

Regional Conveyance System Study

Virtual Borrego Community Forum- Questions and Answers

On November 5, 2020, the San Diego County Water Authority held a Virtual Forum, specific to the Borrego Spring community, to discuss the Water Authority’s Regional Conveyance System Study (RCSS). The Water Authority’s consultant Kevin Davis, vice president, Black & Veatch Corporation, and Water Authority staff have prepared written responses based on the answers provided at the session, with supplemental responses for completeness, further context and additional information and perspective. Note that due to the number of questions and time constraints, not all questions were answered during the session but are answered in this document. Note the questions use the exact language submitted to the Water Authority.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Cost Questions			
C-1	In the cost estimate for the RCS, and specifically in the Borrego Springs area, how much was estimated for the cost of acquisition of land, rights-of-way and easements for the RCS, and the extra land areas needed during its construction? If landowners along the proposed route are not willing sellers, was governmental Eminent Domain power assumed to get the needed land anyway over landowner objections, and if so, for how much money?	Cost	Easements, Right-of-way (ROW), and land costs were estimated for the entire Regional Conveyance System (RCS). The sum of all the costs, including appraisals, title, and other costs are around \$33M. At this level of study, eminent domain was not contemplated or discussed.
C-2	How much would the new costs be to non-irrigator Borrego water users (e.g., homeowners and renters), either through Borrego Water district, or directly for those pumping from a well to their homes, in the event sub-basin water is mixed with imported water, in order to make the combined water potable, and to prevent corrosion and/or clogging of existing plumbing systems in our hoses?	Cost	The purpose of the RCSS is to study alternative transportation of the Water Authority’s existing independent Colorado River supplies from Imperial Valley to San Diego. Providing water to Borrego and storing water in the Borrego Springs Subbasin is not part of the scope of the potential project. Should the Water Authority Board approve proceeding to RCSS Phase B, the Water Authority would begin discussions with potential partners. The Water Authority would welcome discussions with Borrego should they so wish to discuss potential partnership opportunities.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Environmental Related questions			
Env-1	How will this project affect the multiple endangered species and extraordinary Native American sites in Tubb Canyon?	CEQA/NEPA	At this level of study, environmental assessments have not been performed. If the study moves forward beyond Phase B, appropriate California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Protection Act (CEQA/NEPA) review would be conducted which would analyze all environmental considerations, including potential biological resources and cultural resources.
Env-2	The CEQA requires that the project description be adequate to determine potential environmental impacts prior to initiation of environmental review. However the Phase a does not provide an adequate project description. As an example phase A did not identify the disposal of R/O waste water or disposal of the waste rock (million cubic yards) in Borrego. How can you move forward with Phase B without an adequate project description?	CEQA/NEPA	If the study moves forward, appropriate project descriptions would be developed in compliance with CEQA/NEPA.
Env-3	How much will it cost to transport the tunnel waste, and what will be the costs of doing so for Borrego Springs residents and business owners, such as for added road maintenance from heavy truck traffic, diesel or other exhaust, and dust effluent effects on our health and health insurance, and installation of a traffic light in town to regulate the steady flow of trucks and construction workers? The volume of excavation for the borehole alone is ~690,000 cubic yards. This would mean 50,000 to 100,000 truck trips, or one every ~ten minutes every working hour for 10 working years.	CEQA/NEPA	Cost for the transportation of tunneling waste are included in the tunnel costs for the RCS. Those costs are provided in the Cost Opinion Details, Appendix G of RCSS Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. Any potential impacts created by the RCS would need to be mitigated, including those described in the question.
Env-4	Considering the current state of the roads [S-22 & Hwy 78] running east from Borrego Springs, with all that debris being trucked, who will pay for the upkeep of our roads?	CEQA/NEPA	Potential impacts from any future project alignment/component, and/or construction would be analyzed in potential future RCSS phases authorized by the SDCWA Board of Directors..
