

Chapter 8

# Form Letter Comments

## Chapter 8

# Form Letter Comments

This section contains copies of the form letters received, listed in Table 8-1. A sample of each type of form letter is followed by responses to the comments presented in that letter. A list of the people who signed and submitted each form letter is provided in Appendix A. Where signatories of a form letter changed the content of the form, those altered forms and responses to additional comments are included following the general form letter responses. Responses to comments are numbered individually in sequence, corresponding to the numbering assigned to comments in each comment letter. The responses are prepared in answer to the full text of the original comment.

**Table 8-1.** Form Letters Received on the Draft EIS/EIR

---

Form Letter 1  
Form Letter 2  
Form Letter 3  
Form Letter 4  
Form Letter 5  
Form Letter 6  
Form Letter 7  
Form Letter 8  
Form Letter 9  
Form Letter 10  
Form Letter 11  
Form Letter POST

---

# Form Letter 1

To: 19166535077	From: 2022691060	2-07-06 11:27pm p. 1 of 1
<b>Form 1</b>		
<p>Dear Mr. Marshall,</p>		
<p>I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.</p>	<b>Form 1-1</b>	
<p>I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.</p>	<b>Form 1-2</b>	
<p>I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.</p>	<b>Form 1-3</b>	
<p>Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.</p>	<b>Form 1-4</b>	
<p>Sincerely,</p>		

## Responses to Comments

### Form 1-1, Form 1-2, and Form 1-3

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### Form 1-4

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

## Form Letter 2

**Form 2**

---

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

California Trout and our undersigned members are writing to urge you to drop plans for additional pumping from the California Bay-Delta as currently proposed in the South Delta Improvements Program (SDIP), especially while the Delta is experiencing an historic ecosystem collapse.

**Form  
2-1**

Most urgently, we request that you withdraw the highly flawed Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement for SDIP. If the project truly aims to improve water quality and fish survival, you must examine an alternative to the project that accomplishes these goals by significantly reducing Delta pumping from current levels.

**Form  
2-2**

We have more reliable, more cost-effective and more environmentally friendly ways to provide abundant water for California's future. These options include water use efficiency and water recycling, outlined in the Department of Water Resources' draft "California Water Plan Update" and Water for California's "Investment Strategy for California Water" (prepared by the Planning and Conservation League).

Together we must make sensible and sustainable water policy decisions that conserve the Delta and our rivers, to keep our state beautiful, vibrant and strong. The survival of the Delta depends upon your agency's actions. Please support the recovery of the Delta and say NO to increased pumping.

Sincerely,

## Responses to Comments

### Form 2-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 2-2

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

## Form Letter 3

**Form 3**

---

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved. **Form 3-1**

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future. **Form 3-2**

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish. **Form 3-3**

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

## Responses to Comments

### Form 3-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 3-2

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

### Form 3-3

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.



## Form Letter 4

Form 4

I am writing to advise you of my serious concern for the welfare of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary and the fisheries that depend upon it for survival. As you may know, the productivity of a significant part of the foodweb in the Delta has collapsed according to agency scientists with the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP). Delta populations of important plankton and shrimp that help fuel the foodweb and drive the system's ecology have disappeared, as have many other important species including Delta smelt, longfin smelt, threadfin shad and young-of-the-year striped bass. Recently the Dept of Fish and Game has sounded the alarm over a dramatic drop in the sturgeon population.

Form  
4-1

The estuary that once sustained multiple runs of salmon and abundant runs striped bass, American shad, sturgeon, steelhead and a diverse food web is experiencing such low levels of productivity that an ecosystem crash may be imminent. Should this happen, many fisheries will not find the food necessary to sustain their survival. The prolonged decline of our fisheries now averaging between 80 and 95 percent would continue to the point of suffering what may be irreversible damage.

The estuary may be on the verge of an ecological disaster! The collapse of these natural resources would be tragic as hundreds of millions of dollars of public funding has been spent trying to restore the estuary and its fisheries. The economic consequences to the state's sport and commercial fishing industries and the state's tax base could run into many millions of dollars annually. These are industries that have already suffered dramatic losses due to prolonged declines of the Central Valley's once world class fisheries.

Scientists have long maintained that water export is one of the major impacts to the productivity of the of the Bay-Delta estuary. It has changed the natural flow regime and significantly decreased the amount of water that historically flowed through it into the ocean. Instead of the high spring runoff that flowed through the entire estuary, the water projects have reduced Delta outflow by at least 50%, on average, and dramatically changed the timing and the amount of water available to the estuary. These and other changes in the natural flow regime are currently under study by the IEP scientists. I believe they are at the very heart of the problem. While agencies have reacted with an increased effort to further study the declining productivity, the Department of Water Resources continues to move forward with their "South Delta Improvement Project" (SDIP) that could increase water exports out of the Delta by up to 25%! A decision to move forward with the SDIP in the face of a collapsing ecosystem will further compound the estuary's problems and it could do irreparable harm to the estuary and its fisheries.

While I agree with agency scientists that there are other potential sources of impact, including toxic pesticides and herbicides from agricultural runoff and impacts from exotic species introduced from ballast water discharged by ships, I am strongly opposed to moving forward with the SDIP planning process or discussions on increasing flow rates. Many fishing groups support a moratorium on any additional export of Delta water until the problem with the Delta's food web is fixed and our anadromous fishery resources are maintained at sustainable population levels. These groups take this position after more than twenty years of governmental promises that our Central Valley fisheries and the estuary they depend on would be restored.

Given the obvious concern for our state's natural resources, I am hopeful that you will support the position of stopping the SDIP from moving forward, especially since there is not an immediate need for the State Water Project to build additional export capability at this time.

Form  
4-2

One of the greatest estuaries in the world is in real danger. I urge you to help save it!

## Responses to Comments

### Form 4-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 4-2

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

## Form Letter 5

**Form 5**

---

Please stop the plans of the Department of Water Resources to implement the South Delta Improvement Project and the export of any additional water out of Delta until our estuary and its fisheries are restored. There have a decade of broken promises that these public resources would be restored. Given the collapse of the Delta food web, now is the time to restore the estuary and our fisheries before any more water is exported out of the estuary!

Form  
5-1

The DWR's recently released Bulletin 160 clearly demonstrates that the state's water needs will be met for at least the next decade with the existing water infrastructure. There is no water crisis to justify the destruction of the Delta! The health of our Delta and fisheries is truly at stake!

Form  
5-2

The Delta's wellbeing is in big trouble. I'm urging you to put a stop to the SDIP before irreversible damage is done.

## Responses to Comments

### Form 5-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 5-2

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

## Form Letter 6

**Form 6**

---

Eighty-five percent of the water pumped from the Delta goes to farming. The Delta ecosystems are crashing and fish are disappearing yet the farmers continue to get water at insanely cheap prices. It's time the farmers start using water saving irrigation methods, pay the going rate or switch to crops that need less water. Something has to give before the Delta ecosystem is destroyed beyond repair. A billion dollar Northern California sportfishing industry is threatened and the local economies are at stake. Kill the fish and we won't need boats, gas, mechanics, marinas, sandwiches, sodas, ice, fishing tackle etc. Pumping the water is not only killing the Delta but hurting small businesses.

Form  
6-1

Form  
6-2

## Responses to Comments

### Form 6-1

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### Form 6-2

The effects of the SDIP on biological resources, including fish, are fully described in the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 6, which includes impact assessment for fish, vegetation and wetlands, and wildlife. Where a significant effect is found to result from implementation of the SDIP, DWR and Reclamation will implement mitigation measure(s) to ensure that the overall impact is less than significant. Additionally, DWR and Reclamation have committed to a Stage 2 evaluation as explained in Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

## Form Letter 7

Form 7

Dear Paul Marshall, California Department of Water Resources,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Study for the South Delta Improvement Program (SDIP).

