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Thank you, Rory

Rory Stewart Policy & Program Associate Los Angeles Business Council <u>rstewart@labusinesscouncil.org</u> (310) 226-7460



Executive Officers Nadine Watt, Chair Watt Companies

Jacob Lipa, Immediate Past Chairman Micropolitan/Psomas

Antonio Manning, Vice Chairman Affordable Living for the Aging

Alan Rothenberg, Vice Chairman 1st Century Bank

Thomas Flintoft, Vice Chairman Kindel Gagan

Richard Ziman, Founding Chairman, Rexford Industrial Realty

Mary Leslie, President Los Angeles Business Council David Sears, Treasurer Pacific Reach Partners

Linda Bernhardt, Secretary

AMBOO Corporation

Chairman's Circle

Celeste Altimari, Haworth

Javier Angulo, Walmart

Shad Balch, General Motors

Rick Bartlett, Unisource Solutions

David Borger, STV Group, Inc

Chris Bullinger, Hecate Energy, LLC

Kasey Burke, Meta Housing Corporation

John Choi, **Airbnb**

Marcia Choo, Wells Fargo Bank

David Cobb, HDR

Andy Cohen, FAIA, Gensler

Brad Cox, Trammell Crow Co. Joaquin de Monet, Palisades Capital Realty

Advisors, LLC Mark DiNapoli, Suffolk Construction Co.

Alex Drake; Cypress Creek Renewables

John Ek, Ek & Sunkin

Donna Estacio, American Airlines

Amy Freilich, Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac

Virginia Grebbien, Parsons

Ron Griffith, Century Housing Corporation

David Hart, Steinberg

Clyde Holland, Holland Partner Group

Deborah Kallick, Cedars-Sinai Health System

Janet Lamkin, Bank of America

Shane Martin, Loyola Marymount University

John Marshall, Westfield, LLC

Greg McWilliams, FivePoint, LLC

George Mihlsten, Latham & Watkins

Jerry Porter, CresaPartners

Kevin Ratner, Forest City

Dennis Rodriguez, Siemens

Kirk Rose, HMC Architects

Michael Rosenfeld, Next Century Associates, LLC

Jake Saperstein, AT&T

Sarah Shaw, JMB Realty Corporation

Patti Shwayder, Aimco

Lori Tierney, IIDA, Tierney Management, LLC

Jon Vein; The Gotham Group, LLC C.Y. Wang, Ernst & Young, LLP

Christian Wentzel, Ontario Solar Provider Inc

Phil Williams, Delos

David Wright, LA Dept. of Water & Power

Gillian Wright, Sempra Energy Utilities

February 11, 2020

Karla Nemeth Director California Department of Water Resources 1416 9th Street Sacramento, CA 958145

Re: LABC Support for the Delta Conveyance

Dear Director Nemeth,

On behalf of the Los Angeles Business Council and our membership of over 500 businesses, I would like to express our support for the Delta Conveyance project. This important project ensures our region's supply clean water and water infrastructure is modernized, climate resilient, and responsive to the growth of Southern California.

The Los Angeles Business Council unites the power of business with the power of government through education and advocacy to promote environmental and economic sustainability. Our membership is composed of leaders in real estate, energy, transportation, sustainability, and other key industries. This letter represents the support of this business community.

Water is a vital resource for Los Angeles and its businesses. With approximately thirty percent of Southern California's tap water sourced from Northern California's Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, our membership is dependent on the aging 1,100-mile levee system, which is vulnerable to disruption. The current system not only threatens the water supply, but it also endangers the environment and increases the risk of high-cost emergency spending.

The LABC supports the Delta Conveyance's goal of providing a safe and reliable water supply for Southern California, while also maintaining environmental quality and fiscal responsibility. By modernizing water delivery from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to Southern California through a single delta tunnel, the Delta Conveyance project would provide reliable and environmentally-sustainable access to clean water for 19 million Californians.

For these reasons, the LABC supports the Delta Conveyance project as a key way to ensure the growth and vitality of the Southern California region. Thank you for your leadership in creating a California for all. Should you have any questions, please contact Adam Lane, VP of Programs, at alane@labusinesscouncil.org or at (310) 226-7460.

Sincerely,

Mary Lesrie

Mary Leslie President Los Angeles Business Council

CC: Wade Crowfoot, Director, California Natural Resources Agency

From:New Oath Inc.To:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Longer range water management policy needed.Date:Wednesday, February 26, 2020 5:25:08 PM

In order to meet water usage demands in the far future, California needs to adopt policies now requiring each watershed area be self sustained and that coastal communities commit to using only local water sources and treated ocean water. Coastal communities should not be allowed to deplete inland water supplies.

Burt Milburn

From:	Save California Salmon ! via Change.org
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	New petition to you: Save Our Salmon, No New Massive Diversions and Reservoirs in Northern California
Date:	Friday, January 24, 2020 6:58:30 PM



Renee Rodriguez: you've been listed as a decision maker

Save California Salmon ! started a petition on Change.org and listed you as a decision maker. Learn more about Save California Salmon !'s petition and how you can respond:



WHAT YOU CAN DO

View the petition: Learn about the petition and its supporters.
 You will receive updates as new supporters sign the petition so you can see who is signing and why.

2. Respond to the petition: <u>Post a response</u> to let the petition supporters know you're listening, say whether you agree with their call to action, or ask them for more information.

3. Continue the dialogue: Read the comments posted by petition supporters and continue the dialogue so that others can see you're an engaged leader who is willing to participate in open discussion.

CHANGE.ORG FOR DECISION MAKERS

On Change.org, decision makers like you connect directly with people around the world to resolve issues. <u>Learn more</u>.

This notification was sent to DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov, the address listed as the decision maker.

Privacy policy

We'd love to hear from you! Contact us through our help center.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993, San Francisco, CA 94104-5401, USA

change.org

After a video surfaced of George Floyd being murdered by Minneapolis police, 15-year-old Kellen started a petition demanding justice. It's now the biggest petition ever on Change.org and officers have been arrested and charged. But we haven't yet seen justice. <u>You can sign the petition here to send a message that Black lives matter.</u>



Save Our Salmon, No New Massive Diversions and Reservoirs in Northern California



Petition · Save Our Salmon, No New Massive Diversions and Reservoirs in Northern California · Change.org



548 have signed. Let's get to 1,000!



Save California Salmon ! started this petition to California Governor and 2 others

6/18/2020

In early January, California's Governor Gavin Newsom released his highly anticipated California Water Portfolio. Even though the portfolio discusses prioritizing restoration and water savings, it also prioritizes the three most controversial and environmentally destructive threats to California's rivers; the Delta Tunnel project; The Sites reservoir project; and voluntary agreements for agriculture. The portfolio even suggests accelerating environmental permitting for new the Sites Reservoir and diversions, despite the fact that fisheries in the areas targeted are facing extinctions and agencies have warned of potentially devastating fisheries impacts. Only two of the "listening sessions" for these meetings happened north of Sacramento and no hearings happened in Northwest or Northeast California, from which much of the water the state uses is diverted. Most California Tribes and counties of origin were not consulted on the portfolio.

Less than a week after the release of the plan, the state opened the comment period for the new "Delta Conveyance Project" or Delta Tunnel (formally the Twin Tunnels) diversion proposal, showing that the Governor does not care what the people of California have to say about his portfolio. The one tunnel project is a proposal to build a massive new water diversion in the Northern Bay Delta near where the Sacramento River enters. This is where the Delta's water is the cleanest and it is an extremely important area to endangered and subsistence salmon and smelt species.

The governor has also not followed through with his promise to sue the Trump administration for their new water plan and biological opinion. These Trump plans will most likely force many of California's salmon species into extinction and decimate the fishing industry. California released a state alternative to this plan that also threatens California's fisheries and drinking water quality by diverting more water. The state again failed to value public opinion by only holding one daytime hearing in Sacramento on this water plan.

The governor's water portfolio supports spending taxpayer money on new privately owned reservoirs and canals, and water transfers that would mainly benefit large agricultural corporations and water brokers, such as Westlands Water District. This is despite the fact that the state has already committed over a billion dollars of tax paper money to building new privately owned reservoirs and new freshwater diversions.

Make no mistake this Portfolio and new massive One Tunnel diversion are modern day water grabs and are in line with the Trump administration's attack on California's environment.

Orwellian language cannot save the salmon or our drinking water supplies. The governor is selling out the north state, the fishing industry, tribes, cities, and the environment to benefit wasteful agricultural water users.

Help us fight the water Portfolio, State Water Plan, Delta Tunnel Proposal and Sites Reservoir. Water Is Life!

Comments on the Water Portfolio can go to: Nancy Vogel, Director, Governor's Water Portfolio Program, California Natural Resources Agency 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 9581Or input@waterresilience.ca.gov

Delta Tunnel comments can go to: DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov or, Delta Conveyance

Scoping Comments, Attn: Renee Rodriguez, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236 Public Scoping meetings for the Delta Tunnel are at : February 3, 2020, 1 p.m. – 3 p.m. California Environmental Protection Agency Building, 1001 | Street, Sacramento February 5, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. Junipero Serra State Building, 320 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles February 10, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. Jean Harvie Community Center, 14273 River Road, Walnut Grove February 12, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. Santa Clara Valley Water District Board Room, 5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose February 13, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. San Joaquin Council of Governments Board Room, 555 Weber Avenue, Stockton February 19, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. Clarksburg Middle School Auditorium, 52870 Netherlands Road, Clarksburg February 20, 2020, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m. Brentwood Community Center Conference Room, 35 Oak Street, Brentwood

Anyone interested in more information concerning the EIR process, or anyone who hasinformation concerning the study or suggestions as to significant issues, should contact Marcus Yee at (916) 651-6736.

Despite impacts to the Sacramento watershed and Trinity and Klamath River watersheds there are no hearings in Northern California. Call and ask for some! Travel assistance is available for Tribal members and low income subsistence fishermen who have to travel to get to a meeting.

For more information go to Save California Salmon on Facebook or Californiasalmon.org or contact regina@californiasalmon.org.