Env-5	Consideration would need to be giving to the poor road conditions to exit BS as the trucks deliver debris to the Salton Sea area. Continued money would need to be allocated. Would the project include that?	CEQA/NEPA	

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Env-6	<p>CWA’s estimate of RCS costs appears to assume that tunneling under the ABDSP’s wilderness area is not a cost, which is to say it is assumed to be “free.” In addition to the tunnel, Route 3A appears to require significant encroachment on State Park land, and a dramatically larger encroachment on State Park viewshed, on which Borrego Springs tourism partially depends. In a previous economic study done for Anza Borrego Foundation and Tubb Canyon Conservancy, the potential cost of a route through the the State Park for a proposed SDG&E project had an estimated economic cost to the region of \$120M. 1) Why does CWA assume that it should be allowed to bifurcate the ABDSP for free? 2) Why does CWA not include the costs to Borrego Springs’s economy in its model?</p>	CEQA/NEPA	<p>Although at this phase not all costs are itemized, other costs that are required by the project are tangentially included through contingencies applied to the project. Should the study move forward, these costs can be considered. Currently, the RCSS cost opinions include contingencies.</p>
Env-7	<p>No mention was made in Phase A of calculating secondary costs and potential externalities to the discounted cash flow of the project of Route 3A choice. For example, assuming CWA can obtain permitting that would allow CWA to tunnel under the wilderness area of the ABDSP for free is questionable. An economic study was done when SDG&E proposed a similar tunneling project and the economic cost to the ABD State Park at that time was calculated as over \$100 million that would need to be paid to the State Park for this privilege. Would Phase B include this payment due the State Park in its calculations?</p>	CEQA/NEPA	
Env-8	<p>We are concerned about the environmental degradation and impact this project will have on the land. What precautions will be taken to alleviate the impact?</p>	CEQA/NEPA	<p>We appreciate the feedback on specific items that should be looked at during the environmental phases of the RCS. The RCSS is in an early feasibility level analysis, which means no facilities have been designed. RCSS Phase A was a technical and financial fatal flaw study. The potential impacts from any future project alignment, project component, and/or construction methodologies will be</p>

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Env-9	What kind of study has been done on how this project would impact the habitat of the endangered Big Horn Sheep that live in the proposed area?	CEQA/NEPA	analyzed if authorized by the Water Authority Board of Directors, in subsequent phases. Appropriate CEQA/NEPA review would be part of phases subsequent to Phase B, which would adequately analyze potential impacts on all environmental factors and identify appropriate recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts on sensitive resources.
Env-10	What is the timeframe for starting the Environmental Assessment as required by law?	CEQA/NEPA	
Env-11	As far as the SVRA land goes, we are mandated by law to have zero net habitat loss. How will the pipeline be constructed along Highway 78 and the SVRA?	CEQA/NEPA	
Env-12	Are you aware that there are two native American village site in Tubb Canyon?	CEQA/NEPA	
Env-13	Would you expect an increased level of dust to be generated by this project?	CEQA/NEPA	

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Partnership Related Questions			
P-1	Please define "partners." Does this assume \$\$\$ contribution to RCS?	Partnerships	At this early phase of feasibility study, partnerships were identified where mutual benefits could be developed. This includes potential grant funding.
P-2	Some folks in Borrego believe the Route 3A pipeline would somehow solve the critical overdraft problem for Borrego. Why is this belief true or untrue?	Partnerships	The purpose of the RCS is to deliver the Water Authority's independent Colorado River supplies to San Diego County. It's possible that Borrego Springs could work with a third party to secure water that could be delivered through the RCS, if Borrego so desires, if a series of partnerships were established. Partnership discussions would commence in Phase B
P-3	Please list the potential local partners that you identified in the Phase A study.	Partnerships	Potential partners include federal, state, and local agencies, tribes, Mexico, and public-private-partners. Potential partnerships are identified in Chapter 8 of the RCSS Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch.
P-4	It would be useful to understand if your research so far has identified any support for this project from any stakeholder (person or entity) with a stake in Borrego Springs or Anza Borrego Desert State Park?	Partnerships	No. RCSS Phase A focused on engineering and cost. Stakeholder outreach was always planned for Phase B to ensure that Phase A did not identify any technical or financial fatal flaws before commencing such discussions.