I am concerned that at a time when the San Francisco Bay-Delta ecosystem is collapsing and some fish populations are in danger of extinction, a plan is being considered that would significantly increase the amount of fresh water diverted out of the San Francisco Bay-Delta. The exact causes for the fish declines are still being investigated, but Delta pumping is one of the primary culprits. I urge you to withdraw the draft until the causes of the decline are identified and resolved.

Form  
7-1

In addition, a revised Environmental Impact Report/Study should be drafted that includes all reasonable alternatives, such as a significant reduction in Delta pumping from current levels. A reduction would allow the Bay-Delta ecosystem to be restored

Form  
7-2

The California State Water Plan has clearly shown that the state can meet current and future water demand without increasing pumping if investments are made in urban and agricultural water conservation and reclamation.

Form  
7-3

Thank you.



## Responses to Comments

### Form 7-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 7-2

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### Form 7-3

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

## Form Letter 8

Form 8

---

The Delta food chain is severely broken, and increasing water exports should not occur until the habitat's conditions are better understood, and the fish counts have returned to sufficient levels. Delta populations of important plankton and shrimp that help fuel the food web and drive the system's ecology have disappeared, as have many other important species including Delta smelt, longfin smelt, threadfin shad, and young-of-the-year striped bass. Recently the Dept of Fish and Game has sounded the alarm over a dramatic drop in the sturgeon population. Several factors may possibly be at play here, but everyone agrees and understands that increased water export rates at this time will cause additional and possibly irreversible damage to this great Estuary.

Form  
8-1

# Responses to Comments

## Form 8-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

## Form Letter 9

### Form 9

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

Form 9-1

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

Form 9-2

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

Form 9-3

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Form 9-4

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish. I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and

Form 9-5

restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

**F9-5 Cont.**

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

**F9-6**

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

## Responses to Comments

### Form 9-1, Form 9-2, and Form 9-5

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### Form 9-3 and Form 9-6

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 9-4

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

# Form Letter 10

## Form 10

Please stop the plans of the Department of Water Resources to implement the South Delta Improvement Project and the export of any additional water out of Delta until our estuary and its fisheries are restored. There have a decade of broken promises that these public resources would be restored. Given the collapse of the Delta food web, now is the time to restore the estuary and our fisheries before any more water is exported out of the estuary!

Form  
10-1

The DWR's recently released Bulletin 160 clearly demonstrates that the state's water needs will be met for at least the next decade with the existing water infrastructure. There is no water crisis to justify the destruction of the Delta! The health of our Delta and fisheries is truly at stake!

Form  
10-2

The Delta's wellbeing is in big trouble. I'm urging you to put a stop to the SDIP before irreversible damage is done.

Eighty-five percent of the water pumped from the Delta goes to farming. The Delta ecosystems are crashing and fish are disappearing yet the farmers continue to get water at insanely cheap prices. It's time the farmers start using water saving irrigation methods, pay the going rate or switch to crops that need less water. Something has to give before the Delta ecosystem is destroyed beyond repair. A billion dollar Northern California sport fishing industry is threatened and the local economies are at stake. Kill the fish and we won't need boats, gas, mechanics, marinas, sandwiches, sodas, ice, fishing tackle etc. Pumping the water is not only killing the Delta but hurting small businesses.

Form  
10-3

Too much water is diverted from the Delta! The Delta is dying and allowing more fresh water to flow through to the sea will very likely stem the crashing ecosystems. It's time to make the politically powerful agriculture industry step up. Farmers use most of the water flowing south. They need to start using irrigation methods that conserve water or pay the going rate for water. If major changes aren't in place soon, the Delta and local sport fishing economies will be irreparably damaged

Form  
10-4

I am writing to express my complete objection to the DWR's plan to increase water exports from the Delta. The Delta and its habitat are on the brink of total collapse, and now is NOT the time to increase water exports. All fish counts have now been drastically reduced to record all time lows, and increasing water exports at this time will only compound this most recent, drastic decline in fish counts. This great Estuary that once sustained multiple runs of salmon, striped bass, American shad, sturgeon, steelhead and a diverse food web is experiencing such low levels of productivity that an ecosystem crash seems all but inevitable.

Form  
10-5

The Delta food chain is severely broken, and increasing water exports should not occur until the habitat's conditions are better understood, and the fish counts have returned to sufficient levels. Delta populations of important plankton and shrimp that help fuel the food web and drive the system's ecology have disappeared, as have many other important species including Delta smelt, longfin smelt, threadfin shad, and young-of-the-year striped bass. Recently the Dept of Fish and Game has sounded the alarm over a dramatic

Form  
10-6

drop in the sturgeon population. Several factors may possibly be at play here, but everyone agrees and understands that increased water export rates at this time will cause additional and possibly irreversible damage to this great Estuary.

Even the DWR's own recently released Bulletin 160 clearly demonstrates that the state's water needs will be met for at least the next decade with the existing water infrastructure. There is no water crisis to justify the destruction of the Delta. The health of our Delta and fisheries is truly at stake here, and we should not increase water exports and risk irreversible damage to an already broken habitat.

**Form  
10-2**



## Responses to Comments

### Form 10-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 10-2

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

### Form 10-3

Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*, describes the different alternatives that were evaluated for their ability to meet the project purpose and need. The effects of the SDIP on biological resources, including fish, are fully described in the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 6, which includes impact assessment for fish, vegetation and wetlands, and wildlife. Where a significant effect is found to result from implementation of the SDIP, DWR and Reclamation will implement mitigation measure(s) to ensure that the overall impact is less than significant. Additionally, DWR and Reclamation have committed to a Stage 2 evaluation as explained in Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### Form 10-4

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### Form 10-5

DWR and Reclamation have committed to a Stage 2 evaluation as explained in Master Response K, *Staged Decision Making Process* and Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

## Form 10-6

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta  
Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

# Form Letter 11

SDIP Questionnaire	1-26-06	<b>Form 11</b>
To: Paul Marshall.		Stockton Meeting questions
CC: Lester Snow DWR CC: Roger di Fate DBAC CC John Beuttler, AFG CC; Mike Riehl BBAC		
Name : _____		
Address: _____		
Email: _____		
<b>Please put me on your list and send me the answers to my questions.</b>		
1	What is the Master Plan for the Delta estuary ? You have a multi year plan to put more than 4 dams on the Delta and we need all the details.	F11-1
2	CalFed had a multi year plan are you following that plan, describe it.	F11-2
3	We are agents the SDIP and disagree with the increase water flow South !!! What guarantee do the people have that you only plan to take 5,000,000 gal/day out of the Delta ?	F11-3
4	You are pulling salt water into the Delta now how will you control the salt intrusion when you are pumping the additional 5,000,000 gallons ?	F11-4
5	During the summer months when the water levels are low, how will you guarantee us you will keep the same Flows, Water levels, water quality, when you are pulling an additional 5,000,000 gal of water from the Delta.	F11-5
6	We are very concerned about the effect this project will have on the our fishery. Do you have any study data on the effects on the Black Bass, Striped Bass ?	F11-6
7	The micro organisms in the water that feed our fish are dieing. What is causing this and how will your project improve this.	F11-7
8	The fisherman have access to the South Delta area now. What guarantee will you provide that will insure a lifetime access to the Dams area.	F11-8
9	We the people of Northern California request more time to study all the effects the SDIP will have on the Delta. We request a 3 month extension for the public comments. We request an extension to May 31,2006	F11-9
10	Provide a list of benefits your project will have on the Delta, water quality, water levels Summer & Winter, Flood control, Levy stability, Micro organism's food source and Fishery improvements.	F11-10
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____		

## Responses to Comments

### F11-1

The SDIP is composed of two stages. Stage 1 includes constructing and operating the a fish control gate at head of Old River and three flow control gates located on Middle River, Grant Line Canal, and Old River. Stage 2 would increase diversions to CCF up to 8,500 cfs. A description of how the gates would be constructed and operated is provided in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR.