Start a petition of your own

Start a petition of your own

<u>This petition starter stood up and took action. Will you do the same?</u> <u>Start a petition</u>

Updates

<u>California adds North State Delta Tunnel Hearing! Redding, CA March 2nd, 6pm</u> <u>Please share. We won on securing a North State hearing on the Delta tunnel. Now let's pack the room!</u> <u>More information is on facebook at https:...</u>

<u>California adds North State Delta Tunnel Hearing! Redding, CA March 2nd, 6pm</u> <u>Please share. We won on securing a North State hearing on the Delta tunnel. Now let's pack the room!</u> <u>More information is on facebook at https://www.facebook.com/events/838392126633463/ or on our</u> <u>website at californiasalmon.org</u>

The state of California is now holding a North State public hearing on the Delta Tunnel Proposal. This hearing is the result of a campaign led by Tribes and youth. Up until now the Governor, Feds, and water brokers have had only a couple Northern hearings on new dams, diversions and water policy even though it is our rivers and Delta they propose to divert.

This January California's Governor Gavin Newson released his new water portfolio. The portfolio prioritizes the Delta Tunnel, Sites Reservoir, and voluntary agreements over regulation for flows from rivers into the Delta. These proposes taken together will seriously impact the North states rivers and communities, especially when the Trump water plan and Westlands Permanent Contact are factored in. Newsom then immediately started scoping on the newly proposed Delta tunnel. Out of the seven hearings that were planned none were in the North State.

Newsom then backed down from his promise to fight the Trump water plan due to pressure from large water brokers like Westlands Water District, and he instead began negotiating with Trump. Trump is

now coming to California next week. He is most "

more water from the Sacramento, Klama⁺ Make no mistake, Newsom and Trump'

drinking water more polluted and ha

Californians water bills.

<u>The people of California largely do </u> <u>environment. Californians are saving</u> <u>Newson continue to side with the Tru</u> <u>farms and powerful water brokers?</u> <u>uin River systems is now finalized.</u> <u>1%. They will make our rivers and</u> <u>nd fisheries while greatly increasing</u>

> <u>r protects, and war on our</u> <u>ions. The question is will Governor</u> <u>it Californians to benefit desert</u>

From:Lauretta Laura AldridgeTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Public comment on NOP Delta Conveyance ProjectDate:Monday, March 2, 2020 11:56:00 AM

Attn: Renee Rodriguez, Department of Water Resources

In regards to the Delta Conveyance Project, when looking at options, include all methods of conserving water, directing runoff to bioswales to regenerate ground water, water storage, desalination, and water efficiency in agriculture including growing crops that require less water. The Delta is a valuable resource which will change forever if too much fresh water is redirected south. Look at the research.

Sincerely, Lauretta Aldridge PO Box 1448 Brentwood, CA

From:	<u>J"Carlin</u>
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	reply@emails.sierraclub.org
Subject:	Re. Sea level rise justification for Conveyance.
Date:	Monday, February 24, 2020 8:09:06 AM

Instead of letting sea level rise in the delta worry you about the aqueduct feed infrastructure. Which will also have disastrous effects on the salinity of delta water. Spend the multi billions in San Francisco building a cofferdam across the bay via Alcatraz to Marin. You could probably get BART to contribute by tunneling under Sausalito to Marin City and using the excavated material for the cofferdam. They would put their tunnels under the ship and tidal locks and otherwise build them roughly at 2010 sea level anticipating burying them when Thwaits Glacier collapses.

This cofferdam will eliminate the need for sea walls all around the bay, and the tidal lock will enable management of the salinity of the bay to scientifically optimized levels. Oh yes, it will eliminate the need for the conveyance tunnel.

Carlin Black San Jose, 95129

Carlin Black THS Blood Drive Chair

Aka J'Carlin

From:	<u>Lisa</u>
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	The Delta
Date:	Friday, February 21, 2020 4:44:06 PM

Multiple scientific studies including one by the prestigious National Academy of Sciences, have made it very clear that the long term health of the Delta depends on pouring more, not less, water through its 1,000 miles of levees. The governor's singletunnel plan must provide a more reliable water supply for California as well as protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. It is critical that SOUND SCIENCE be the basis for deciding whether to move forward with the single-tunnel project.

Lisa Hoivik

Monterey CA <u>Ihoivik@comcast.net</u>

From:	<u>J"Carlin</u>
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	reply@emails.sierraclub.org
Subject:	Water Management a Better Idea.
Date:	Sunday, February 23, 2020 6:35:40 PN

Cover the Aqueduct to Reduce Evaporation Waste

By one estimate a million acre-feet per year is lost to evaporation from the aqueduct which is roughly 1/4 of the 6000 cfs tunnel.

Eg.

http://watermanagement.ucdavis.edu/files/4114/3891/2385/A01_Burt_Good_Shachar_Pascual_ESM121_FinalReport.pdf

To pacify the contractors and especially the unions lobbying for the tunnel remind them that tunneling is machine intensive, while covering the aqueduct is a labor intensive construction job.

Recycling ALL Waste Water

Sooner or later all of Southern California is going to have to pump fresh water into their aquifers just to prevent salinization. Some coastal cities are having to do it now. There isn't enough water in the aqueduct to make a difference, and the only source of fresh water large enough is the waste water now being wasted. Aggressively treated this waste water could replace all of the water now diverted from Northern California.

Eg. https://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2011/04/04/from-wastewater-to-drinking-water/

Best regards,

Carlin Black San Jose, 95129

Carlin Black THS Blood Drive Chair

Aka J'Carlin

From:	Nancy K
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta tunnel
Date:	Wednesday, March 4, 2020 8:40:51 PM

Hello,

I am writing to ask this plan be canceled. For the study, I want the build project alternative to account for the source of every drop of water that would be sent south in a delta tunnel. I don't want any water from the Klamath or Trinity rivers to be diverted as there is too much water taken from those systems now. I want a no-tunnel alternative to be fully studied. California water is over allocated. Any actions taken should not be allowed to harm native fish at all because they are already on the edge of survival. The fish are the foundation of the ecosystem and I think this plan would harm them. Please protect resources and cultural rights in your decisions. Thank you.

Nancy Kuykendall 2244 Kipling Dr, Eureka, CA 95503

From:	Kyle Griffith
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Conveyance NOP Letter
Date:	Thursday, March 5, 2020 11:55:20 AM
Attachments:	image001.png
	CWS NOP Comment NASCAR LETTER LOGOS.pdf

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter signed by more than 45 organizations in support of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project outlined in your NOP. Please let me know if there's anything else you need from our end!

Kyle Griffith (916)443-0872 <u>kgriffith@bcfpublicaffairs.com</u>







California Small Business Association













March 5, 2020 California Department of Water Resources P.O. Box 942836

Sacramento, CA 94236

Subject: Members of Californians for Water Security Support Proposed Delta Conveyance Project Notice of Preparation

Dear Renee Rodriguez,

Our growing coalition of citizens, labor unions, family farmers, businesses, local governments, water agencies, community groups and minority advocates strongly support the state's proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Failure to act on this project will result in a less secure water future for residents and businesses, the cost of water deliveries could increase, and the health of the Delta will continue to deteriorate.

More than 27 million Californians rely on outdated infrastructure to deliver water from the Sierra Nevada Mountains through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to homes, farms, and businesses throughout the state. This aging water distribution system is vulnerable to the threats posed by climate change and natural disasters.

For far too long, we have failed to address these pressing issues, the status quo is no longer acceptable. Without action, water supplies through our main distribution system are at risk of collapse in the event of a major earthquake or flood. Breaches to our current dirt levee system could disrupt water supplies for up to one year for millions of Californians.

This system is unprepared to deal with our state's changing hydrology. Scientists agree snowpack is becoming less abundant and less predictable due to climate change. With an improved conveyance system, California will be better prepared to handle the challenges associated with prolonged droughts and more intense storm systems driven by climate change.

The proposed Delta Conveyance Project, a key component of the administration's statewide water reliability portfolio, will address many of California's complex water challenges. This project would:



















International Union of Operating Engineers Local Union 3







- Protect water security for two-thirds of the state
- Improve the reliability and security of our water system
- Protect water supplies from earthquakes, floods, and natural disasters
- Prepare for the impacts of climate change
- Promote more natural water flows
- Serve as a critical component of a comprehensive water portfolio

We support a proposed capacity of at least 6,000 cubic feet per second and encourage the state to evaluate even larger capacities as well. We must have sufficient water flow to ensure the project is financially viable and that it provides the water security we need. Wastewater recycling, groundwater recharge, and desalination need fresh water to be most effective. We must take an "all of the above" statewide portfolio approach to secure California's water future.

Moving forward to modernize our water infrastructure is vital to protect our quality of life and our economy. Without this project, California's economic growth could slow, water rates could rise as we're forced to purchase water from less affordable sources, and the health of the Delta will continue to decline.

We must act now. California's water security cannot wait.

Sincerely,

Michael Quigley, Executive Director California Alliance for Jobs

Robbie Hunter, President State Building & Construction Trades Council California

Jose Mejia, Director California State Council of Laborers

Dan C. Dunmoyer, President & CEO California Building Industry Association

Brad Diede, Executive Director American Council of Engineering Companies California

Emily Cohen, Executive Vice President United Contractors

Mike Mielke, Senior Vice President, Environment & Energy Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Tim Cremins, Director California-Nevada Conference Operating Engineers

Stuart Waldman, President Valley Industry & Commerce Association Allan Zaremberg, President & CEO California Chamber of Commerce

Alice Huffman, President California Hawaii State Conference NAACP

Peter Tateishi, CEO Associated General Contractors of California

Shane A. Gusman, Director California Teamster Public Affairs Council

Rex Hime, President & CEO California Business Properties Association

Charley Wilson, Executive Director & CEO Southern California Water Coalition

Maria Salinas, President & CEO Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Pat Fong Kushida, President & CEO Californian Asian Chamber of Commerce

Betty Jo Toccoli, President California Small Business Association

John Hakel, Executive Director Southern California Partnership for Jobs









GABRIEL VALLE













SANTA CLARITA VALLEY Chamber of Commerce

Ron Hasson, President
Beverly Hills Hollywood NAACP

Tracy Hernandez, Founding CEO Los Angeles County Business Federation

Ron Miller, Executive Secretary LA/OC Building and Construction Trades Council

David Grau, President Ventura County Taxpayers Association

Michele Newell, Board Chair Ventura County Economic Development Association

Gretchen Gutierrez, CEO Desert Valleys Builders Association

Brigette Browning, President UNITE HERE Local 30

Matt Mahood, President & CEO **The Silicon Valley Organization**

Brian Holt, Assistant Business Manager IBEW Local 428

Deborah Barmack, President Inland Action

Nancy Starczyk, Chair of the Board Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce

John Spaulding, Executive Secretary Kern, Inyo, and Mono Counties Building and Construction Trades Council

Anthony Duarte, CEO Regional Chamber of Commerce of San Gabriel Valley

Patrick Lavin, Business Manager & Financial Secretary IBEW Local 47





Pastor Jethroe Moore II, President San Jose - Silicon Valley NAACP

Curtis Kelly, Assistant to the Executive Secretary Northern California Carpenters Regional Council

Jessica Lall, President & CEO Central City Association Los Angeles

David Bini, Executive Director Santa Clara & San Benito Counties Building and Construction Trades Council

John Doherty, Business Manager/Financial Secretary IBEW Local 6

Dan Reding, Business Manager Operating Engineers Local Union 3

Louise Lampara, Executive Director Ventura County Coalition of Labor Agriculture and Business

Donna Duperron, President & CEO Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce

William R Manis, President & CEO San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

Michael G. Lopez, Business Manager U.A. Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union 114

Gary Cushing, CEO Camarillo Chamber of Commerce

Cindy Roth, President & CEO Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce

Nancy Lindholm, President & CEO Oxnard Chamber of Commerce

Joe McDermott, Director of Resource Conservation & Public Outreach Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

From:	<u>kariit@riseup.net</u>
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Plan
Date:	Wednesday, March 4, 2020 10:04:11 AM

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I am a resident of Hyampom in Northern California. I write to state my utmost opposition to the Delta Conveyance Plan that would divert water from our rivers to places south. THIS IS AN OUTRAGE. We know that the watersheds here WILL BE impacted. Our rivers are already stressed due to the lack of normal amounts of precipitation, especially this year, as well as in years past. I also stand with the Native peoples whose lives will be adversely impacted if this misguided plan proceeds. PLEASE DO NOT PUT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S RIVERS AT FURTHER RISK - CLIMATE CHANGE HAS TAKEN AND WILL CONTINUE TO TAKE ITS TOLL.

Most sincerely, Barbara Mauk PO Box 153 93 Creekside Lane Hyampom, CA 96046

From:	Felice Pace
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	Tom Stokely; Regina C; Vivian Helliwell; Vi Orcutt; Mike Orcutt
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Attn: Renee Rodriguez
Date:	Friday, March 6, 2020 9:59:36 AM

Analysis of Delta Conveyance impacts shouild include:

- Assessing and disclosing whether the current available water supply is sufficient to provide water for export via the conveyance in dry, very dry and drought years.
- Assessing potential impacts to the Trinity River and Klamath-Trinity salmon stocks, including SONC Coho salmon and Trinity River Basin Spring Chinook salmon.
- Assess the impact of the increased water exports from the Trinity and Klamath Rivers that would be needed to fill the conveyance in order to meet federal and state water project contracts on long-term efforts to restore Klamath-Trinity River Basin salmon stocks. How will those stocks and the restoration effort, especially streamflow needed for restoration to be impacted?
- Assessing potential impacts to Trinity Reservoir, recreation related to that reservoir and related impacts to the economy of Trinity County.
- Assessing potential impacts to the Trinity Hatchery related to water supply and water temperature impacts.

Please keep me informed.

F 💽

Felice Pace Klamath, CA 95548 707-954-6588

> "Ring the bells that still can ring. Forget your perfect offering. There is a crack, a crack in everything, That's how the light gets in." Anthem, Leonard Cohen

From:	Catherine Windham
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	Brian Balbas; Allison Knapp; Tim Jensen; Michelle Cordis; Teri Rie; Ryan.Hernandez@dcd.cccounty.us; Joe Smithonic
Subject:	Notice of Preparation for the Delta Conveyance Project
Date:	Wednesday, March 4, 2020 4:56:57 PM
Attachments:	image001.jpg
	image002.png
	<u>Imageous.png</u> 2020-0304 - Comment Letter - Delta Conveyance.pdf

Dear Renee Rodriquez:

Attached is a letter from Joe Smithonic of the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District regarding the Notice of Preparation for the Delta Conveyance Project. A hard copy will follow by mail. If you have any questions, please contact Joe at (925) 313-2348 or at Joe.Smithonic@pw.cccounty.us. Thank you.



Catherine Windham | Senior Clerk

Contra Costa County Flood Control & Water Conservation District 255 Glacier Drive, Martinez, CA 94553 p: 925.313.2270 | f: 925.313.2333 | e: <u>catherine.windham@pw.cccounty.us</u> | <u>cccpublicworks.org</u>



Brian M. Balbas, ex officio Chief Engineer Allison Knapp, Deputy Chief Engineer

March 4, 2020

Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Attn: Renee Rodriguez Department of Water Resources P.O. Box 942836 Sacramento, CA 94236

> RE: Notice of Preparation for the Delta Conveyance Project Our File: 3045-06 (various APN's), Delta Conveyance

Dear Renee Rodriguez:

The Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FC District) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of Environmental Impact Report, dated January 15, 2020, for the Department of Water Resource's Delta Conveyance Project, partially located in Contra Costa County. We appreciate the opportunity to coordinate on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for this project to address potential adverse impacts to Contra Costa County communities and FC District property and drainage facilities. We submit the following comments:

- 1. We recommend that the DEIR include a map of the project area and show the extent of the impacted areas with Contra Costa County.
- 2. We request that the DEIR provide a map of the watersheds where the project is located, including watershed boundaries within Contra Costa County, and FC District drainage area boundaries.
- 3. In the Hydrology Section, please identify and show all existing watercourses, tributaries, and man-made drainage facilities within and around the project site that could be impacted by this project within Contra Costa County. The discussion should include an analysis of the capacity of the existing watercourses. If improvements or work within the natural watercourses is proposed, the DEIR should discuss the scope of improvements.
- 4. The Hydrology Section should quantify the amount of runoff that would be generated by the project and discuss how the runoff entering and originating from the site would be distributed between the natural watercourses, the detention basins (if proposed), and the man-made drainage facilities. The DEIR should discuss the adverse impacts of the runoff from the project site to the existing drainage facilities, and drainage problems in the downstream areas.
- 5. We recommend that the DEIR address the design and construction of storm drain facilities to adequately collect and convey stormwater entering or originating within the project area to the nearest adequate man-made drainage facility or natural watercourse, without diversion of the watershed, per Title 9 of the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. The DEIR should discuss all proposed on-site and off-site drainage improvements and include maps or drawings for the improvements.

- 6. Construction of new roads to serve the proposed project may result in altered drainage patterns and may increase stormwater runoff due to additional impervious surfaces. New culverts may be needed to convey the additional stormwater, which concentrates the flow, but may potentially cause erosion, if not mitigated. The DEIR should address the impacts of new conveyance facilities, including erosion, from newly concentrated flows resulting from the project and its ancillary facilities and propose mitigation measures including new culverts, channel widening, erosion protection, energy dissipaters, and vegetation restoration within Contra Costa County.
- 7. The proposed pumping plant, southern forebay, and central tunnel corridor shown on Figure 1 of the NOP appear to be located within Contra Costa County limits near unincorporated Byron and Discovery Bay. The central tunnel corridor extends northerly near the outer edge of Contra Costa County limits. The southern portion of the project is partially located in Drainage Area 45 (DA 45) and partially in Drainage Area 110 (DA 110). These drainage areas define the watersheds for the East County Delta Drainages and Brushy Creek watersheds. The DEIR should discuss how the project would impact these drainage areas.
- 8. The FC District owns several properties and operates major drainage facilities in east Contra Costa County including channels and reservoirs for Marsh Creek, Sand Creek, Dry Creek, Deer Creek, and Kellogg Creek. If the project and its proposed facilities impact the capacities and operation of FC District facilities, or if the project needs access to any FC District property, the DEIR should note that a Contra Costa County Drainage and/or FC District Encroachment Permit might be required. At a minimum, the DEIR should list the FC District as an agency to notify.
- 9. The DEIR's analysis of adverse impacts should include potential drainage impacts caused by all construction activities including tunneling, dredging, construction of new conveyance facilities and access roads, and storage of borrow material. Tunneling may create an abundance of excess material that may require off-site storage, and the DEIR should analyze the changes in drainage patterns and flows caused by both temporary and permanent storage of excavated materials.
- 10. When the DEIR analyzes the impacts in Contra Costa County, the Hydrology Section of the DEIR should include a study that uses Contra Costa County's hydrology method (HYDRO6) for unincorporated areas impacted by the project. Other commonly accepted hydrology methods were developed using runoff patterns of other regions that do not accurately model the Pacific Coast storm patterns experienced in Contra Costa County. The runoff results of other methods have proven to be significantly less than field observations of local storms made by the FC District and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).
- If detention basin facilities are proposed, the DEIR should include a discussion of the basin design information (i.e., capacity, sizes of inlet and outlet structures, routing, etc.). A discussion of how maintenance of these facilities would be performed and funded should also be included.

- 12. The DEIR should address the impacts of this project's runoff due to the increase in duration (length of time) of flows and the effect on creeks and channels downstream of the project. Whereas detention basins are capable of mitigating peak flows to pre-project levels, they increase the duration (length of time) of flows in the downstream watercourses, which saturate the channel banks and increase the potential for stream and channel erosion.
- 13. DA 45 and DA 110 have inadequate maintenance funding. The construction of this project should not result in added costs or reduction of revenue for Contra Costa County or the FC District. As one of the mitigation measures for the adverse drainage impacts of this project, this project shall be required to identify a perpetual funding source for maintenance of the drainage area facilities required to serve the project and its ancillary facilities, such as access roads and fuel stations.
- 14. The DEIR should discuss how the project would comply with the current NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirements under the Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinances and the C.3 Guidebooks for the project's various local jurisdictions.
- 15. We recommend the project sponsors request that the appropriate environmental regulatory agencies, such as the USACE, the State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, explore the permits, special conditions, and mitigation that may be necessary for construction within the project area.
- 16. Portions of the project are situated in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as Zone A or Zone AE. In addition, the project area incorporates areas designated by FEMA as "Areas with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee." The DEIR should also analyze potential adverse impacts on nearby levees due to construction activities.
- 17. The DEIR should discuss the impacts of grading in a floodplain and whether a Conditional Letter of Map Revision will be required.
- 18. The proposed intake locations between Courtland, Hood, and Clarksburg would reroute a portion of flows from the Sacramento River south to the Clifton Court Forebay, which may result in decreased flows through the Delta. The reduction in flows could result in increased sedimentation throughout the Delta tributaries in the eastern regions of Contra Costa County, which in turn could increase water surface elevations and create additional flood hazards. East Contra Costa County already has multiple areas designated as SFHAs, so the DEIR should include a thorough analysis on increased risks of flooding in all impacted tributaries along the eastern Contra Costa County limits.
- 19. The DEIR should consider the effects of anticipated rising sea levels on the Delta tributaries and cumulative effects with the Delta Conveyance Project due to the diversion of water out of the delta. Sea level rise in the delta could lead to increased frequency, duration, and extent of flooding, shoreline erosion, and increased salinity intrusion further into the delta. Adapting to Rising Tides, a program of the San Francisco Bay Conservation

and Development Commission, is currently modeling effects of rising water surface elevations between 12 inches and 83 inches in eastern Contra Costa County during this century. The DEIR should address the impacts of the project with cumulative impacts from rising tides in the Delta and eastern Contra Costa County and propose mitigation measures.