Potential Visual & Noise Impact Questions			
VN-1	Can you show us visual presentations (simulations or photos) of what this pipeline would look like coming through Borrego, and if not, can you describe what it would likely look like and the path through our town it would take.	Visual	Alignment - For Alternative 3A, the RCS could pass through Borrego Springs. The RCSS Phase A, provided a high-level evaluation and did not intend to provide a precise alignment. The RCSS team has provided several optional routes that could be considered through and around Borrego Springs. There are many other possibilities as well.
VN-2	How visible will the pipeline be and what, if anything, will be done to have it blend in with the environment.	Visual	What would a pipeline look like – All pipelines would be buried, and the ground level would be restored to the existing conditions to the extent possible. Visually, there would be very little change from what the existing ground looks like. No visualizations have been prepared at this point.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
VN-3	This is a quiet desert community. Please explain how any noise would be mitigated during construction and once the pipeline and pump stations are built?	Noise	Construction and long-term noise mitigation strategies would be developed as part of the CEQA/NEPA and preliminary engineering processes. Mitigation would comply with all local, state, and federal requirements. The pump station would likely need to have acoustical treatments incorporated into the design and construction to meet local sound requirements.
VN-4	What is the acceptable noise level for a pumping station?	Noise	
Potential Borrego Springs Economic Impact Questions			
Ecn-1	What is your estimate of the economic hit to Borrego Springs in lost tourism? Why are the devastating costs to the Borrego Valley associated with the RCS not being considered at this juncture, including: loss of scenic vistas (visual blight across the State Park and vicinity power caused by canals, substation facilities, tunneling, and power line towers); loss of peace and quiet (due to truck convoys, high ambient construction noise, increased fine particulate air pollution, etc); irreparable damage to sensitive wildflower fields and iconic wildlife species (such as the endangered peninsular bighorn sheep). How many Borrego Springs businesses will go under because of the suppressed geotourism resulting from extended construction and the permanent disfigurement of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, Pinyon Wilderness, and historic sites caused by the RCS's intrusive presence across the fragile desert and its pristine viewshed?	BS Economic Impact	Potential economic impacts to Borrego Springs have not been evaluated as part of this feasibility level study. Future phases of the RCS could evaluate potential impacts. Appropriate CEQA/NEPA review would be part of phases subsequent to Phase B, which would adequately analyze potential impacts on all environmental factors (i.e., aesthetics, noise, air quality, biological resources, geology, etc.) and identify appropriate recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts on sensitive resources.
Ecn -2	What's estimate on number of jobs the RCS would bring to locals Borregans?	Potential Borrego Springs Economic Impacts	Jobs creation is a potential positive impact to the Borrego community if the RCS were to be built in proximity to the community. No estimate of job creation has been performed at this feasibility stage of the RCS.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
Engineering			
Eng-1	<p>On Page 43 of the Kleinfelder Report, it is stated that the depth of the RCS tunnel is twice the depth where gasketed segmental lining was used in the Arrowhead tunnels. Also, the report (page 22) stated that the example given in the San Jacinto River tunnel (with a high static pressure) was determined to be a permanent problem and couldn't be fixed. In such a case environmental impacts to surface spring water sources sustaining the Endangered Peninsular big horn sheep would be significant and unmitigable and could result in a "taking" under the Endangered Species Act. Note that Peninsular bighorn sheep, flat-tailed horned lizard, burrowing owls, and several other sensitive and listed species are found in and around Tubb Canyon, which is one of the preferred proposed eastern portal of the 47-mile water tunnel. Multiple year human presence and construction disruptions alone will damage habitat and numerous species, perhaps permanently. In the event that a significant negative impact were found to be the case of the proposed project on the endangered Peninsular bighorn sheep, flat-tailed horned lizards, and other sensitive species — what cost was assumed in the cost estimate to cover legally-required mitigation actions to offset such catastrophic impacts?</p>	Technical	<p>There are numerous tunnels around the world are much deeper than the proposed RCS, most notably the Gotthard Base Tunnel in Switzerland, which was recently completed, and has a maximum depth of cover of 2.3 km (approximately 7,500 feet).