### F11-2

Please see Master Response J, *Relationship Between the South Delta Improvements Program and the CALFED Record of Decision and EIS/EIR Programmatic Documents*.

### F11-3

Stage 1 of the SDIP would not increase south-of-Delta exports. Stage 2 of the SDIP would increase diversions to CCF up to 8,500 cfs. An evaluation of the amount of additional water that would be exported under Stage 2 is provided in SDIP Draft EIS/EIR Section 5.1, Water Supply. The Draft EIS/EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of increasing exports as described in the water supply chapter. Increasing exports beyond those amounts would require additional analysis.

### F11-4

Section 5.3, Water Quality, of the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR describes the expected changes in water quality as a result of operating Stage 1 and Stage 2. Stage 1 does not include increasing exports from the south Delta. As shown in Table 5.3-1, water quality would general remain the same compared to existing conditions or would improve. Table 5.3-3 shows changes in water quality under Stage 2 conditions. Similar to Stage 1, the quality of water in the south Dela would generally remain similar to existing conditions or would improve.

### F11-5

Please see response to comment F11-4. SDIP Draft EIS/EIR Section 5.2, Delta Tidal Hydraulics, provides the assessment of changes in south Delta water levels. As summarized in Table 5.2-6, there would be a small change in the tidal levels and flows for each project alternative.

## **F11-6**

Section 6.1, Fish, of the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR includes an assessment of striped bass and black bass.

## **F11-7**

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship Between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline* and Master Response K, *Staged Decision-Making Process*.

## **F11-8**

Chapter 2, "Project Description," of the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR provides a description of the fish control gate and the flow control gates. The head of Old River, Grant Line Canal, and Old River at DMC gates will all include boat locks. The Middle River gate does not include a boat lock, however, boats would be able to pass over the gate when not in use.

## **F11-9**

Please see Master Response K, *Staged Decision-Making Process*

## **F11-10**

Please see Sections 5.3, Water Quality, 5.2, Delta Tidal Hydraulics, 5.5, Flood Control and Levee Stability, and 6.1, Fish, of the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR regarding water quality, water levels, flood control, and fish, respectively.

# Form Letter POST

**POST**

Dear Mr. Marshall:

**POST-1** I oppose the actions proposed in the draft EIR/EIS for SDIP. SDIP is another  
**POST-2** attempt to appropriate additional water from the already-compromised Bay-Delta  
**POST-3** Estuary. The dredging, barriers, and eventual increased pumping and water exports  
**POST-4** of SDIP will only worsen the Delta Ecosystem Crash (aka Pelagic Organism  
**POST-5** Decline). Instead of the measures you propose, measures that will benefit special  
**POST-6** interests such as Westlands Water District, I request the following: Withdraw the  
EIR/EIS. Reduce pumping rates and water exports to those that existed in the early  
2000s when Delta Smelt appeared to be on the road to recovery. Increase ecosystem  
restoration measures. Improve water quality. Ensure the ecosystem of the Bay-Delta  
Estuary, including its fishery resources, is restored and self-sustaining before you con-  
sider appropriating more of its lifeblood (water). As California's Water Plan demon-  
strates, our needs will be met for several more decades through conservation, reclama-  
tion, efficiency, and conjunctive use.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Printed \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

## Responses to Comments

### POST-1

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### POST-2

The SDIP is intended to balance the needs of the environment with the needs of the water users south of the Delta. Impacts identified as potentially significant will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level to ensure minimal effects on the environment.

### POST-3

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### POST-4

The SDIP is the first CALFED conveyance action. Several restoration and water quality projects have already been implemented or are underway. CALFED actions implemented specifically to improve habitats and the environment help to reduce the effects of the overall CALFED Program on these resources. However, CEQA and NEPA require lead agencies to identify and mitigate specifically impacts on environmental resources. Therefore, specific mitigation of each specific impact resulting from the implementation of the SDIP is proposed.

### POST-5

Please see Master Response K, *Staged Decision-Making Process*.

### POST-6

Please see Master Response L, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the California Water Plan Update 2005*.

## Modified Form Letters

**Table 8-2.** Modified Form Letters Received on the Draft EIS/EIR

Code	Name
1-JG	Jeanine Gilvaher
1-PM1	Phyl Morello
1-RG	Robert Groff
1-EL	Elizabeth Leite
1-RT	Ruth Troetschler
1-PM2	Phyl Morello
1-AN1	Alexis Nahabedian
1-SL	Sherry Lizardo
1-DB1	David Beck
1-HH	Holy Holian
1-JN	Jane Nielson
1-JD	Joann DeSantis
1-ML	Michael Linvill
1-TG	Troy Gordon
1-DG1	Deborah Giordano
1-KA	Kent Andrews
1-ST	Sauwah Tsang
1-TN	Toni Nash
1-KW	Kathryn Wild
1-LD	Larry Dennis
1-DR	Donna Riddle
1-TRT	Terry R. Thomas
1-NS	Nicole Sanders
1-DB2	Dena Bergstrom
1-DG2	Diana Ginnebaugh
1-RA	Richard Artley
2-DC	David Carle
2-CK	Carrie King
2-JS	Jeffrey Schultz
2-RZ	Rosa Zambrano
3-NL	Noemi Levine
3-DM	Dean Mieras
3-EM	Elizabeth Moody
3-SO	Susan Orozco-Neu
3-PR1	Philip Ratcliff
3-BW1	Bettine Wallin
3-MW	Meredith Whitaker
3-BW2	Betty Winholtz,
3-TH	Tom Hazelleaf
3-BF	Bernard Franklyn



Code	Name
3-LEF	L. Eleanor Finney
3-LD	Lou Anna Denison
3-TA1	Thomas Aldridge
3-JB	Jan Balcom
3-PJ2	Paul Jarvis
3-JW	Judith Wolfe
3-DW	Daniel Whittaker
3-DLS	Dana L. Stewart
3-PS1	Patricia Standing
3-GS1	Gayle Spencer
3-BS	Barrett Sherwood
3-MR	Matthew Roman
3-PR2	Patricia Roca
3-MK	Mary Kimball
3-TK1	Tara Kamath
3-LP1	Lauri Provencher
3-TK2	Teresa Kruse
3-CL	Christopher Lish
3-SL2	Sherry Lizardo
3-CM	Clayton Mansfield
3-DB3	Diane Beck
3-TA2	Thomas Aldridge
3-DB4	Doug Brutocao
3-CB	Chris Bucklin
3-GD	Galen Davis
3-BD	Bonnie Dombrowski
3-LE	Lari Evangelinos
3-JG	Jose Gonzalez
3-JC	Judith Castiano
3-JP	JoAnn Perryman
3-MM	Mary Markus
3-DN	Dorothy Norris
3-PP	Patricia Puterbaugh
3-GK	Gretchen Koch
3-JH	Jeff Hoffman
3-PS2	Phil Scordelis
3-BU	Bill Uyeki
3-AN2	Adam Noar
3-MB	Marisa L. Bautista
3-JB	Juan Byron
3-BRG	Barbara and Rob Goodell
3-ES	Ellen Sweeney
3-AU-1	Arthur Unger
3-LT2	Larry Thompson
3-MD	Mac Downing