20. The FC District should be included in the review of all drainage facilities that have a region-wide benefit, that impact region-wide facilities, or that impact FC District-owned facilities. The FC District is available to provide technical assistance during the development of the DEIR, including hydrology and hydraulic information and our HYDRO6 method, under our Fee-for-Service program. In addition, we can provide copies of our drainage area maps, upon request.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Delta Conveyance Project and welcome continued coordination. If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at (925) 313-2348 or by e-mail at <u>Joe.Smithonic@pw.cccounty.us</u>.

Sincerely,

Joe Smithonic Staff Engineer Contra Costa County Flood Control & Water Conservation District

JS:cw

G:\fldctl\CurDev\CITIES\Byron\3045-06\Delta Conveyance\2020-0304 - Comment Letter - Delta Conveyance.docx

c: Brian Balbas, Chief Engineer Allison Knapp, Deputy Chief Engineer Tim Jensen, Flood Control Michelle Cordis, Flood Control Teri E. Rie, Flood Control Ryan Hernandez, DCD—Community Development Division From:Bayla GreenspoonTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Scoping commentsDate:Wednesday, March 4, 2020 8:28:29 PMAttachments:Delta Conveyance Scoping Itr final.docx

Please see the attached comment letter for inclusion in the scoping comments. Thanks you, Bayla Greenspoon March 4, 2020

Re: Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments

c/o Department of Water Resources

I am writing this letter as a concerned citizen living in Mt. Shasta City close to the headwaters of the Sacramento River. I am totally opposed to the Delta Conveyance one-tunnel revised plan. I support a "no tunnel" option.

I attended the scoping meeting in Redding on March 2nd and heard eloquent speeches about potential consequences of this proposed water grab. The speakers were youth and elders, men and women, Native and non-Native, recreational and commercial river users, and members of Tribes who live along the rivers, their life-ways. THERE WAS NOT ONE COMMENT SUPPORTING THIS PROJECT. What I heard was impassioned declarations from people whose ancestors have lived here for 1,000s of years, in harmony with the land and resources. Over and over we heard testimony that this project will amount to cultural genocide for the Tribes along the river!

It is only in the past 200 years that severe degradation of the rivers has occurred due to unlimited use of natural resources and the use of dams. The Delta Conveyance will add to this degradation.

Here are the questions that should be addressed in the upcoming EIR.

 What will be the social, psychological and emotional consequences for the people who live along the rivers (including the Klamath, Trinity, Pitt, Sacramento) in Northern California? DWR says the EIR will address public health. Be sure to add these items into the public health category.

By allowing over 6,000 CFS to be sent south through the tunnel, the rivers will be affected as will the fish and general environment around the rivers. The emotional, spiritual and psychological health of the people depends on the health and well-being of the rivers and the fish. Many of the youth spoke about depression and anxiety, and how they go to the river for emotional healing. I would like the EIR to answer:

- a. Exactly how many youth are expendable?
- b. What will be the cost of increased need for mental health services for the Tribes?
- c. What mitigations can be put in place to support social, emotional and psychological well-being of local populations including Tribes?

- What will be the cultural and economic consequences for the Tribes who depend on the rivers for the fish and for their spiritual practices? The EIR is supposed to address cultural resources. The rivers, water and fish ARE the Tribes' cultural resources. Please address:
 - a. How many Tribes are expendable? Is cultural genocide an acceptable consequence of this project?
 OR...
 - b. What measures can be put in place to ensure the maintenance and even increase of the health of the rivers?
 - c. Consider a "no-project" alternative to mitigate these issues.

The health and well-being of the rivers and the many who depend on the them should not, MUST NOT, be sacrificed for the profit of the few down south. The ultimate costs are too great and too short-sighted to be viable.

Thank you for addressing these questions in the upcoming EIR.

Sincerely, Bayla Greenspoon 724 Butte Avenue Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

530-926-4339

Will your work help with the waterways filing in around Bethel Island?

Can our waterways be dredged?

I hear that southern water deptments have purchased islands around Franks Track. How will that affect this project?

Can the pumps help us when we are flooding?

Will there be any water capture to save rain water snow melt?

Can you use Bethel Island Scouts Hall or SanJoaquin Yacht club for meetings and help up upgrade those locations?

What other things can we request that my help our community roadways, bridges, community centers parks, marinas?

Its a hard drive with bad roads and bridges from Bethel Island to highway five, Can that be improved?

Weather patterns have changed will there be water in the future for you to take?

Who will control how much and when you can take water?

What about solar to run pumps?

There are docks and wreaks thought out the delta can they be cleaned up?

Is there any thing you can do to help us with problems with wees and sediment art Franks Track?

If we need you leftovers will you transport to locations no charge?

Will this do anything to our fish?

Thank you

Mike Ackley

From:	Ellen Koivisto & Gene Thompson
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Comment submission for the Delta Conveyance Environmental Review and Public Scoping
Date:	Saturday, March 7, 2020 10:35:01 PM

As a citizen and lifelong resident of California, as a person who has lived through multiple droughts here, as a public high school science teacher who has been studying and teaching environmental issues my entire professional life, and as a taxpayer who has to fund whatever it is you decide, I want to state my strong, unequivocal opposition to the Delta Tunnel, and to any shipping of water from the Delta out of the hydrosphere where it belongs to other locations, municipalities, ecosystems, and commercial customers in California and elsewhere.

Only a fool makes the same mistake over and over again, but apparently California is being run by anti-science fools. This proposal is yet another attempt to "solve" a problem *created* by these exact same strategies decades ago. It didn't solve anything then and it won't solve anything now. It will only make everything worse.

Why? Because a biosphere is not a plumbing project. It cannot be relaid without enormous loss of biodiversity, life, and resilience. Doing something this damaging is criminal; doing it in an era of rapid climate change and during a mass extinction event is suicidal.

Specifically, California may be a single state, but it is composed of different bioregions that have different ecosystems depending on very different combinations of biotic and abiotic participants. Southern California is desert while northern California is temperate rain forest to the west and sagebrush steppe to the east. The Sierra's biomes are dependent on elevation. Don't take my word for it; look in any high school level science text or lesson plan.

That means the north is meant to be wet and the south is meant to be dry.

Take the water away from the north and ship it south and you destroy the life in the north that depends on that water. Since that life includes the salmon and other fish species that go to the ocean, collect resources there, bring these resources back to the rivers in northern CA and deposit them deep in the forests when they die, that means that you are not only condemning these fish species to extinction by taking away their water, but you are also condemning all the species that depend on them for this resource collection and redistribution.

What species depend on these fish? Bears, obviously, but also orcas, seals, and over 130 other animal species. But **the forests themselves** also depend on the salmon. Without the fish, without their infusion of fertilizer, without the massive amount of nitrogen they deposit when dying, the forest is failing. In the face of incredible stresses from a rapidly heating climate and invasive species (like the bark beetle), trees are weakening and dying. If you kill the salmon, you cripple the forest; they are tied together.

So what? Who needs forests?

We do. Our coastal forests create rain. Trees provide surface areas for droplet formation, and load the air with particles that provide rain nucleation sites. Redwoods survive by wringing water out of the air and dropping it to the forest floor where it nourishes life, forms into streams, joins up into rivers, and flows down to the Delta. Kill the forest and you do irreparable harm to the hydrologic cycle that northern California depends on.

So, you take away the water, which kills the fish, which kills the forest. An absent forest can no longer trap rain. The north dries up, it desertifies, leaving no water to ship south to that desert anymore. It's a Rube Goldberg death machine. You kill both the north and the south with one incredibly stupid and scientifically ignorant idea, benefitting the very few, temporarily, at the cost of life in CA permanently.

And, really, did it never occur to you all that if you're agreeing with Trump about *science* issues that you're on the wrong side? Covid-19 should make you wary of being in bed with his anti-science storm troopers, if nothing else gets through the fog of denial and lobbying that temporarily shields Sacramento from reality. But you do know it's just temporary, right? There is no hiding from any of this on-going disaster anymore, and pretending that business as usual is the way to go is condemning us all to the worst possible outcomes in the quickest timeframes.

Please, pull yourselves out of the 19th century and start dealing with real problems facing us now. There's very very little time in which to act, and no time at all for this kind of mindless, scientifically absurd, anti-biological idiocy.

Ellen Koivisto

[Note: this comment was also sent to Gov. Newsom, Sen. Feinstein, Sen. Harris, Rep. Pelosi, Sen. Wiener, Assemblymember Ting, Mayor Breed, and Supe. Mar]
From:Jan VickTo:DWR Delta Conveyance ScopingSubject:Comments on Delta Conveyance NOPDate:Wednesday, March 11, 2020 12:19:10 PMAttachments:NOP comments.docx

Please see attached letter.

Jan Vick <u>Seawingjan@gmail.com</u> 707-863-1255 *Moral Courage and Intellectual Honesty* To: Department of Water Resources Delta Conveyance Scoping – Notice of Preparation

From: Jan Vick

Former Mayor, City of Rio Vista Former Commissioner, Delta Protection Commission

I attended the scoping meeting in Walnut Grove and felt I must make the following comments on the single tunnel project.