</p> <p>A gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel liner is one of many available methods for controlling groundwater infiltration into tunnels, such as those used on the Arrowhead Tunnels Project. For tunnels that may experience high groundwater pressures, other mitigation methods would need to be utilized in conjunction with gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel linings, such as probe drilling, pre-excavation grouting, formation grouting, and installation of a secondary steel lining inside the initial gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel lining in order to handle the higher groundwater pressures, especially for portions of the tunnel alignment within fault and fault zone areas. This is further discussed in subsection entitled "Geologic Issues" of Section 2.4.5 and in detail in subsection entitled "Groundwater Concerns" of Section 2.4.7 of the Regional Conveyance System Study – Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. The San Jacinto Tunnel was constructed in the 1930s. The Kleinfelder Report notes that "unstable sections [of the San Jacinto Tunnel] were supported with horseshoe and circular steel sets and gunite for temporary tunnel support [and] some sections of the tunnel were self-supporting and not lined initially." Further, the report indicates that "efforts to reduce the groundwater pressures during construction and shut off the water flow included driving pioneer tunnels parallel to the main tunnel to reduce groundwater pressures and perform pressure grouting by injecting cement into drill holes." It should be noted that there have been significant advancements in tunnel lining and grouting technologies since this tunnel was constructed, mainly to prevent potential negative impacts of groundwater intrusion. The means and methods utilized</p>
Eng-2	<p>Is it true that this tunnel for the pipeline is deeper than any tunnel pipeline that has yet been constructed?</p>	Technical	<p>There are numerous tunnels around the world are much deeper than the proposed RCS, most notably the Gotthard Base Tunnel in Switzerland, which was recently completed, and has a maximum depth of cover of 2.3 km (approximately 7,500 feet).</p> <p>A gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel liner is one of many available methods for controlling groundwater infiltration into tunnels, such as those used on the Arrowhead Tunnels Project. For tunnels that may experience high groundwater pressures, other mitigation methods would need to be utilized in conjunction with gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel linings, such as probe drilling, pre-excavation grouting, formation grouting, and installation of a secondary steel lining inside the initial gasketed precast concrete segmental tunnel lining in order to handle the higher groundwater pressures, especially for portions of the tunnel alignment within fault and fault zone areas. This is further discussed in subsection entitled "Geologic Issues" of Section 2.4.5 and in detail in subsection entitled "Groundwater Concerns" of Section 2.4.7 of the Regional Conveyance System Study – Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. The San Jacinto Tunnel was constructed in the 1930s. The Kleinfelder Report notes that "unstable sections [of the San Jacinto Tunnel] were supported with horseshoe and circular steel sets and gunite for temporary tunnel support [and] some sections of the tunnel were self-supporting and not lined initially." Further, the report indicates that "efforts to reduce the groundwater pressures during construction and shut off the water flow included driving pioneer tunnels parallel to the main tunnel to reduce groundwater pressures and perform pressure grouting by injecting cement into drill holes." It should be noted that there have been significant advancements in tunnel lining and grouting technologies since this tunnel was constructed, mainly to prevent potential negative impacts of groundwater intrusion. The means and methods utilized</p>

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
			almost a century ago in an attempt to control groundwater intrusion are completely different from those utilized in the tunnel industry of today. Regarding specific comment on “taking” under Environmentally Sensitive Area, the RCS is in an early feasibility level analysis. The potential impacts from any future project alignment, project component, and/or construction methodologies would be analyzed if authorized by the SDCWA Board of Directors, in subsequent phases. Appropriate CEQA/NEPA review would be part of phases subsequent to Phase B, which would adequately analyze potential impacts on all environmental factors and identify appropriate recommendations to avoid or minimize potential impacts on sensitive resources. Additionally, the SDCWA would coordinate and consult with appropriate regulatory agencies to obtain all necessary discretionary permits and/or other regulatory approvals.
Eng-3	Would solar be used to assist the pumps?	Technical	Renewable energy, including solar, is a potential energy source for RCS operations and would be explored in subsequent phases.
Eng-4	How much debris does 47 miles of tunnels deliver, how and where does this debris go?	Technical	Since we are focused on the Borrego Springs area, that portion of the tunnel associated with that portal only represents a length of 8.7 miles as opposed to 47 miles. The resulting material is around 262,000 cubic yards.