Code	Name
3-BM3	Boyd McDonald
3-PL	Peter Loeff
3-JN	Joanna Nelson
3-RV	Robin Vosburg
3-LP2	Lamar Pittman
3-RP	Richard Placone
3-MAK	Maureen A. Kirk
4-KF	Ken Fujii
5-AA	Abraham Ayala
7-KLA	K.L. Andersonnoecker
7-BB	Bob Busch
7-AC	Ann Carranza
7-SD	Shannon L. Dillon
7-WD	William Drake
7-PE	Peggy Ents
7-LF	Lis Fleming
7-CF1	Claire Flewitt
7-CF2	Christopher Flynn
7-CH	Candance Hallmark
7-KW	Kathleen Wong
7-RW	Roberta Wilson
7-WT	William Thompson
7-MS1	Martha Stookey
7-GS2	Gayle Spencer
7-KS	Kathryn Sibley
7-BR	B. Rozett
7-LR	Linda Riebel
7-OH	Ocie Hudson
7-AHF	Audrey A. Holmes Fatooh
7-RH	Rebecca Hollingsworth
7-RDH	Rich and DeAnne Hart
7-JK	James Koss
7-DK	Daniel Kendrick
7-PJ1	Pete Jussel
7-PR3	Philip Ratcliff
7-ML2	Michael Lu
7-SL1	Shelly Leung
7-DSL	David and Susan Link
7-JM	Joshua McCabe
7-BM1	Bonnie Martin
7-KM1	Kathleen Means
7-KM2	Kurt Merg
7-PM1	Patrick Micheletti
7-BM2	Brian Milton, P.E.
7-JJ	Jim Jordan

---

Code	Name
7-CW	Cam Wolff
7-PL	Peter Loeff
7-KG	Karen Guma
7-JPM	James P. Maddox
7-PMV	Patricia McVeigh
7-LS	Linda Staaf
7-MS2	Mary Sweeters
7-AT	Arlene Taeger
7-LT1	Lara Triona
7-TN	Thomas Nass
7-LN	Lorraine Norby
7-JW	Jessica Warner
8-JP	Joe Peterson

---

## Modified Form Letters 1

To: 19166536077	From: 2022891050	2-02-06 1:14pm p. 9 of 10
		1-JG A-103 1
February 01, 2006		
Paul A. Marshall California Department of Water Resources South Delta Branch 1416 9th Street, 2nd floor Sacramento, CA 95814		
Dear Mr. Marshall,		
<p>We cannot take water out of delicate ecosystems which are integral to the health of our environment...While I am aware that we are always short of water, I believe we need to find more responsible methods for managing the water resources we have at our disposal. I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.</p>		
<p>I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.</p>		
<p>I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta – the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.</p>		
<p>Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.</p>		
Sincerely,		
Jeanine Gilvahr 6225 Mayfield Ave La Crescenta, CA 91214-2372 USA		
		JG-1

To: 19166535077

From: 2022891050

2-06-06 11:40am p. 3 of 10

1-RG 3

February 06, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

As a citizen and resident in the Bay area, I am sending this message to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions and that water conservation and reuse of grey water should be a priority.

RG-1

I strongly urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also strongly urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I must urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Robert Greff  
225 Michelle Dr  
Campbell, CA 95008  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-30-06 11:25pm p. 3 of 10

1-RT

January 29, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

These are my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program. I am particularly concerned by the proposed increase in the maximum pumping limit for the Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. The delta has already experienced a great reduction in fresh water which has reduced the estuary fish population to historic lows. The proposed pumping increase will further damage the Bay-Delta ecosystem. We need to think of more creative ways to gain the water we need, including conservation and recycling.

RT-1

To implement such a program, I urge you to withdraw the current draft environmental impact report. Then in the next few months issue a new draft which includes a preferred alternative that proposes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of such an alternative should take into account its evident environmental benefits. It should include techniques for water conservation and other proven water management tools so that the state can use to meet future water needs.

The Department of Water Resources should restore the delta protections for the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan that have been undermined during the past five years. To accomplish this the new preferred alternative should dedicate as much water to ecosystem restoration and protection as is mandated by the plan.

Sincerely,

Ruth Troetschler  
184 Lockhart Lane  
Los Altos, CA 94022-2121  
USA

To: 19166535077

From: 2022691060

2-07-06 11:27pm p. 1 of 1

1-PM1<sup>2</sup>

February 07, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

My family & I are definitely wanting to protect the South Delta. This project proposed will only destroy the ecosystem of the whole area. It will be devastating for wildlife.

PM1-1

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Phyl Morello  
HC 2  
Albrightsville, PA 18210-9832  
USA

To: 19166536077

FROM: ELLC031000

1-EL 4

January 29, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

My husband and I are California natives and have watched the environmental changes to our state over the last fifty years. We are particularly concerned about what is happening to ocean quality and the destruction and degradation of wetlands. As you know, the oceans are in trouble and our San Francisco Bay as well. We have lost the filtration system that used to exist and the rich habitat for fish and migratory birds. Please don't make things worse by sacrificing water quality further.

EL-1

I am referring to the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Leite  
77 Willow Avenue  
Walnut Creek, CA 94595-1636  
USA



To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-21-06 11:26am p. 6 of 10

1-PM2

January 21, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

You are NOT thinking environmentally in any respect, are you?

PM2-1

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Phyl Morello  
HC 2  
Albrightsville, PA 18210-9802  
USA

To: 19166536077      From: 2022891068      1-20-06 6:58pm p. 6 of 10

**1-AN1** 8

January 20, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing in opposition to any 'improvement' plan that will jeopardize the natural wildlife and fragile balance of the Bay-Delta. I am particularly concerned about the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly the part regarding the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I STRONGLY believe that this project is unnecessary and will cause severe and further damage to the Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions. | **AN1-1**

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, please work to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Alexis Nahabedian  
1384 11th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94122-2205  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022691060

1-20-06 6:00pm p. 5 of 10

1-SL 9

January 20, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

We the people are fed up with government regulatory programs being staffed with those who have no regard for the environment, seeking only to help big industry and line their own pockets, and with officials who refuse to listen to sound science from biologists who have been in the field. There are so many precious ecosystems that have disappeared under concrete or agriculture; please do not allow the San Francisco Bay/Delta become another one. This unique ecosystem is home to many species who depend on the health of one another for their survival, and pumping water away from their homes will ultimately destroy them. I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions. SL-1

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Sherry Lizardo  
1396 E. Kern  
Tulare, CA 93274-4524  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-20-06 6:00pm p. 4 of 10

1-DB1 10

January 20, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall:

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

The entire United States of America looks to actions of the State of California as a guide for its policies so please continue to lead the nation to preserve our environment.

DB1-1

Sincerely,

David Beck  
37 Round Top Rd  
Warren, NJ 07059-5521  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891050

1-20-06 2:01pm p. 3 of 5

1-HH //

January 20, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

peace,  
i didn't realize the san francisco bay area is the largest west coast outflow into the pacific in all the western hemisphere. of course we need to do our best & moroso to keep it in peace. peace

HH-1

Sincerely,

HOLY HOLIAN  
POB 4664  
Accata, CA 95518-4664  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-20-06 2:01pm p. 1 of 5

1-JN

12

January 20, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second.

I strongly believe that the Bay-Delta ecosystem already has been harmed by excessive water diversions, and this project will cause further damage. In addition, the project is unnecessary. I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

It is time for the whole state to start planning major water-conservation programs, as outlined by the Pacific Institute's report "Waste Not Want Not," available on-line (see [http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban\\_usage/media\\_release.htm](http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban_usage/media_release.htm)).

JN-1

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available to identify the causes of the delta's decline and the current decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Jane Nielson  
3727 Burnside Rd  
Sebastopol, CA 95472-9459  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891050

1-19-06 1:42pm p. 5 of 10

1-JD <sup>13</sup>

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta – the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Protection of our natural resources and the wildlife that depend on them is just as important as providing water to grow our food.

JD-1

Sincerely,

Joann DeSantis  
9504 Sylvia Ave  
Northridge, CA 91324-1752  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-19-06 9:51pm p. 2 of 10

1-ML

14

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

As a resident of the SF Bay Area since childhood, I am aware of the unique biological treasure that the inland delta used to be. There is a small amount of this treasure remaining - we can restore a significant part of this gem to its original grandeur. It is important to do for biological diversity - which is necessary for the future health and survival of not only the local area, for the larger environment as a whole.