Pursuing a single tunnel is just recycling a bad idea. Even with the smaller tunnel (though the final tunnel could be take almost as much water as the 2-tunnel project) and two intakes instead of three, the negative impact on the Delta and beyond is not reduced. A new Delta conveyance should be a last choice after all other considerations and activities. It is perhaps the easiest option but would inflict serious permanent damage to the richest agricultural land in California and negatively impact the economy of both the Delta and the state as a whole. In addition, it is not likely to adequately protect the threatened fish populations.

Reasons this project should not be built:

- 1. The impacts of recurring and potentially severe droughts would make any alternate conveyance either inoperable or more damaging. The climate is changing and it is predicted that snowfall in the Sierras will decrease. Since California depends on continued sufficient flows from the rivers, decreased snowfall may reduce the average flows, making this conveyance basically useless. Potential sea level rise could create higher water levels in the rivers, but would also increase salinity much further upriver, which could worsen with the new conveyance.
- 2. Salinity is now an issue in several parts of the Delta and will become worse with climate change; it could become even more of an issue with this project. A farmer just south of Rio Vista raises wine grapes, alfalfa, sheep/lambs and wheat and barley. During the last drought they could not use river water at all because of the salinity. Even now there are peaks in salinity that limits the times and duration of their irrigation.
- 3. Building the tunnel, regardless of the route, would seriously damage the economy in the north Delta and the towns of Hood, Courtland and likely Locke and Walnut Grove. The farmers in this area have been here for generations, for some families since the levees were first built.
- 4. Alternatives to a new conveyance have not received attention or direction from the state. You may say that these are not DWR's responsibilities but they should be implemented <u>before</u> any new conveyance is built. This would require support and financing from federal, state and local government agencies.
 - One of the greatest needs in the Delta is to preserve, repair and strengthen our levees. Even if a new conveyance is built, the levees need to be able to withstand high water and severe storms as well as earthquakes. The current process and assignment of costs does not get the job done.
 - We need more recycling of our water and greater use of recycled water. The water discharged from many sewer plants (including Rio Vista) is often cleaner than the river.
 - The state should refine water conservation laws statewide to help both urban and rural areas pay for recycling, such as "purple pipes" to all areas of a community. Ramp up conservation laws more can be done. Work with agriculture to reduce water usage and intelligently plant crops that take advantage of the soil and climate and provide a decent rate of return, not just big value crops.
 - Communities and the state should establish above ground and underground storage of water throughout California but especially in the southern half of the state. Limit ground water use where it threatens to cause subsidence. Do not allow SWP recipients to store water they don't need but get because it is in their contract, and then sell it making a huge profit from the state's water.
 - The State should seriously consider increased use of desalination plants along the coast and provide assistance in funding the construction of these plants.

5. Thoroughly evaluate other locations for intakes that are not so damaging to towns and agriculture, such as Congressman Garamendi's suggestion to put a diversion on Sherman Island.

Since I have no doubt that DWR will undertake an EIR for this particular project, the following issues MUST be thoroughly discussed.

- 1. Anticipated climate change impacts include more rains and lesser snowpack in the mountains. This will reduce flows into and through the Delta. Temperatures in the rivers could significantly increase. Reduced and potentially warmer river flows will have a variety of negative impacts downstream. These would not only harm the endangered smelt species and the salmon but will impact the entire estuary into the San Francisco Bay. The wider impacts of salinity should be thoroughly discussed. The Delta is not an isolated piece of California located in the central valley; it is a vital part of the entire valley and bay area.
- 2. Loss of rich and productive agricultural land to benefit huge agribusiness farmers in what is essentially a desert. The agricultural land in the Delta will be permanently damaged not only by the construction and operation of the tunnel but by all the associated building that will accompany it on a permanent basis. The acreage that will be temporarily taken out of production can probably never be replaced; that part of the Delta is mainly in vines and trees. Many farmers will potentially not be able to survive the loss of productive land even during the construction process. Some of the land will be permanently out of production. An economic estimate of this potential loss must be included.
- 3. Both routes the tunnel could take is a critical issue and requires careful and thorough analysis by DWR. To run a tunnel through sensitive wildlife habitat that has been protected for many years is no more acceptable than taking productive farmland. The Delta is a critical stop on the Pacific Flyway as overwintering places have been reduced already. The Stone Lakes and Cosumnes River Preserve as well as fallow fields throughout the western side of the Delta are critical stopping points for geese, ducks and the endangered Sandhill Cranes. Both projected routes would seriously endanger these important wintering areas for many, many species.
- 4. Questions must be addressed that have to do with the size of the tunnel itself as well as the flows through the tunnel. You have stated that water will be taken only during "higher flows" and that no additional water will be sent south. What exactly does that mean? What are "higher flows"? How will this be determined? How will this determination be affected when average flows are reduced by climate change?
- 5. DWR must perform a real, detailed and scientific cost/benefit analysis that reflects all the costs, real and hidden, of the project, including fiscal impact to the farmers and residents in the construction zone and along the two tunnel routes. The economic loss of productive agricultural land to the state as a whole must be quantified.
- 6. The EIR must contain a detailed assessment the impact of taking water from the north Delta would have on existing water wells, the underlying aquifer and how it will be affected not only along the tunnel routes but spreading outward since the aquifer covers a wide area.
- 7. The Delta lies on one of the largest natural gas reservoirs in the west. There are numerous gas wells throughout the Delta along with pipelines and pumping. You must show how the tunnel will interfere with these gas operations and the overall reservoir. You will need to show exactly where these gas wells occur and the pipelines that run through the islands.
- 8. The EIR must specify the exact location of all the construction disturbances and the final permanent facilities. These should all be delineated on clear, detailed large format maps. These include the following:
 - Exact location of the intakes, and the extent not only of the construction impact but the final land, towns, roads and buildings that will be impacted or lost;
 - Exact routes for both tunnel routes on maps that would clearly outline the corridors and islands that would be impacted;
 - Exact location of the construction "launch sites" and shafts used during construction and what will be left after completion;

- Location of the Intermediate Forebay and the final structures that would be there.
- Location and size of the proposed pumping plant.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is a unique place critical to the economy of California. We cannot take the chance that this special place of rivers, sloughs, wetlands and islands will be damaged or destroyed by sending water south to areas that are essentially deserts. There are crops that are suitable to those areas, but high water use crops are not. It is the responsibility of the State of California and the Department of Water Resources in particular too protect and sustain the richest agricultural and recreational area in the state.

Jan Vick

From:	Rank, Elke
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Conv NOP
Date:	Tuesday, March 10, 2020 11:08:04 AM
Attachments:	Delta Conveyance NOP comments.pdf

See attached.

Elke Rank | Associate Water Resources Planner Zone 7 Water Agency 100 North Canyons Parkway Livermore, CA 94551 Direct: 925.454.5005 | Main: 925.454.5000 | E-mail: <u>erank@zone7water.com</u>



ALAMEDA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT, ZONE 7

100 NORTH CANYONS PARKWAY, LIVERMORE, CA 94551 • PHONE (925) 454-5000 • FAX (925) 454-5727

March 10, 2020

Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Attn: Renee Rodriguez Department of Water Resources P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236 Sent Via email: <u>DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov</u>

Dear Ms. Rodriguez,

Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7) is a wholesale water agency serving retailers in Livermore, Pleasanton, and Dublin. We are a State Water Contractor and one of three Bay Area agencies receiving water via the South Bay Aqueduct, which conveys Delta water from Bethany Reservoir to Livermore and finally to San Jose.

Delta Conveyance, and the State Water Project, are critical components to support regional and local water supplies – including the Bay Area. Zone 7 receives nearly 90% of its water supply from the Delta, making these two components of utmost importance to reliably provide water to over 260,000 residents and to about 3,500 acres of irrigated agriculture in the East Bay.

We are actively pursuing ways to diversify our supplies and enhancing resilience locally through the collaborative Bay Area Regional Reliability Partnership. Still, Delta Conveyance is an indispensable project. It serves to protect us against Delta outages due to earthquakes, climate change, etc., and it is critical to the Tri-Valley's health and economic prosperity.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions on this letter, please feel free to contact me at (925) 454-5005 or via email at erank@zone7water.com.

Sincerely,

Eke Rank

Elke Rank cc: Carol Mahoney, Amparo Flores, file

 From:
 Dan Muelrath

 To:
 DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping

 Subject:
 Delta Conveyance Project - Scoping Comments

 Date:
 Tuesday, March 10, 2020 2:21:10 PM

 Attachments:
 image003.jpg DWD - Comment Letter.pdf

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,

Dan Muelrath, <u>Certified Special District Manager</u> General Manager



P.O. Box 127 87 Carol Lane Oakley, CA 94561 (925) 625-3798 Main Office (925) 625-6159 Direct Line (925) 752-2051 Cell Phone

DCS140



87 Carol Lane P.O. Box 127 Oakley, CA 94561-0127 925-625-3798 Fax 925-625-0814 www.diablowater.org

Directors: Howard Hobbs President

John H. de Fremery Vice President

Kenneth L. Crockett Paul Seger Scott Pastor

General Manager & Secretary: Daniel Muelrath

General Counsel: Jeffrey D. Polisner March 10, 2020

Department of Water Resources Delta Conveyance Project Sacramento, CA

RE: Water Resilience Portfolio and Delta Conveyance Project

Department of Water Resources:

Diablo Water District (DWD) is uniquely situated in the heart of one of the State's most important natural resources, the Delta. The current and future health of the Delta (wildlife, quality of drinking water, and recreation) is of the highest concern to DWD and our residents.

Based on current efforts of state agencies, there is a disproportionate level of effort being put towards the Delta Conveyance Project's Scoping and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process, as opposed to water use efficiency implementation, which is putting the proverbial cart before the horse.

DWD opposes the Delta Conveyance Project.

The opposition is based on the project's potential to:

- Export volumes of water that exceed the health and human safety needs of the south of Delta population.
 - AB 685 (2012) and SB 200 (2019) refer to the right of every Californian to have access to safe <u>drinking water.</u>
 - Current and projected future Delta water transfers far exceed the <u>drinking</u> <u>water demands</u> for the south of Delta population.
 - Water districts in the water rich regions of the state, have been forced to reduce the water demands of our customers; therefore, the south of Delta population (living in water short regions) should be under even higher conservation standards.
 - What is the rational for residents in southern California receiving a larger water budget than northern California residents?
 - Current state regulations, including the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, reward poor plant selection in Southern

California with additional water allowances due to the higher Evapotranspiration rates.