	In an economic evaluation for a large capital allocation decision, one may think of risk as the probability of an adverse event occurring multiplied by the estimated cost if that event occurs. Thus, any comprehensive economic assessment would take into account the financial consequences of this probabilistic risk. Route 3A would cross at least two major and active earthquake faults: the Elsinore Fault zone and the San Jacinto Fault zone. Why did the Phase A consultants not make explicit the financial consequences of this probabilistic risk of Route 3A attempting to cross these two active fault zones?	Technical	Please refer to subsection entitled “Faults” of Section 2.4.7 of the Regional Conveyance System Study – Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. This subsection describes the special considerations that would need to be made to construct tunnels through fault and fault zone areas, an excerpt of which is as follows: “Specialized designs would be developed for fault crossings [to mitigate the potential for damage (breakage) caused by earthquakes]. These designs could include, but are not limited to: 1) over-excavation or enlargement of the tunnel to provide for future movement of the fault where the tunnel crosses the fault; 2) filling of the annular space between the initial tunnel excavation and the exterior of the tunnel final lining with low strength material such as cellular concrete; 3) grouting the faulted ground to increase the strength and ductility of the faulted ground; and/or 4) using
Eng-5	The RCS would cross six active fault lines, how have you factored this risk into the assessments?	Technical	

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
			flexible joints to increase the longitudinal flexibility of the tunnel final lining.” Costs for these types of remedies were included in the cost estimates. Phase B and subsequent phases would evaluate this at a deeper level.
Eng-6	Are the tunnels bored out or blasted or a combo?	Technical	The tunnels would likely be hard rock in many areas and excavated with a tunnel boring machine.
Eng-7	Borrego Springs is very quiet, which is one of the features that brings thousands of visitors, and is appreciated by residents. The "decibel level" that might be considered "appropriate to existing codes" as the speaker stated is likely to be at least 10 dB (a factor of ten) above the unusually low ambient background levels in Anza Borrego Desert State Park. How much will it cost to reduce the pumping station noise level to a level that maintains the natural quiet level extant for the last several decades? How much will it cost to reduce to ambient noise during the construction phase.	Technical	At this phase of feasibility, these types of items have not been evaluated. The RCSS has been divided into several small phases in line with the incremental approach to the study work directed by the Water Authority Board. These types of issues would be evaluated as part of CEQA/NEPA which would be conducted subsequent to Phase B.
Eng-8	How wide would the construction area for the pipeline trench be? I believe the answer is 70-100 feet. Wouldn't that encroach onto Hwy 78, as well as requiring scraping miles of desert — largely on undisturbed state parks lands.		The width would likely be in the range of 30 feet wide. The ROW would likely be wider than that.
General Questions			
G-1	What do the alignments look like further east of these maps in the east end of Anza Borrego DSP and Ocotillo Wells SVRA?	Alignments	The full alignment can be found in Chapter 2, Figure 2-7 of the RCSS Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch..
G-2	Will all slides be available on SDCWA website for participants to review?	General	Yes.
G-3	Albert Einstein said, “We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.” Conveyance has been the solution to the problem of providing water to arid and semi-arid lands in California for hundreds of years. Storage and conveyance solutions can cause enormous environmental damage, destruction of ecosystems, and species extinctions. (1) Why does this proposed conveyance system make sense when the source of the water may not be available because of climate change and other unknown	General	The QSA supplies are a part of a broader water portfolio for the San Diego Region, which includes seawater desalination, recycled water, conservation, and local runoff capture. In addition, the QSA water is conserved water and conservation helps to promote the long-term sustainability of the Colorado River. The QSA also helps reduce strain on the Bay Delta. The RCSS aims to secure the Water Authority’s existing QSA supplies well into the future by studying alternative conveyance. The San Diego region depends on the QSA supplies to meet 50 percent of its demands. The QSA supplies are

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
	<p>factors over the estimated minimum 25 years needed to complete the project? This proposed conveyance system is very likely to have significant negative impacts to the environment in the Borrego Valley, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, and cause major disruptions in the daily lives of Borrego residents and visitors during the years of construction. (2) Why is it being considered instead of working on conservation of existing water supplies and use, cessation of unsustainable development and population growth in arid lands, and developing new technologies for water acquisition such as seawater desalination since there is adjacent access to the largest body of water on the planet?</p>		<p>also highly reliable because share Imperial Irrigation District’s high priority status within the Colorado River priority system meaning they are largely insulated from cutbacks due to shortages. Phase B, if authorized by Water Authority Board, would evaluate opportunities for additional local supply development projects.</p>