ML-1

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversion. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Michael Livvill  
1317 Lincoln Ave Apt 15  
San Rafael, CA 94901-2129  
USA



To: 19166535077      From: 2022891060      1-19-06 10:30am p. 1 of 10

1-TG 15

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Although I am not a California resident, I spend a week in San Francisco every year or two. My wife has business conferences in the area and my daughter and I travel with her so we can spend the week exploring the wildlife areas around the San Francisco Bay.

I am very concerned by the Department of Water Resources' draft environmental impact report for the South Delta Improvements Program, specifically the proposal to increase the pumping limit for the Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I believe that this part of the project will be very detrimental to the fisheries of the San Francisco Bay.

I urge you to abandon the increased water diversions, and instead advocate an alternative that would reduce water diversions, offsetting the loss of water with increased water conservation efforts and improved wastewater and groundwater management.

Thank you for considering my comments. The wildlife of San Francisco Bay is a national treasure, and one that I hope to continue to enjoy. You can help protect this treasure by your actions to reduce water diversions.

TG-1

Sincerely,

Troy Gordon  
9705 N Route E  
Harrisburg, MO 65256-9851  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-19-06 7:01pm p. 7 of 10

1-DG1<sup>v. 2/13/07</sup>  
1-7

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Recently I was made aware of a draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program. After looking over key elements of the project, particularly the part that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second, I feel I must register a strong protest.

Based on the information I have read, this project is unnecessary. Beyond "unnecessary" -- it is actively harmful to our state's fish and wildlife and, ultimately, we humans, as well.

DG1-1

This project will cause further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Deborah Giordano  
17848 Columbia Drive  
Castro Valley, CA 94552-1739  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891050

1-19-06 4:20pm p. 5 of 10

~~4-108~~  
1-KA 18

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Recent activity on the part of the federal government has demonstrated the folly of naively taking action without the benefit of thoughtful deliberation and adequate preparation. California does not need to emulate the current federal administration's example.

KA-1

Therefore, I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta - the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Kent Andrews  
220 Sunset Way  
Mar Beach, CA 94965-9746  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891050

1-19-06 4:18pm p. 9 of 10

1-ST

19

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to let you know that the South Delta Improvement Program kills the Delta and its deminishing fishes. We all need water; and fishes need it more. And by suggesting taking more water from of the Delta will not have any negative effect on its wildlife is wrong!

ST-1

I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta - the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Sauwah Tsang  
10800 Peach Grove St  
North Hollywood, CA 91601-4675  
USA

To: 13166536077      From: 2022891050      1-19-06 4:10pm p. 10 of 10

1-TN <sup>1000</sup> +  
20

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am concerned about the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program.

I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions. It is not necessary to increase the maximum pumping limit to 8,509 cubic feet per second and would only irrevocably harm the Delta.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions.

We need to return to water conservation and other proven water management tools to meet our future water needs.

We also need to recommit ourselves to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan.

It is your duty, as a key player in the Department of Water Resources to restore and protect the Delta, not destroy its future viability. Please show us a full draft environmental impact report regarding the causes of the Delta's decline and the further impact this proposal would have on it.

Sincerely,

Toni Nash  
111 South Street  
Sanalito, CA 94965-2555  
USA

TN-1

To: 19166536077 From: 2022691050 1-19-06 5:43pm p. 1 of 5  
34x  
21 1-KW

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Water diversions from the Klamath River were catastrophic. Diverting water from the Bay-Delta ecosystem will cause more harm than help. I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed. THINK AHEAD, WAY AHEAD! Thank you.

KW-1

Sincerely,

Kathryn Wild  
7275 Canyon Breeze  
San Diego, CA 92126-2076  
USA

KW-2

01-19-06 08:47:00 AM

To: 19166536077      From: 2022891050      1-19-06 1:34pm p. 1 of 10

24 1-LD

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Remember, you are a servant of the people, not of special interests.

LD-1

Sincerely,

Larry Dennis  
35176 Garcia St  
Union City, CA 94587-5206  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022691060

1-19-06 2:52pm p. 6 of 10

26 1-DR

January 19, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program.

The Delta bay ecosystem is already degraded by the excessive water withdrawals that have taken place in the past. This estuary is an important lay over for migratory birds and should be enhanced, not further degraded.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta - the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Donna Riddle  
1238 Crest Dr  
Eugene, OR 97405-1902  
USA

DR-1



To: 19166535077      From: 2022891068      1-23-06 2:42pm p. 1 of 1

21  
1-TRT

January 23, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I speak for my family and most of my friends and relatives in California. We are concerned about the DWR's proposed intent to increase the pumping described in the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program.

The increased pumping up to 8,500 cubic feet per second has the very real probability to result in damaging further the stressed San Francisco Bay-Delta ecosystem that has been abused from years of excessive water diversions. | TRT-1

We request you to adopt the No Action alternative and undertake new studies for water conservation and management that will not result in additional adverse effects on the Delta. | TRT-2

Like many others, we urge you to adopt a program that would include dedicating at least as much water to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. We also urge the DWR to sponsor independent scientific analysis to document the causes of the delta's decline, and adopt future programs that would protect the delta and remedy the problems identified.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please take our suggestions to heart.

Sincerely,

Terry R. Thomas  
2520 Snow Ln  
Redding, CA 96003-3419  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022691050

1-23-06 3:40pm p. 5 of 6

28 1-NS

January 23, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

This letter is intended to submit my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly targeting the aspect in the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,300 cubic feet/second. This project seems unnecessary and potentially harmful to the Bay-Delta ecosystem already damaged by excessive water diversions.

I would prefer that you withdraw the draft environmental impact report currently on the table and instead present a draft with viable alternatives, including a REDUCTION in Delta water diversions.

NS-1

I do not believe the current report takes in our current water potential and water-saving technology, such as the introduction of water-saving devices, collection and purification of rainwater, the increased push for fewer impervious surfaces in widely paved areas, and so forth.

NS-2

The new analysis should review potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and established, intelligent water management tools can help California meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

I think all this would be in line not only with the responsibilities you have to your position, but the responsibilities you have as a person in power to all the lifeforms and citizens not in the decision-makers chair. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nicole Sanders  
616 onions st # 202  
Davis, CA 95616-6031  
USA

To: 19166536077

From: 2022891060

1-22-06 11:50pm p. 4 of 9

2001  
29 1-DB2

January 22, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta – the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

I am a former resident of Marin, having lived there for most of my life and care deeply for the San Francisco and its wildlife. I am a graduate of the Environmental Forum of Marin and support efforts to monitor the water of the bay and its delicate balance. Please think of the future of the bay!!!

DB2-1

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

Sincerely,

Dena Bergstrom  
10612 Milkweed Dr  
Great Falls, VA 22066-3309  
USA

To: 19166536077 From: 2022891050 1-22-06 3:36pm p. 2 of 2

31  
**1-DG2**

January 22, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

PLEASE SEE MY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BELOW.

I am writing to offer my comments on the draft environmental impact report/statement for the South Delta Improvements Program, particularly regarding the part of the project that would increase the maximum pumping limit for the state water project's Delta pumps to 8,500 cubic feet per second. I strongly believe that this project is unnecessary and could further damage a Bay-Delta ecosystem that has already been harmed by excessive water diversions.

I urge you to withdraw the draft environmental impact report and issue a new draft with a preferred alternative that includes a significant reduction in Delta water diversions. The analysis of this alternative should include potential environmental benefits, how water conservation and other proven water management tools can help the state meet its future water needs, and how such a reduction, combined with investments in other water supply sources, could improve the reliability of urban water supplies.