- Why is water being transferred through the Delta for application to outdoor landscapes that are up to 475 miles away?
- Damage the ecosystem health of the Delta.
 - Delta smelt, salmonids and the salmon populations will be impacted first.
 - Increased salinity will be compounded when including climate change and sea level rise.
 - Conveyance tunnel may rupture during an earthquake causing catastrophic and irreversible damage to the Delta region.

In reference to the Department of Water Resource's current notice of preparation, for the EIR pertaining to the Delta Conveyance Project, the following items must be addressed in the EIR.

- 1. Demonstrate and quantify the progress made towards *"Making Conservation A Way of Life."*
- 2. Evaluate the Delta demands by setting a fair and equal statewide indoor and outdoor water budget, (i.e. 50 gallons per capita per day for indoor water use and 15 gallons per square foot per year for landscape water use). This would force regionally appropriate landscape choices and also be equitable for both northern and southern California residents. Thereby supporting the Water Resilience Portfolio (Jan 2020 draft) Water Supply Diversification goals 2.1 and 2.2 (pg. 18).
- 3. A "no project" alternative that investigates the true water demands for south of Delta users for <u>drinking water only</u>, not including landscape and other discretionary uses.
- 4. Decision tree showing how water transfers would be handled if/when declines to fish populations or other ecosystem health indicators decline.
- Evaluate the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission of the Delta Conveyance Project, which has a cumulative impact on the entire State Water Project (SWP). Demonstrate how the SWP is going to meet the state's 80% GHG reduction target by 2050.
- 6. Provide sufficient time (minimum of 6 months) for public consumption of the draft EIR.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel Muelrath (on behalf of Diablo Water District Board of Directors) General Manager

From:	Patsy Cheney
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	lorieDuarte21@gmail.com; gwoods40@gmail.com
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Project
Date:	Saturday, March 7, 2020 12:20:38 PM

Here's a copy of what I sent off to the Dept of Water Resources today in protest. Pat

Dear Ms. Renee Rodriguez

The Delta supplies water for 27 million people and irrigates 3 million acres. California's economy depends, in large part, on its health.

But the Delta's ecology has been declining, primarily because water from rivers has been diverted for agriculture before it reaches the West Coast's largest estuary. This has devastated native fish populations.

The current proposal of one tunnel will further damage the environment ruining it for all time. I am **completely against** this engineering nightmare as a solution to California's water problems.

Sincerely,

Patricia R Cheney

900 Suntan Lane

Brentwood, CA 94513

Pat51Cheney@yahoo.com

From:	Jim
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Project Opposition
Date:	Tuesday, March 10, 2020 4:23:16 PM

Dear Renee Rodrigues,

I am writing this e-mail to inform you that I wish for the Department of Water Resources to take note that I am against the construction of the tunnel through the Sacramento Delta. Even a single tunnel will be so harmful to the surrounding area which includes our own water quality, wildlife, environment and the serious impact it will have on boaters that wish to access the Delta during construction and in years to come following completion of the project. Please take the necessary steps needed to stop this detrimental project to our great and vibrant Delta.

In advance I thank you for your action,

Barbara Tortorici

From:	Paul Anderson
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments
Date:	Thursday, March 12, 2020 11:17:36 AM

Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Attn Renee Rodriguez Department of Water Resources PO Box 942836 Sacramento, CA 94236

Dear Ms. Rodriguez,

As a California boater, I am very concerned about the significant negative impact that the closure of navigable waterways and tributaries will have on recreational boating for more than a dozen years.

There must be a plan to ensure that the Delta infrastructure will not only be preserved but improved.

The plan must address the threat that climate change and increased water transfer pose to the amount and quality of the water in the Delta.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments.

Sincerely yours,

Paul N. Anderson

450 San Luis Ave., Los Altos, CA 94024 Anderp33@outlook.com

From:	Terra Land Group
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	fbuchman@sjgov.org; Aysha Massell; Jones, Ryan@CVFPB; Gallagher, Leslie@CVFPB;
	dawn.clement@stocktonca.gov; nguyen@sjcog.org; "Danielle Barney"; clerk@tridamproject.com; "Teresa
	Vargas"; Mierzwa, Michael@DWR; Ericson, Jon@DWR; Jimenez, Mary@DWR; "Nomellini, Grilli & McDaniel";
	pamforbus@sbcglobal.net; rdebord@sjgov.org; sstowers@sjgov.org; "Toland, Tanis J CIV CESPK CESPD (US)";
	Elizabeth.A.Salyers@usace.army.mil; "Candini, Cassandra"; info@dcdca.org; tracycitycouncil@cityoftracy.org;
	<u>"Beth Thompson"; lschimmelfennig@ci.manteca.ca.us; Padda, Jes S@DOT; Darling, Ruth@CVFPB;</u>
	vtovar@ccstockton.org; jcain@americanrivers.org; emily@acerail.com; "Jennifer Suda"; "Trushinski, Brian"
Subject:	Delta Conveyance Scoping Project Public Comment Letter
Date:	Wednesday, March 11, 2020 10:50:39 AM
Attachments:	2020-03-11 LTR DCP PubComm.pdf

Good Morning,

Attached please find a public comment letter dated March 11, 2020 from Terra Land Group, LLC to the California Department of Water Resources Delta Conveyance Scoping Project Re: Public Comments in Response to Recent Scoping Sessions Regarding the Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Conveyance Project, January 2020.

Thank you,

Martin Harris Terra Land Group MH/cm

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message including any attachments of any kind are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, is confidential and may include legally protected information. If you are not the intended recipient or you have received this e-mail message by mistake, printing, copying, storing or disseminating in any way is prohibited and doing so could subject you to civil and or criminal action. Please notify the sender if you received this e-mail in error and delete all information contained in and attached to this e-mail.

March 11, 2020

VIA EMAIL

Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Department of Water Resources P.O. Box 942836 Sacramento, CA 94236 (DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov)

Re: Public Comments in Response to Recent Scoping Sessions Regarding the Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Conveyance Project, January 2020.

Dear Project Team Members,

My name is Martin Harris and I am an authorized representative for Terra Land Group, LLC ("TLG"). TLG owns several properties located in Manteca and Lathrop, and as an organization, dedicates a significant amount of its efforts to ensure the safety of our communities by soliciting local, state, and federal agencies to protect our area from the effects of flooding.

TLG believes that as more and more people move into California and as more land is being developed or farmed, there needs to be more water storage and reuse opportunities to accommodate those increased needs. This is especially important as local city, county, state, and federal authorities take various actions to divert or hold back an increasing amount of water (from all sources) to make more water available to the public they serve. However, there also needs to be safe ways of storing, delivering, conveying, draining, and discharging that water to avoid flood and other hydrology-related impacts for the people who live in the areas that may be affected.

TLG is writing this letter to make the Delta Conveyance Project (single tunnel) team members aware of what appears to be a joint effort by both local, state, and federal authorities to pursue a phased strategy of flood protection and other federally-assisted improvements both inside and outside of the South Delta to meet California Senate Bill No. 5 ("SB 5") requirements as well as provide improved efficiencies in the ways we currently are storing, delivering, reusing, and draining water. (See Enclosures 1-12)

TLG believes that storing, delivering, reusing, and draining water in and along the South Delta becomes complicated when it is considered that the January 2018 San Joaquin River Basin Lower San Joaquin River, CA Final Integrated Interim Feasibility Report/EIR/EIS: (LSJRFS") includes the following:

1. Page ES-1 of the LSJRFS states: The study area also includes the distributary channels of the San Joaquin River in the southernmost reaches of the Delta; Paradise Cut and Old River as far north as Tracy Boulevard, and Middle River as far north as Victoria Canal.

- 2. Page 3-31 of the LSJRFS states: Currently, the levee safety program has defined the levee system that incorporates RD 17 as bounded on the north by Walker Slough, west by the San Joaquin River and south by the Stanislaus River. This includes RD 17, RD 2096, RD 2094, RD 2075 and RD 2064.
- 3. Page 5-17 of the LSJRFS states: **Stanislaus River to Paradise Cut.** The confluence of the San Joaquin and Stanislaus Rivers defines the upstream extent of the hydraulic model used for this study.
- 4. Page ES-2 of the LSJRFS states:

Analysis of the study area is challenged by the presence of three sources of flooding, the Delta Front, Calaveras River and San Joaquin River. This results in commingled floodplains for the North and Central Stockton areas. The distributary nature of the Delta also affects Delta water levels, because high flows from the Sacramento River may "fill" the Delta prior to a peak inflow on the San Joaquin River as occurred in 1997, raising water levels on the Delta front levees.

5. Page 5-27 of the LSJRFS states: 2.1.1 FLOODING Problem: **There is significant risk to public health**, **safety and property in the study area associated with flooding.** The study area is located in the Central Valley of California which has very little topographic relief, resulting in potential flooding of areas far from water courses... (See Enclosure 1)

Potential Impacts to Consider:

TLG believes that all Mossdale Tract Flood modeling and Adequate Progress reports that have been publicly released to date have failed to fully consider and provide mitigation measures for:

(i) Unresolved and continuing sedimentation issues that continue to reduce channel flow capacity in and along the South Delta Lower San Joaquin River System; and

(ii) Climate change and continued uncertainty relating to its effect on increasing the total potential volumes of channel flows to be expected in and along the South Delta Lower San Joaquin River System;

<u>COMMENT</u>: Martin Harris and several other South Manteca rural neighbors attended a Central Valley Flood Protection Board Workshop on February 14, 2020. Although a number of climate change presentations were made by staff, flood models and associated drainage flow volumes related to climate change do not appear to have been fully determined.

QUESTION: What effect will this have on determining the total amount of reservoir storage water that can be safely stored in higher elevations throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Reservoir System(s)?

(iii) A Stanislaus River right bank levee breach in the areas west of the City of Ripon; and

(iv) Limited topographic relief to ground surface areas in and along the South Delta; <u>QUESTION</u>: Will mitigation measures be included to prevent any potential for reverse channel flows and associated backwater effects that may impede the natural flow of Old

River as identified on pages 3A-28 and 3A-29 of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan California WaterFix Final EIR/EIS (December 2016)?