G-4	<p>Given the high cost to local tourism of degrading the environment in Borrego, what alternative technologies could the SDCWA consider and what would the costs be? For example, waste-water capture, runoff capture, or additional desalinization?</p>	General	
G-5	<p>What is the projected impact of climate change on the Colorado River flows? In particular, how sure are we that there will be enough water for the various shareholders to receive their shares if this conveyance is built?</p>	Climate Change	
G-6	<p>Why not look at desal since the sea level is rising, sea water is free, very little transport is required since the population is near the ocean, ground water cost will increase, and the cost listed here are compatible. You should be more forward looking!</p>	Climate Change	
G-7	<p>As a landowner on the RCA 3A route located next to a bug-ugly massive RCS pumping station and on the direct construction route that goes right through my land, I am NOT going to sell to this project for any price. I am likely not alone in this view, since I worked with several neighboring landowners and attorneys to stop SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink Project from devastating our land, Tubb Canyon, the State Park and surrounding environment along the exact same route. If we do not sell, this RCS is dead in the water... unless</p>	General	<p>There are many options for the Alternative 3A route of the RCS in the Borrego Springs area, including avoiding Borrego Springs entirely. At this level of study, eminent domain was not contemplated or discussed.</p>

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
	a hostile "Eminent Domain" takeover of our private properties and the State Park lands is attempted. Is that how the RCS intends to obtain rights-of way?		
G-8	My family has owned 700 acres in Tubb Canyon for over 70 years. To say this project would degrade our peaceful desert sanctuary is an understatement. The scale of this project does not seem to fit the size of the desert community. This is a quiet desert community, that prides itself on dark skies, the state park, and pristine land. As is evident in the photos showing the Tubb Canyon route, this is a flood plain. We had major flooding in that area after storms. It doesn't seem like a feasible place to build such a project.	General	We appreciate your comment.
G-9	Is there enough water available from the Colorado river to even divert? Would there not be many legal battles over such access as it limits from Imperial and even Mexico?	QSA	The RCS would convey the Water Authority's existing annual 280,000 acre-feet of QSA supplies only. Agreements for this water are already in place.
G-10	Can Power Line go in through the tunnel or be hidden from view? Can there be added transportation through the tunnel like "Hyperlink" for the many residents of San Diego that don't have access to Borrego's beauty? Can the 20 Mega Watts from the NRG Solar plant being wasted today be used to power any water supply, the fence around the plant along with the heat generated from the panels have caused all the wild life a problem with natural movements. Basically, most of the wildlife is consolidated to the farms or further up the mountains. How much Native American Artifacts were scraped to make the Solar Plant being wasted today because of the failed Sunrise power link.	General	We appreciate your comments. The CEQA/NEPA process will be followed if the study moves to future phases and evaluate such items.
G-11	I understand that there is an existing agreement for the water. What is the confidence level that by 2045 there will be sufficient water in the Colorado River system to make this a viable water supply? Given our current climate crisis what is this confidence level based on?	QSA	The RCS would convey the Water Authority's existing annual 280,000 acre-feet of QSA supplies only. Agreements for this water are already in place. The QSA supplies are also highly reliable because share Imperial Irrigation District's high priority status within the Colorado River priority system meaning they are largely insulated from cutbacks due to shortages.
G-12	Annual flow of the Colorado River will inevitably be at risk due to climate change. How can you guarantee that there will be enough water to bring to San Diego by the years 2045?	Climate Change	

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
G-13	Phase A has been misstated and misinterpreted in some quarters as indicating that RCS has been proved as 'economically viable.' But that is not what Phase A suggests. All Phase A says is that it appears likely that for ~\$5B in first order costs RCS construction is feasible. Will Phase B actually determine the economic feasibility of RCS Route 3A through Borrego?	General	A preliminary economic analysis was done as part of the RCSS Phase A, which demonstrated that the RCS routes 3A and 5A is economically competitive and could provide billions of dollars in net present value savings. If the study moves to Phase B, a comprehensive economic analysis will be performed.