I also urge you to include, in the new preferred alternative, at least as much water dedicated to ecosystem restoration and protection as is required by the state's plan to protect and restore the delta -- the CALFED Bay-Delta Plan. The Department of Water Resources should work to restore the delta protections in that plan that have been undermined during the past five years.

Finally, I urge you to issue a full draft environmental impact report on the proposal to increase the state water project's maximum pumping limit once improved scientific information is available regarding the causes of the delta's decline and once this decline has been reversed.

IN ADDITION - I feel like water conservation projects around the state (such as rebates for low-water toilets and washing machines) are NOT adequately advertised. I did a study on the situation in San Diego and although they have great programs (and have had good success), many residents are not aware of the potential rebates available. This information should be easy to find and should be advertised somehow to let people know their options and use individual Californians to really spark massive water efficiency improvements around the state.

DG2-1

Sincerely,

Diana Ginnebaugh  
100 Pasito Ter Apt 120  
Sunnyvale, CA 94086-4857  
USA

To: 19166536077 From: 2022691050 1-22-06 7:41am p. 1 of 1

32 1-RA

January 22, 2006

Paul A. Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
South Delta Branch  
1416 9th Street, 2nd floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am a retired US Forest employee. For 18 years before my retirement, I reviewed and corrected NEPA documents prepared for all projects on our 2.2 million acre forest. I am an expert on the NEPA.

I have read your DEIS for the South Delta Improvements Program. Allow me to say sir, that it is by far the worst I have ever read. There are scores of NEPA errors in your document. Space does not allow me to identify them all here. However, I would highly recommend that you have someone with even a basic knowledge of NEPA review your DEIS before you proceed further. RA-1

I am particularly concerned about your environmental effects analysis of your proposal to increase the maximum pumping limit for the Delta pumps. I have knowledge of aquatic organisms and their habitat as well as NEPA. I cannot believe that your increased pumping limit will not have adverse effects on the Bay-Delta aquatic ecosystem. RA-2

Why do you not state this in your environmental effects finding for the project?

I ask you to withdraw the DEIS and issue a new draft ... that is correctly done.

I also ask you to include, in your new preferred alternative (which is certain if you do a good analysis) a proposal to save water just for aquatic ecosystem restoration. RA-3

After all this is your job.

Your final DEIS submitted for public review must be based on science and not on those who might profit financially from increasing the water pumping limit. RA-4

Sincerely,

Richard Artley  
415 East North 2nd  
Grangeville, ID 83530-2257  
USA

## Responses to Comments

### **1-JG-1, 1-RG-1, 1-RT-1, 1-JN-1, 1-TG-1, 1-DG1-1, 1-TRT-2, 1-NS-1, 1-NS-2, and 1-DG2-1**

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### **1-PM1-1, 1-AN1-1, 1-SL-1, 1-ST-1, 1-DR-1, and 1-TRT-1**

The effects of the SDIP on biological resources, including wildlife, are fully described in the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 6, which includes impact assessment for fish, vegetation and wetlands, and wildlife. Where a significant effect is found to result from implementation of the SDIP, DWR and Reclamation will implement mitigation measure(s) to ensure that the overall impact is less than significant.

### **1-EL-1**

The effects of the SDIP on biological resources, including wetlands, are fully described in the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 6, which includes impact assessment for fish, vegetation and wetlands, and wildlife. Where a significant effect is found to result from implementation of the SDIP, DWR and Reclamation will implement mitigation measure(s) to ensure that the overall impact is less than significant. One goal of the SDIP is to improve water quality in the interior south Delta. The SDIP achieves this goal in many areas of the south Delta.

### **1-PM2-1, 1-DB1-1, 1-HH-1, 1-JD-1, 1-ML-1, 1-TN-1, 1-KW-1, 1-LD-1, and 1-DB2-1**

The SDIP is intended to balance the needs of the environment with the needs of the water users south of the Delta. Impacts identified as potentially significant will be mitigated to a less than significant level to ensure minimal effects on the environment.

### **1-KA-1**

The SDIP Draft EIS/EIR represents a full-faith<sup>[kk1]</sup> effort to disclose the effects of the SDIP actions to ensure that decision-makers, including DWR and Reclamation, have the best available information on which to base a decision. As described further in Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*, DWR and

Reclamation have committed to another CEQA/NEPA compliance document that will include any new information gathered during the POD investigations, prior to making a decision on increasing diversions.

### **1-KW-2**

Please see Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*.

### **1-RA-1**

DWR and Reclamation believe the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR meets the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.

### **1-RA-2**

The effects of the SDIP on biological resources, including wildlife, are fully described in the SDIP Draft EIS/EIR in Chapter 6, which includes impact assessment for fish, vegetation and wetlands, and wildlife. Where a significant effect is found to result from implementation of the SDIP, DWR and Reclamation will implement mitigation measure(s) to ensure that the overall impact is less than significant.

### **1-RA-3**

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### **1-RA-4**

The SDIP Draft EIS/EIR utilizes the best available tools and information. As described further in Master Response B, *Relationship between the South Delta Improvements Program and the Pelagic Organism Decline*, DWR and Reclamation have committed to another CEQA/NEPA compliance document that will include any new information gathered during the POD investigations, prior to making a decision on increasing diversions.

## Modified Form Letters 2

2-DC

---

**From:** carle@qnet.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2006 4:25 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Comments on SDIP EIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Please alter your plans for additional pumping from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta as has been proposed in the South Delta "Improvements" Program (SDIP). With the Delta's current ecosystem collapse, now is not the time for even more pumping away from its ecosystem.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Statement for SDIP is missing an alternative that considers improvements to water quality and fish survival accomplished by reducing pumping below current levels. Water use efficiency and water recycling options, described in the Department of Water Resources' draft "California Water Plan Update" can replace those waters. It is time for a new direction. I hope you will manage for the recovery of the Delta by decreasing, rather than increasing pumping. increased pumping.

DC-1

Also, please include me on your mailing list concerning this project.

Sincerely,

David Carle  
PO Box 39  
Lee Vining, California 93541-0039



2-CK

---

**From:** carrie@mlode.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2006 8:29 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Comments on SDIP EIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Please, no additional pumping from the California Bay-Delta as currently proposed in the South Delta "Improvements" Program (SDIP)!

Additional pumping must be the last solution, after all other conservation measures have been taken.

The project claims to improve water quality and fish survival, but conservation alternatives achieve these project objectives better, and without the additional environmental costs of SDIP.

Sincerely,

Carrie King

Sincerely,

Carrie King  
20751 Rising Hill Circle  
Groveland, California 95321

CK-1

2-JS

---

**From:** jefschultz@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 5:05 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Comments on SDIP EIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

It boggles the mind to see the short-sighted plans some people come up with to further erode California's ecosystems.

JS-1

Please drop plans for additional pumping from the California Bay-Delta as currently proposed in the South Delta "Improvements" Program (SDIP), especially while the Delta is experiencing an historic ecosystem collapse.

Most urgently, I request that you withdraw the highly flawed Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement for SDIP. If the project claims to improve water quality and fish survival you must examine an alternative to the project that accomplishes these goals by significantly reducing Delta pumping from current levels.

We have more reliable, more cost-effective and more environmentally friendly ways to provide abundant water for California's future. These options include water use efficiency and water recycling and are outlined in the Department of Water Resources' draft "California Water Plan Update" and Water for California's "Investment Strategy for California Water" (prepared by the Planning and Conservation League).

Together we must make sensible and sustainable water policy decisions that conserve the Delta and our rivers, to keep our state beautiful, vibrant and strong. The survival of the Delta depends upon your agency's actions. Please support the recovery of the Delta and say NO to increased pumping.