(v) Various federal and state-funded Manteca and Lathrop area highway construction projects as presented in (a) the 2014 San Joaquin Council of Governments Sustainable Communities Strategy, Draft EIR and 2015 FTIP Conformity Document and in (b) other highway projects approved and/or funded in association with the San Joaquin Council of Governments ("SJCOG") (See Enclosure 11); and

(vi) Unresolved plans as to how the cities of Manteca and Lathrop can reasonably drain what appears to be ever-increasing amounts of stormwater and effluent wastewater from developing areas into non-developing areas that flooded in 1997 (See Enclosures 1-12);

COMMENT: TLG is including copies of letters previously submitted to other regulating and land use authorities in the Manteca and Lathrop areas to make the Delta Conveyance Project (single tunnel) team fully aware that any and all total drainage flows to be expected in and along the South Delta may be greater than what existing flood models may indicate.

(vii) What appears to be the City of Manteca's total indifference in following its own goals and policies as stated in the existing 2023 Manteca General Plan (**See Enclosure 8**); and

(viii) What appears to be the City of Manteca's total indifference in following the Handbook for Local Communities for Implementing California Flood Legislation into Local Land Use Planning ("2010 Land Use Planning Guide") as issued by the California Department of Water Resources in 2010. (See Enclosure 8, pages 8 & 9)

<u>QUESTION</u>: How can anyone determine the total floodwater, stormwater and wastewater flows to be expected without respecting and following the 2010 Land Use Planning Guide?

(ix) Flood and other hydrology-related drainage impacts anticipated to occur in conjunction with the ACE train and Valley Link rail expansions; and

(x) Flood and other hydrology-related drainage impacts anticipated to occur in conjunction with RD 17 planned improvements associated with any and all Phase II, Phase III, and California Senate Bill No. 5 200-year projects to be considered.

With these concerns in mind, TLG urges the Delta Conveyance Project (single tunnel) team members to consider the comments and concerns stated in this letter and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures into any single tunnel Delta Conveyance Project environmental impact report to be created.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter.

Respectfully,

for Terra Land Group, LLC.

MH/cm

Enclosures:

These Enclosures can be downloaded as needed via Dropbox through the provided hyperlinks.

- 2018-02-26 letter from TLG to the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/8scnhemfwexbkr9/2018-02-26 LTR SJAFCA LSJR%20EIR Public Comm wEncl.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 2. 2018-03-05 letter from TLG to the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/tl0ir7soookd6ze/2018-03-05 LTR SJAFCA Letter2.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 2019-03-18 letter from TLG to the City of Lathrop Public Works Department (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/musf61jmz7azjvy/2019-03-18 LTR LPW EIRWaterResPlan.pdf?dl</u> =0)
- 4. 2019-01-15 letter from TLG to the California Department of Water Resources (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/0rgif3aql6dwg35/2019-01-15_LTR_DWR_CAWaterPlan.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 5. 2019-11-20 letter from TLG to the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/tlnfyrri524q6gq/2019-11-20 LTR DCDCA Aglt7b.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 6. 2019-12-09 letter from TLG to the Lathrop City Council (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/qkk2an4jzivbh29/2019-12-09 LTR LCC Aglts5.1.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 7. 2019-12-09 letter from TLG to the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/6p3tm8gcjg57lxi/2019-12-09 LTR SJCBOS Aglt1.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 8. 2020-01-29 letter from TLG to J.D. Hightower
 (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/ljlrkxqsol7p5dc/2020-01-29 LTR Hightower GeneralPlan.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 9. 2020-01-29 letter from TLG to the State of California Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/gt61vuwc7ju21mh/2020-01-29 LTR WRP PubComm.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 10. 2020-02-12 letter from TLG to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/njodon28y8j2yx8/2020-02-12 LTR CVFPB Aglts4A.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 11. 2020-03-02 letter from TLG to the Manteca City Council (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/u3aw0nashy9137t/2020-03-02 LTR MCC AgltsC1.pdf?dl=0</u>)
- 12. 2020-03-09 letter from TLG to the Lathrop City Council (<u>https://www.dropbox.com/s/63eimrc8ygwp73j/2020-03-09 LTR LCC Aglts2.2.pdf?dl=0</u>)

cc:

San Joaquin Flood Control and Water Conservation District, % Fritz Buchman American Rivers, Attn: Aysha Massell, Associate Director Central Valley Flood Protection Board, Attn: Ryan Jones Central Valley Flood Protection Board, Attn: Leslie Gallagher, Executive Officer San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency, Attn: Dawn Clement San Joaquin Council of Governments, % Diane Nguyen South San Joaquin Groundwater Sustainability Agency, % Danielle Barney Tri-Dam Project Board of Directors

South San Joaquin Irrigation District Board of Directors, % Danielle Barney

Lathrop City Council, % Teresa Vargas, City Clerk

Michael Mierzwa, Lead Flood Management Planner, California Department of Water Resources Jon Ericson, Hydrology and Flood Operations Officer, California Department of Water Resources California Department of Water Resources, Attn: Mary Jimenez

Reclamation District No. 17, % Nomellini, Grilli & McDaniel PLC

Reclamation District No. 2075, Attn: Pam Forbus

Reclamation District No. 2094, Attn: Pam Forbus

San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, Attn: Rachél DeBord, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Board San Joaquin County Planning Commission, Attn: Stephanie Stowers, Senior Planner

Tanis Toland, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District

Elizabeth Salyers, Chief, Civil Works Project Management Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Manteca City Council, % Assistant City Clerk Cassandra Tilton

Delta Conveyance Design And Construction Authority Board of Directors

Tracy City Council

City of Manteca General Plan Advisory Committee, % De Novo Planning Group, Attn: Beth

Thompson & Lisa Schimmelfennig

California Department of Transportation, District 10, Attn: Jes Padda, Acting Deputy District Director

Ruth Darling, Program Manager I, Engineering and Technical Office, Central Valley Flood Protection Board

Veronica Tovar, Environmental Justice Program Manager

River Partners, Attn: John Cain

San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission Board of Directors

Tri-Valley - San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority Board of Directors, % Jennifer Suda, Executive Assistant

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, FEMA Region IX, Attn: Brian Trushinski

From:	Maisy Cooper
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	Delta Tunnel - NO!
Date:	Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:08:54 PM

To: Department of Water Resources Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Renee Rodriguez

I am a resident of Orleans, CA on the Klamath River just above the confluence of the Trinity River. I am writing to let you know that I have grave concerns over this proposed project and feel that it would deleteriously harm the watersheds which depend upon flows from the Trinity River. We oppose this project and hope that the EIR will considering the following in its assessment:

* The EIR should analyze impacts to California's salmon people, including salmon dependent Tribes and coastal fishing communities.

* The EIR should analyze alternatives that would increase Delta outflow and reduce exports as compared to current conditions in the Delta. Specifically, the EIR should examine a "no tunnel" alternative.

* The EIR should analyze the impacts to source waters, and their reservoir storage, including the Trinity, Klamath, Sacramento, Feather, Yuba and San Joaquin Rivers. Water quality impacts from any increased diversions should be included in this analysis. * The EIR should analyze the cumulative impacts of the Delta tunnels with the new Trump administration Biological Opinions for the Trump Water Plan, the long term operations of the State Water Project, the Shasta dam raise and the proposed Sites Reservoir. Would these new projects and rules be used to fill the tunnels?

* The EIR should analyze water conservation, efficiency, and additional demand reduction measures that would be less environmentally harmful and more economical than the tunnel and achieve the same water supply reliability goals and targets.

* The EIR must analyze the tunnel's consistency with the Delta Reform Act's policy of reduced reliance on the Delta. The EIR must analyze the tunnel's cumulative impacts, with particular focus on: \circ global climate change impacts; \circ water quality, including effects of increases in salinity, toxic hot spots, pesticides, mercury, and other pollutant discharge that won't be cleaned out due to lack of freshwater in the Delta; \circ biological resources, including all species that may be impacted by the SWP, as well as upland habitats that may be affected; \circ impacts on tunnel alignment, since the proposed eastern alignment has potential for significant urban impacts for Delta residents; and \circ Impacts incurred during construction of the tunnel

* The EIR must adequately analyze the effectiveness of proposed mitigation and

conservation measures over the term of the tunnel project, and include mitigations and protections for every impacted watershed.

* The EIR should analyze the economic costs and benefits of the single tunnel project, as well as those of a "no tunnel" alternative and investment in water conservation and efficiency improvements to meet water supply needs.

Thank you for your attention

Sincerely, Meredith Cooper PO Box 224 Orleans, CA 95556 maisycooper@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Rachel Huang
То:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	In Opposition to Shasta Dam raising and Delta Conveyance Project
Date:	Monday, March 9, 2020 10:24:48 AM
Attachments:	Salmon deprived bear docx

Dear staff at the Department of Water Resources,

Hope all is well.

My name is Rachel and I denounce the proposed raising of Shasta Dam due to its inevitable cultural impact on the Winnemem Wintu people and its environmental disruption of the geographical region. We also denounce the proposed tunnel project, which will seriously endanger the four extant Sacramento and American River Chinook salmon runs that Winnemem Wintu (WW) tribe desperately need as Chinook Salmons are an essential part of WW tribe's culture and livelihood.

The Chinook salmon are a keystone species that is largely responsible for Northern California's rich agricultural soils and ecosystem. Further, the extinction of this salmon would ultimately devastate the agriculture economy and ecosystems. Last year, only 0.1% of the salmon came back! Much of the species living in the area require salmon to continue living and surviving. For example, the picture attached is the California Grizzly Bear that did not make it through the winter. How are we supposed to call California our home and use the Grizzly Bear flag when we make it impossible for the species that depend on the land and resources to survive.

As a community, we need to be much more critical of how our decisions will impact one another. This dam will endanger the livelihoods of the Winnemem Wintu and non-human communities as well as the species that depend on Salmons. We demand that the Department of Water Resources listen to the voices of the most impacted communities and that the right decision will be taken. If you care about the future of California please oppose BOTH proposals!

Respectfully,

Rachel Huang (she/they)



1/10th of 1% of salmon return to Broughton Archipelago in 2019, and bears like this one who's no likely to find enough salmon to live through the winter are suffering. We can avoid this happening here or ...

DelaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov

From:	Save California Salmon ! via Change.org
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	New petition to you: Governor Newsom: Water is Life, No Delta Tunnel
Date:	Thursday, March 12, 2020 3:41:26 PM

?