G-14	Why isn't one alternative continuing to use MWD pipes as has worked for years?	General	The Phase A preliminary economic analysis does include the existing conveyance system (MWD alternative). The agreement with MWD to deliver the Water Authority's water transfer ends in 2047. Additionally, MWD rates have been historically increasing greater than inflation rates. Therefore, the Water Authority is performing due diligence to explore both the RCS and MWD transportation alternatives which would be further evaluated in Phase B should it move forward.
G-15	Has the San Diego County Water Authority discussed this project San Diego Gas and Electric about this potential project yet?	General	No. Should the project move forward, discussions would take place with SDG&E.
G-16	Can a 4th more northern route along Borrego Salton Sea alternate pipeline be connected and sent up toward 371 Anza. By connecting Westside Canal to Coachella Valley Water District which is heading toward Travertine Point now. Connecting them together then send along Borrego Salton Seaway. Allow farmers to turn off their wells therefore fixing the overdraft- then allow farmers to buy the water saving power, providing revenue and allowing Plants, Trees, and Palms to filter the water naturally. Keeping the trees alive and green is a counter balance to climate change, it is a refuge to all the animals that live on the farms, just as people seek shelter so too the animals. When town people see animals running across streets or flying above they are heading toward the farms- they are not stupid like so many in town who block everything and damaged all the private property owners values.	General	These ideas could be considered but have not been evaluated in the RCSS Phase A.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
G-17	<p>I support your efforts to bring water into San Diego and believe there may be a better way through at way less cost. I would propose going along Borrego Salton Sea Road toward Clark Lake where (partners Jack McGrory & CO , Seley, John Doljanin West Coast Trees, have 160 acres Clark Lake LLC. Also Clark Lake Water Company who then could basically gravity feed the water down toward Peg Leg Rd to Palm Canyon for town use and another pipe toward farms for 2 above ground lakes that recharge the upper aquifer. Lake 1 Surf Water Park with eco geo tourism including tram to bird watch or scenic views from valley. The 2nd a water fowl and wild life lake the State Park could manage if they behave kindly to the plan and don't threaten the County with \$100 million dollars fees to run a pipe.</p> <p>This way those who love to watch birds or wildlife the volume of living beings would increase, the water would be sacred. Then run up toward Anza a smaller pipe that should not cost as much in power or Boring, meanwhile the farms turn off the Wells and buy the water from the system therefore making viable plus development on top of the Full Aquifer within years not decades. Please send me any information that can help this common goal.</p>	General	
G-18	<p>NRG 400 acres sold for \$12 million in 2012? What would 400 acres of raw land go for today? We the farmers have been Damaged intentionally however we are always striving to work more efficiently and are the true care takers of Gods Green Earth. Most of us are all Tier 4 Compliant with equipment, Tree growers also offset carbon, and again refuge to wildlife.</p>	General	RCS is in an early feasibility level analysis and these specific properties have not been evaluated.
G-19	<p>Is there a current concept plan for open canals in or adjacent to Penninsular bighorn sheep habitat on the 3A allignment?</p>	General	No, that was not evaluated.
G-20	<p>Where do the Hawks fly and roost- Our properties. They don't roost on solar panels that sit idle causing true warming- what a waste!</p>	General	This was not assessed as part of the RCSS Phase A.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
G-21	What communities would be impacted by the 5A route and what are their concerns?	General	The conceptual route for Alternative 5A is shown in Figure 1-1 of the RCSS Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. In general, Alternative 5A runs north beginning at the westerly terminus of the All-American Canal and parallels existing canals on the western edge of agricultural lands to just north of Interstate-8. The alignment then follows County Routes S80 and S2 and ends near the San Vicente Reservoir.