Also, please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Schultz M.T.S.  
P.O. Box 151  
Gualala, California 95445

2-RZ

---

**From:** rosa.m.zambrano@boeing.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2006 1:51 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Comments on SDIP EIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to urge you to drop plans for additional pumping from the California Bay-Delta as currently proposed in the South Delta "Improvements" Program (SDIP), especially while the Delta is experiencing an historic ecosystem collapse.

Most urgently, I request that you withdraw the highly flawed Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement for SDIP. If the project claims to improve water quality and fish survival you must examine an alternative to the project that accomplishes these goals by significantly reducing Delta pumping from current levels.

We have more reliable, more cost-effective and more environmentally friendly ways to provide abundant water for California's future. These options include water use efficiency and water recycling and are outlined in the Department of Water Resources' draft "California Water Plan Update" and Water for California's "Investment Strategy for California Water" (prepared by the Planning and Conservation League).

Together we must make sensible and sustainable water policy decisions that conserve the Delta and our rivers, to keep our state beautiful, vibrant and strong. The survival of the Delta depends upon your agency's actions. Please support the recovery of the Delta and say NO to increased pumping.

Also, please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Looking forward to be at the next meeting, since my wish for 2006 is to become a better informed member of our community and be more active on issues that affect our community's future.

RZ-1

Sincerely,

Rosa Zambrano  
5604 Mission Way  
Commerce, California 90040

## Responses to Comments

### 2-DC-1, 2-CK-1

Please see Master Response D, *Developing and Screening Alternatives Considered in the Draft EIS/EIR*.

### 2-JS-1

The SDIP is intended to balance the needs of the environment with the needs of the water users south of the Delta. Impacts identified as potentially significant will be mitigated to a less than significant level to ensure minimal effects on the environment.

### 2-RZ-1

DWR and Reclamation appreciate all public input throughout the decision-making process.

## Modified Form Letters 3

3-NL

---

**From:** noemilevine@speakeasy.net  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 7:51 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

I am writing in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Please withdraw this proposal until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and resolved. To increase Delta pumping while fish population is in decline is just irresponsible. | NL-1

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that reduces Delta pumping from current levels, improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Thank you,

(your name and address here)

noemi levine  
2706 ashby ave 2  
berkeley, CA 94705

**3-DM**

---

**From:** Tahoeartman2@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 6:32 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

At what point will we decide that care of the planet is more important than the short term wants of the human inhabitants? We do not have an alternative to Earth. If other species are being lost to our actions, is it not fair to consider that we are at risk also?

DM-  
1

Thank you.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Dean Mieras  
PO Box 18662  
520 Koru St.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151

**3-EM**

---

**From:** lizbetm28@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 4:15 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

In regard to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish. Water and its conservation, along with protection of diminishing fish populations and stewardship of the irreplaceable and declining environment, is of vital concern now and for the future. **EM-1**

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Moody  
40 Camino Alto #10102  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

3-SO

---

**From:** osuzi@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2006 9:14 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

The Delta is an extremely important ecosystem in California and damage to it has effects on plants, animals and ecosystems that are hundreds of miles away. Please do what you can to find a resolution to the water issues that does not do further damage to the Delta. **SO-1**

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Susan Orozco-Neu  
3458 Lee Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90023



3-PR1

---

**From:** skazz999W@netscape.net  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 9:25 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

The more fresh water that is diverted, the more salt water encroaches into the Delta. **PR1-1**

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Philip Ratcliff  
15 Foster Ct.  
Cloverdale, CA 95425

**3-BW1**

---

**From:** bettine@wallinstudios.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2006 3:58 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

We should be initiating water conservation education and even rationing of water for non-essential uses long before we endanger more natural life and scenic wonders. The people mostly cooperated with rationing during the past drought. Business and agriculture are allowed to have cheaper water and that pricing could be reconsidered to promote more efficient consumption.

**BW-1**

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Bettine Wallin  
895 Toro Canyon Road  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

**3-MW**

---

**From:** rmwhit@charter.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 8:31 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Why not start by looking at an alternative such as significantly reducing Delta pumping from current levels, this would actually improve Delta water quality and habitat, and protect fish. | MW-1

Diverting fresh water will harm all ecosystems in the Delta. | MW-2

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Meredith Whitaker  
764 Azalea Ct.  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

**3-BW2**

---

**From:** winholtz@kcbx.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 22, 2006 12:01 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

I would like to see Southern CA institute water saving measures, water conservation, rather than ruin the Delta. It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

**BW2**  
**-1**

The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

betty winholtz  
405 acacia  
morro bay, CA 93442

3-TH

---

**From:** tomhazelleaf@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 11:27 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

With fish populations crashing we need less diversion, not more.

TH-1

Other less damaging alternatives exist for providing domestic water needs.

TH-2

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Tom Hazelleaf  
4656 Fir Avenue  
Seal Beach, CA 90740

**3-BF**

---

**From:** bgbrfrnklyn@netscape.net  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2006 2:38 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

As a avid fisherman, I deplore this proposal. The valley & southern california have taken enough water. Their inefficient water use practices must cease. It's been way too easy to raid northern california's resources. **BF-1**

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Bernard Franklyn  
1131 Compass Lane  
Unit# 311  
Foster City, CA 94404

**3-LEF**

---

**From:** lefinney@cox.net  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2006 10:20 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

I am a resident of Southern California and I have never thought Delta water pumping should have been instituted nor should it continue. The Delta itself needs to be protected and alternative solutions to water needs need to be developed and addressed. **LEF-1**

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

L. Eleanor Finney  
29571 Via Alto Cerro  
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-1811

3-LD

---

**From:** LAnnD4animals@charter.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 1:26 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

We are among the millions of Americans who are concerned about about diminishing supply of wild fish! Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

LD-1

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

Lou Anna Denison  
6931 E 11 TH St  
Long Beach, CA 90815



3-TA1

---

**From:** thomasaldrige95112@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 12:22 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

I am sending this letter to you because it makes no sense to me to increase the diversion of water from the delta and thereby give the kiss of death to many of the species of fish which are already on the brink of extinction!!!Over the years the Corps of Engineers have had many water diversion projects which have turned into absolute catastrophes!!!This is not the time to destroy the fish in our delta but it is the time to save those species and save the delta from any more ill designed business as usual diversions of water all in the cause of progress!!!It is amazing that any fish at all can survive in the delta after all the harm that has been caused and designed by man all in the name of progress.Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

TA1-  
1

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase Delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, actually improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

(your name and address here)

thomas aldrige  
296 s 13 st  
san jose, CA 95112

**3-JB**

---

**From:** mbalcom@prodigy.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2006 4:36 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Please Protect California's Bay-Delta Estuary

Dear Mr. Marshall:

I appreciate your soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Diverting more fresh water from the Delta when Delta fish populations are crashing seems short sighted and unwise to me. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the Delta fish decline are identified and fully resolved. It is cheaper to keep from further harming the Delta now and wait for more information than it is to try to undo the damage caused by our impatient greed for water later.

JB-1

The State's own Water Plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future, so diverting more water now seems particularly foolish.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces Delta pumping from current levels, improves Delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Sincerely,

jan balcom  
27266 Twin Ponds  
Clovis, CA 93619

**3-PJ2**

**From:** apjarvis@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 9:36 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Much of the Bay area gets water for drinking from the Delta. With less fresh water staying in the Delta, the poorer the drinking water will be here. Besides the southern part of California does not conserve water that it gets from other sources such as the Colorado River. We are the next to feel their pain, rather than the South! PJ2-1 PJ2-2

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Paul Jarvis  
1135 Blandford Blvd.  
Redwood City, California 94062

3-JW

**From:** jmwolfe17@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2006 6:49 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved. How much more "punishment" can the Delta take & why???? It has given "much to the residents" along the banks for decades. Non-residents are demanding something they have no knowledge or appreciation for. California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future. JW-1

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Judith Wolfe  
1093 Hwy 101 N., # 31  
Crescent City, California 95531-8385

**3-DW**

**From:** dwhittaker@shastalink.k12.ca.us  
**Sent:** Friday, January 27, 2006 9:44 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

I am a native California and have lived in the Delta. I agonize over the loss of both the land in the richest single chunk of dirt on earth and the water in the Delta. At some point, hopefully before we destroy the survivability of California's natural beauty and riches, profitmaking will be blanced with preservation. It has been a long time since I felt safe eating fish from the Delta due to pollution exacerbated by deminished flow to cleanse the water. Too often we wait for catastrophe before we do what is proper.

