

Chapter 3 Master Responses

Introduction

This chapter provides master responses to comments made on the RDEIR/SDEIS. Master responses were crafted for comments that were made multiple times by different agencies, organizations, entities, or members of the public and for comments related to multiple subtopics that could be addressed by one topical master response. Table 3-1 summarizes the master response numbers, titles, and topics covered.

If a master response is referenced in a response for an individual comment in Volume 3, Chapter 4, *Responses to Comments*, the response to that comment is found within the identified master response.

Table 3-1. Summary of Master Responses

Master Response Number	Master Response Title	Topics Addressed
1	CEQA and NEPA Process, Regulatory Requirements, and General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public review and outreach process for the RDEIR/SDEIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of public outreach • Acknowledgement of community concerns and recommendations • CEQA/NEPA process and document development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency coordination • 2017 Draft EIR/EIS • Length and complexity of the RDEIR/SDEIS • General methods and modeling • Recirculation and disclosure of significant impacts • Public trust and California reasonable use doctrines • Relationship with other plans, programs, policies, and agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Water Commission and the Water Storage Investment Program (Proposition 1) • Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan updates • State Water Board 2018 Framework • Voluntary agreements • Human Right to Water • Sustainable Groundwater Management Act • State Water Resources Control Board Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Resolution

Master Response Number	Master Response Title	Topics Addressed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting timeline and processes • Water rights
2	Alternatives Description and Baseline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merits of the Project and alternatives • Adequacy of the Project and alternatives description • Preferred alternative and environmentally preferable alternative • Baseline existing conditions/No Project Alternative/No Action Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEQA's definition of environmental baseline and the No Project Alternative • NEPA's definition of the No Action Alternative • Commonalities and assumptions of the No Project Alternative, No Action Alternative, and environmental baseline • Why climate change is analyzed separately from the No Project Alternative • Long-term operation of the CVP and SWP—biological opinions and incidental take permit • Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and updates • Adequacy of the impact analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use and incorporation of mitigation measures • Timing of CEQA and NEPA analyses and lead agency decisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife decisions • Potential future CEQA and NEPA compliance actions • Refinements to Project facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of emergency release structures • Sloped I/O tower • One I/O tunnel • Refinements to Project operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchanges • Reduction in operational dead pool volume • Diversion criteria for excess conditions • Storage and releases • Coordination with SWP and CVP and exchanges • Reservoir operations plan
3	Hydrology and Hydrologic Modeling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modeling modifications • Hydrology used for modeling of alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydrologic data development • Modeling period, hydrology and climate change • Hydrologic model description

Master Response Number	Master Response Title	Topics Addressed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of CALSIM II • Selection of CALSIM II versus CALSIM 3 • Model parameters • Exchanges • Modeling time step <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly time step • CALSIM II and Upper Sacramento River Daily Operations Model • CALSIM II and real-time operations • Presentation of results
4	Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best available data • Modeling modifications • Metals and metalloids other than mercury <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods of analysis • Effect of anoxic conditions on metals other than mercury • Consideration of effect of metals other than mercury on beneficial uses • Consideration of additive effects • Use of the I/O tower to control releases of constituents • Adequacy of mitigation
5	Aquatic Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of best available tools • Methods and use of modeled results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of daily or monthly modeling results in analysis • Thresholds and criteria used in analyses • Uncertainty • Use of means in reporting modeling results • Special-status fish species and CEQA and NEPA requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline and special-status species • Permitting • Project benefits to fisheries • Flow and mitigation measures • Funks and Stone Corral Creeks • Longfin smelt impact analysis and mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrainment • Flow-related effects • Mitigation Measure FISH-9.1: Tidal Habitat Restoration for Longfin Smelt • Delta smelt impact analysis and mitigation

Master Response Number	Master Response Title	Topics Addressed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General • Effects from reservoir releases to Colusa Basin Drain/ Yolo Bypass • Flow-related effects • Upstream sediment entrainment
6	Vegetation, Wetland, and Wildlife Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General comments on vegetation, wetland, and wildlife resources • Analytical approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline conditions • Special-status species surveys and impact analysis • Habitat models • Wetland and non-wetland waters survey data • Adequacy of mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of mitigation under CEQA • Adequacy of mitigation under NEPA • Adequacy of mitigation in the EIR/EIS • Comments related to deferred mitigation
7	Tribal Coordination, Consultation, and Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tribal coordination and AB 52 • Tribal consultation and Section 106 • Federal trust responsibility over Indian trust assets • Tribal beneficial uses • Additional Tribal outreach
8	Trinity River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the Trinity River System in the RDEIR/SDEIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trinity River operating framework • Project water right application approach • Ability to divert CVP water into Sites Reservoir • Protection under existing water rights • Reclamation’s investment • Water temperature impacts in the Trinity River • Scope of modeling analysis with regard to the Trinity River system
9	Alternatives Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEQA and NEPA requirements for the discussion of alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable range of feasible alternatives • Consideration of alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CALFED alternatives screening process • Alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS • Commenter-suggested alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan updates • Multiple operational scenarios or modifications to operational scenarios

AB = assembly bill; CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; CVP = Central Valley Project; EIR = environmental impact report; EIS = environmental impact statement; I/O = inlet/outlet; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act; Project = Sites Reservoir Project; Reclamation = Bureau of Reclamation; RDEIR = revised draft environmental impact report; SDEIS = supplemental draft environmental impact statement; State Water Board = State Water Resources Control Board; SWP = State Water Project.