California Department of Water Resources: you've been listed as a decision maker

Save California Salmon ! started a petition on Change.org and listed you as a decision maker. Learn more about Save California Salmon !'s petition and how you can respond:

?

Save California Salmon ! is petitioning California Department of Water Resources (Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments)

Governor Newsom: Water is Life, No Delta Tunnel

California's salmon rivers are at a crisis point. A recent report stated over 45% of California's fisheries are facing extinction within 50 years. The Klamath River spring chinook and coho salmon are currently facing extinction, and the Sacramento River/ Bay...

View the petition

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. View the petition: <u>Learn about the petition and its supporters</u>. You will receive updates as new supporters sign the petition so you can see who is signing and why. **2. Respond to the petition:** Post a response to let the petition supporters know you're listening, say whether you agree with their call to action, or ask them for more information.

3. Continue the dialogue: Read the comments posted by petition supporters and continue the dialogue so that others can see you're an engaged leader who is willing to participate in open discussion.

CHANGE.ORG FOR DECISION MAKERS

On Change.org, decision makers like you connect directly with people around the world to resolve issues. Learn more.

This notification was sent to DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov, the address listed as the decision maker.

Privacy policy

We'd love to hear from you! Contact us through our help center.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993, San Francisco, CA 94104-5401, USA

change.org

After a video surfaced of George Floyd being murdered by Minneapolis police, 15-year-old Kellen started a petition demanding justice. It's now the biggest petition ever on Change.org and officers have been arrested and charged. But we haven't yet seen justice. <u>You can sign the petition here to send a message that Black lives matter.</u>



Governor Newsom: Water is Life, No Delta Tunnel



https://www.change.org/p/gavin-newsom-gov-newsom-water-is-life-no-delta-tunnel?cs_tk=&utm_campaign=d879a09fc6e042578ba32e052a7cbb61&... 1/19



684 have signed. Let's get to 1,000!



Save California Salmon ! started this petition to Governor Gavin Newsom and 1 other

California's salmon rivers are at a crisis point. A recent report stated over 45% of California's fisheries are facing extinction within 50 years. The Klamath River spring chinook and coho salmon are currently facing extinction, and the Sacramento River/ Bay Delta winter run salmon, Spring Salmon, delta smelt,

6/18/2020

Petition · Governor Newsom: Water is Life, No Delta Tunnel · Change.org

and green sturgeon are all imperiled. Loss of habitat, low river flows and poor water quality are the main issues impacting the fish in both watersheds. The Trinity River, the Klamath's largest tributary, has been dammed and diverted to the Sacramento River, and is delivered to Central Valley Project contractors such as the Westlands Water District. The Bay Delta, Sacramento River and Klamath-Trinity River salmon declines are connected to overallocation of water to the Central Valley Project and State Water Project.

This situation has been made much worse by bad water management during recent droughts and ocean impacts from climate change. Even fish that are not endangered such as the Klamath and Trinity River fall run Chinook are facing rapidly dwindling numbers, which means that members of California's three largest Tribes, the Yurok, Hoopa Valley, and Karuk Tribes do not have access to an essential food source. Most Delta and Sacramento River Tribes have not had access to salmon for many decades. Commercial fishing and coastal communities are also suffering from the economic impacts from loss of salmon. This year only 47,261 salmon returned to the Klamath and Trinity Rivers out of the 97,912 that were predicted. This severely impacted people in Northern California and Southern Oregon. All available science points to the fact that floodplain and estuary restoration, access to cold water habitat and improved flows will be essential if salmon are to survive climate change in California. Now the state of California is taking public comments on the plan to build a new 7000 cfs diversions that would be feed by California's most important salmon River. At public hearings on the Delta tunnel proposal hundred of people from at least eight Tribes, four fishing organizations and many social justice and environmental groups testified against this proposal. Concerns came from all over the state and ranged from concerns about increased water bills from L.A. to concerns about possible fish kills from diversions and lack of salmon fishing seasons in Del Norte County. Delta Tribes also expressed opposition due to the desecration of cultural sites from the construction of the tunnels and residents of Stockton, California said they will have to deal with the health impacts from tunnel construction and diminished water quality.

Luckily the people of California do not need this tunnel. Californians are saving water and support conservation to save the environment. Unfortunately, large water brokers and corporate agriculture interests, such as the Westlands Water District, know there is money to be made from water. In 2017 Donald Trump appointed a Westlands Water District lobbyist, David Bernhardt to head the Department of Interior, and he has created several new plans and rules that would harm California's salmon. California's Governor, Gavin Newsom has also prioritized water deliveries over the environment thus far, but did recently challenge one of these plans in court.

Currently proposed state and federal processes threaten California's rivers include;

- * The Trump Water Plan for Long Term Operations of the Central Valley Project,
- * Shasta Dam Enlargement,
- * The Long Term Operations of the State Water Project,
- * The Proposed Sites Reservoir,
- * The Twin Tunnels proposal, which is now the One Tunnel,
- * The Westlands Water District and other CVP water district permanent water contracts,

6/18/2020

* The Governor's Water Resilience Portfolio. This document lays out the Governor's water priorities and the one tunnel proposal and Sites Reservoir are top priorities in the document.

These projects are all connected as the Sites Reservoir project and its new diversions, the Trump water plan, and the Long Term Operations of the State Water Project would allow more water to be diverted and stored from the Trinity and Sacramento River systems and Bay Delta, and the tunnel would allow this water to be moved south. The Governor's water portfolio and Trump actions make sure all of these new reservoirs and diversions are prioritized on the state and federal level above salmon and communities.

Public comments on the Delta Conveyance Scoping are due on March 20, 2020 by 5 p.m. and may be submitted via email at DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov or mail at P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.

Start a petition of your own

Start a petition of your own

<u>This petition starter stood up and took action. Will you do the same?</u> <u>Start a petition</u>

Updates

<u>Tribal Members and Youth Speak Out on Delta Tunnel: "Shut It Down!"</u> <u>The message was loud and clear for state water officials at a public meeting Monday evening in</u> <u>Redding: Don't send any more water south thr...</u> Tribal Members and Youth Speak Out on Delta Tunnel: "Shut It Down!"

The message was loud and clear for state water officials at a public meeting Monday evening in

<u>Redding: Don't send any more water south through a proposed Delta tunnel project.</u>

<u>A group of more than 100 Native Americans rallied on the lawn of the Redding Civic Auditorium before</u> they marched into a scoping meeting held inside the Redding Sheraton Hotel across the street.

"We're here today at the Delta tunnel scoping meeting to let the government know that we cannot sustain any more diversions from the Trinity River," said Margo Robbins, an adviser for the Hoopa High School Water Protectors Club. "As native people, we rely on the river and the salmon as part of our traditional heritage. We cannot afford to let anything further erode our river systems."

More: Trump water plan blasted by Northern California tribe

The state Department of Water Resources held the Redding meeting at the request of far Northern California tribes and the Hoopa High School students, according to Regina Chichizola, spokeswoman for Save California Salmon. She said tribal members from Hoopa Valley, Yurok, Karuk, Pit River and Miwok attended along with Winnemem Wintu people.

---1 of 21

Save California Salmon !

<u>3 months ago</u> 3 months ago

From:	Eihway Su
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Subject:	No Delta Conveyance Project
Date:	Thursday, March 12, 2020 10:38:57 AM

Water conservation is the best way to deal with our water needs. Mandatory rationing especially for the agriculture industry that grows water intensive crops should be implemented instead of siphoning of water needed for the stability of our environment. Also waste water should be recycled. Unsustainable development should be stopped as well. These are all alternatives to this expensive proposal that does not deal with the limited water available for us all.

Eihway Su 170 Parnassus Ave., #2 SF CA 94117

From:	<u>Colin Diaz</u>
To:	DWR Delta Conveyance Scoping
Cc:	CFrey@mwdh2o.com
Subject:	Regarding Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments
Date:	Friday, March 6, 2020 5:05:56 PM
Attachments:	Delta Conveyance Scoping Letter.docx

Attn: Renee Rodriquez

My name is Colin Diaz and I serve as the Chair of the Westside Councils of Chambers of Commerce (WC3). We recently had a discussion about the plans for the Delta Conveyance Scoping. As a group that supported your efforts in the past, we also support this endeavor too. Attached is a letter of support for those efforts on behalf of the 13 Chambers we represent. Please let me know if you have any questions with regards to this.

Thank you,

Colin Diaz

President/CEO

Culver City Chamber of Commerce

6000 Sepulveda Blvd. #1260

Culver City, CA 90230

www.culvercitychamber.com

310.287.3850 | Main

310.287.3855 | Direct





February 25, 2020

Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments Attn: Renee Rodriguez California Department of Water Resources

VIA EMAIL: DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov

On behalf of the Westside Council of Chambers of Commerce – comprised of thirteen Chambers of Commerce on the westside of Los Angeles County -- I am pleased to provide input for the scoping process of the single-tunnel Delta conveyance project being advanced by the Department of Water Resources. We appreciate Governor Newsom's leadership to help ensure, safe, affordable and reliable water supplies to much of California.

More than 30 percent of Southern California's water supply comes from the Sierra Nevada and it provides the backbone water supply for millions of people, our \$1.6 trillion economy, farms and our environment. Modernizing and upgrading our state's aging infrastructure with a single tunnel properly sized to convey 6,000 cubic-feet-per-second of water supply for the State Water Project will allow us to more efficiently move water, restore the Delta ecosystem and manage our water supply through climate extremes.

We are not alone in our support. There is widespread backing for the project in Southern California and throughout the state from diverse and prominent interests, ranging from labor and business to public agencies, nonprofits and agriculture. We all recognize that a severe water shortage would come with an enormous economic cost and the time to move forward is now.

This project is not the only step we must take to ensure water resiliency. Ensuring Southern California has a reliable water supply in the future requires a diverse portfolio of both imported and local supplies and conservation. Much progress and significant investments are being made on a wide range of local projects and water efficiency, but the Delta conveyance project remains vitally important.

We support the Newsom Administration's work to move forward in the planning process in a manner that achieves the goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration. With our largest and most affordable supply at risk, we need the reliability the proposed Delta conveyance project will provide.

Should you like any additional input from us please contact our Legislative Consultant, Ted Green, at (310) 659-9450 or <u>ted@greenpaac.com</u>.

Sincerely,

Colin Diaz Chair Westside Council of Chambers of Commerce