DW-1

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Daniel Whittaker  
Box 175  
Millville, California 96062

**3-DLS**

**From:** abccdana@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 5:45 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish. How about being sure the levees will hold? Remember New Orleans..... Please include us on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project. The Stewart and McKinley Families

**DLS-1**

Sincerely,

Dana L. Stewart  
2660 N. Farrell Drive  
Palm Springs, California 92262

**3-PS1**

---

**From:** patcat7@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 5:51 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

THE DELTA NEEDS FRESH WATER. PLEASE SEE THAT IT GETS IT.

**PS1-1**

Sincerely,

PATRICIA Standing  
30335 Rainbow View Drive  
Agoura Hills  
Agoura Hills, California 91301

3-GS1

---

**From:** bwfolks@pobox.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 29, 2006 5:02 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

This proposal should not go forward. Taking actions that worsen the delta situation makes no sense. **GS1-1**

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Gayle Spencer  
2603 Alpine Road  
Menlo Park, California 94025



3-BS

---

**From:** alfaboy74@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2006 8:43 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Please Encourage More Responsible Growth First!

BS-1

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

While you are most like aware of the issue of the Delta Smelt's declining population, please take note that just because the water's there doesn't mean we should just take it. The impact isn't just to the fish, but to the entire eco-system. You know this, yet you proceed. Please stop. Tell the city councils to create new growth ordinances, it's the only way.

BS-2

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Barrett Sherwood  
1015 Keniston Ave.  
Los Angeles, California 90019

**3-MR**

**From:** matthewroman@gorebels.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 28, 2006 11:31 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved. As a Pittsburg resident and a person who is deeply concerned about our environment I firmly believe that absolutely no more fresh water should be taken from this area because people in other areas are wasteful over-consumers of water who apparently care about nothing or no one but themselves. I fear for the future of our entire planet and we must do all we can immediately to protect the home of all living things.

MR-1

MR-2

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Sincerely,

Matthew Roman  
2225 E Leland Rd #109  
Pittsburg, California 94565

3-PR2

---

**From:** p\_roca2003@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 7:29 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing in response to your solicitation of comments regarding the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

I urge you to withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the reasons for the decline of delta fish populations have been fully investigated, including the possibility that water diversions are compounding the problem. Any further diversion would be irresponsible before we understand the delta ecosystem more thoroughly. PR2-1

At the very least, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Roca  
4940 Rocky Road  
El Sobrante, California 94803

3-MK

---

**From:** mquite@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2006 7:18 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Already less than 10% of our invaluable wetlands in this country remain. Without these wetlands many species cannot reproduce or even survive. As stewards of the Earth, we need to protect wetlands, not waste and destroy them. We should always be trying not to waste water, as in a drought, not using it up profligately. MK-1  
MK-2

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Mary Kimball  
9813 Monogram Ave.  
Northridge, California 91343

3-TK1

---

**From:** tarakamath@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2006 2:20 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I am writing to comment on the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Moving forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta is the wrong thing to do when delta fish populations are crashing. Although scientists suspect a number of factors factor in the crash, it's generally agreed that diverting water is one of the biggest. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please think beyond the short term benefits of this project to the long term consequences. TK1-1

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Tara Kamath  
1959 Cloverfield Blvd., #118  
Santa Monica, California 90404

3-LP1

---

**From:** noelp71@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2006 5:01 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please give nature and its creatures the dignity of a fair chance at surviving the ravages of the desecration perpetrated upon them for what we foolishly call OUR "needs." If we are the "superior beings" that we claim to be, we should be intelligent enough to devise methods that do not put nature and its creatures in peril for our "needs."

LP1-1

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Lauri Provencher  
10440 Seabury Lane  
Los Angeles, California 90077

3-TK2

---

**From:** Teresa7897@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 5:57 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Please consider this an important issue for all of us. Our environment is so important. It is the inheritance for all. Let the investigation take place. This will allow a future for all. TK2-1

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Teresa Kruse  
882 Cleveland Street  
#32  
Oakland, California 94606

3-CL

---

**From:** lishchris@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2006 9:18 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved. Even in the face of scientific uncertainty, the prudent stance is to take cost effective steps to restrict or even completely prohibit any activity that has the potential of causing long-term or irreversible harm. CL-1

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish. A choice to do nothing in response to the mounting evidence is actually a choice to continue and even accelerate the reckless environmental destruction that is creating the catastrophe at hand. CL-2

?A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.? -- Aldo Leopold, The Conservation Ethic

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lish  
PO Box 113  
Olema, California 94950



**3-SL2**

**From:** luv4wildlife@redjellyfish.net  
**Sent:** Friday, January 27, 2006 3:01 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

Please use common sense and compassion for our fellow living beings in your decision making. We humans MUST stop believing that everything on Earth is simply here for our use and abuse - we share this planet with others, and Earth's ecosystems have functioned beautifully for thousands of years. However, those functions are constantly being ruined and set off-balance by greed and poor planning by humans.

SL2-1

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Sherry Lizardo  
1396 E. Kern  
Tulare, California 93274

**3-CM**

---

**From:** cmans12232442@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2006 9:56 AM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S.

It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

Conservation should be our first resort, not the last option.

**CM-1**

Sincerely,

Clayton Mansfield  
217 15th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94118

**3-DB3**

---

**From:** dfbeck@northcoast.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2006 5:51 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments on this project.

This project is bad at both ends. At the north end, it will deprive the Klamath-Trinity River system of greatly needed cold, fresh water for the already disastrously impacted fisheries. **DB3-1**

At the south end, it will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant.

Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline--including water diversions--are studied and fully resolved. And the project should specifically consider Trinity River chinook salmon, the primary commercial and recreational species of the Klamath-Trinity system. **DB3-2**

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

Diane Beck  
3200 Greenwood Heights Dr.  
Kneeland, California 95549

3-TA2

---

**From:** thomasaldrige95112@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2006 3:55 PM  
**To:** Marshall, Paul  
**Subject:** Re: South Delta Improvement Project DEIR/S

Mr. Paul Marshall  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9th Street - 2nd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Marshall,

Thank you for soliciting public comments in response to the South Delta Improvement Project (SDIP) DEIR/S. It makes no sense to increase the water diversions of the delta. Business as usual is leading the delta to a monumental disaster. Its time to start protecting the delta and stop this relentless bleeding her to death under with the stupid pretext of helping the delta. SHAME!!!! It makes no sense to move forward with a project that will divert more fresh water from the delta when delta fish populations are crashing. While scientists suspect several factors are responsible for the crash, most agree that water diversions are one of the most significant. Please withdraw the SDIP DEIR/S until the causes of the delta fish decline -- including water diversions -- are investigated and fully resolved.

TA2-1

California does not need to increase delta diversions to meet its current and future water needs. The state's own water plan proves that increased investments in urban and agricultural water use efficiency and reclamation can meet our needs well into the future.

At the minimum, the SDIP DEIR/S should consider an alternative that significantly reduces delta pumping from current levels, actually improves delta water quality and habitat, and protects fish.

Please include me on your mailing list to be notified of any decisions or activities concerning this project.

Sincerely,

thomas aldrige  
296 s 13 st  
san jose, California 95112