G-22	There is NO acceptable level of "mitigation to an acceptable decibel level" for a RCS pump station sited in the quiet, pristine Anza-Borrego Desert. Nor is any intrusive pump station facility acceptable along Tubb Canyon Road, or as seen from the beautiful state park viewshed, or located on sensitive, irreplaceable desert habitat. No pump station will ever be "pretty" plopped down in natural, fragile desert. NO costly EIR will change the unsuitability of the RCS on Route 3A. Certainly, no "compensation" would be enough for the damage this project would inflict; therefore, any future use of taxpayer's dollars for extensive studies of this project option is throwing good money after bad. Obviously, the economic impact and opposition to the RCS by Borrego Springs and those protective of the State Park should've been considered before the 3A Route was made a candidate. We also have concerns re: conflicts of interest between certain large Borrego Valley landowners	General	We appreciate your comment.
G-23	If pipeline went through, I assume rams Hill could develop, perhaps a badly needed hospital; Jobs and Economy bringing all values up and allowing some progress for all of San Diego County especially depressed Borrego Springs.	General	Thank you for your comment.
G-24	Where can we find the detailed itemized cost estimate, and the basis of the estimate for each line item in that estimate? From my understanding of the estimate so far, I believe that the cost is significantly underestimated. For example, financing costs through bond measures or another borrowing mechanism is likely to at least double the cost to ratepayers and/or taxpayers. Further, based on comparison to other	General	Cost estimates for the RCS are found in Appendix G of the RCSS Phase A Report, dated August 2020 prepared by Black & Veatch. Addressing potential impacts to the community would be evaluated in subsequent RCSS phases.

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
	<p>large proposed California engineering projects, such as the high-speed train that also requires land acquisition and tunneling, almost every estimate at this level of project immaturity turns out to be low-balled by a factor of several. Also, financial feasibility of handling impacts to affected local communities, including Borrego Springs, must be a part of any decision to conclude "financial feasibility" of the overall project. So far, no mechanism has been identified to compensate Borrego Springs residents and business owners for the negative impact to them. Can you please identify this mechanism?</p>		
G-25	<p>How will Borrego Springs business owners be compensated for lost geotourism income during a decade or more of construction? How will their employees be compensated for lost working hours and dismissal? How much is assumed for these costs in the cost estimate?</p>	General	
G-26	<p>Why do you start with technical and economic flaws? It seems telling that you would not start with environmental fatal flaws. You have the Pacific Ocean right next to the population base and it has exponential capacity compared to the Colorado River basin. Why not focus on that with far less environmental impacts?</p>	General	<p>If the RCS was not feasible from a technical standpoint, then the project would stop there. There would be no need to proceed with detailed environmental assessments if the project wasn't technically or financially feasible.</p>
G-27	<p>Regardless of any priority draw of Colorado River water over MWD rights, in reality Colorado River water is NOT a more stable supply for San Diego over the long term, particularly considering the fact that climate change is projected to result in drastically reduced snow melt that would lower total Colorado River flow.</p>	General	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
G-28	<p>All the press about the Borrego Aquifer was polluted with nitrates. Its true we use that water to grow trees that filter that water- but now it seems the water is Pure? Which is it?</p>	General	<p>The RCSS Phase A did not evaluate the water quality in the Borrego sub-basin.</p>
G-29	<p>Conserved water? Disappointed in Kelley's remark about the conserved water. Why not leave it in the river system and let it flow to the gulf where the earth intended?</p>	General	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

No.	Stakeholder Comment	Area of Concern	SDCWA Response
G-30	Does Garmon and/or Troy wish to answer any of the questions that have been asked so far?	General	Unfortunately not all questions addressed in the session due to time constraints, including this question.
G-31	How are you planning to compensate the land owners for the loss of real estate market value caused by simply initiating the studies in Phase B?	General	This was not a part of the RCSS Phase A.
G-32	how do you compensate for making our town and park UGLY??	General	Thank you for your comment.
G-33	Can the Debris be used to build a Sea Dam on the north end of the Salton Sea and around toward the South eventually to connect the Laguna Saluda and on to Sea of Cortez for water to rise in Salton Sea for ecosystem improvement, transportation and trade.	General	This idea was not evaluated as part of the RCSS Phase A.
G-34	How will you know when/if you are moving on to Phase B. Is there a vote where people can talk to your Board prior to the vote	General	The Water Authority Board of Directors will vote on whether or not to proceed to RCSS Phase B, at the November 19 th Board Meeting. There will be opportunity for public comment. Instructions can be found on the Water Authority's website here: https://www.sdcwa.org/public-notice