Welcome

Sites Project Authority
&
Bureau of Reclamation
Meeting Format

Information Stations*

Overview Presentation

Public Comment Session

*Staff with Badges to Answer Questions / Help Find Information

Meeting Purpose

Provide Information on the Sites Project and Draft EIR/EIS

Solicit Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS

Inform the Environmental Analysis for the Sites Project
The Sites Project would provide surface water storage north of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to:

- Enhance water management flexibility
- Provide storage and operational benefits to enhance local and statewide water supply reliability, benefit Delta water quality and improve ecosystems
- Allow for flexible hydropower generation in order to support the integration of renewable energy sources
- Develop additional recreation opportunities
- Provide opportunities for flood damage reduction
- Provide operational flexibility to help mitigate the effects of climate change on water supply and ecosystems
Station 1: Project Benefits

- Enhanced water management flexibility
- Improved environmental flows
- Increased water supply reliability
- Ecosystem improvements
- Potential new renewable energy resources
- New recreation opportunities
- Climate change resiliency
- Flood management
- Enhanced water quality
Station 1: Project Benefits

Net improvements in ecosystem and water quality conditions in the Sacramento River system and Delta

- **Conserve coldwater pools** in existing reservoirs later into the summer months to improve conditions for salmon spawning and rearing
- **Stabilize Sacramento River fall flows** for salmon
- **Provide nutrient rich water** to the Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough to benefit smelt
- **Net improvements in** water supply reliability for fish protection, habitat management (including refuges) and other environmental water needs
- **Increase water supply availability** for refuges and managed wetlands north and south of the Delta
### Organizations Requesting Sites Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Board Members</th>
<th>Other Sacramento Water Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colusa County</td>
<td>Colusa County Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa County Water District</td>
<td>Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord-Artois Water District</td>
<td>Proberta Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District 10B</td>
<td>Western Canal Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Water District</td>
<td>Glenn County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxwell Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placer County Water Agency &amp; City of Roseville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Represented**
- AP Water District
- Davis Water District
- Dunnigan Water District
- LaGrande Water District
- City of American Canyon
- Carter MWC
- Garden Highway MWC

**Organization**
- Antelope Valley-East Kern WA
- California Water Service
- Castaic Lake Water Agency
- Coachella Valley Water District
- Desert Water Agency
- Metropolitan Water District
- Pacific Resources MWC
- San Bernardino Valley Municipal WD
- San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency
- Santa Clara Valley Water District
- Wheeler Ridge-Marcopla WD
- Zone 7 Water Agency

*Also provides water to Sacramento Valley communities

Total authorized to participate as of 8/14/17 = 33
Alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS:

- Feasible and reasonable
- Meet project objectives and purpose and need
- Avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts

Result of:

- Completion of previous analyses
- Comments received during the scoping process
- Screening the range of feasible alternatives against the project objectives and purpose and need
Five alternatives were developed to avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the Sites Project’s significant impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Features/Facilities</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Alternative C₁</th>
<th>Alternative D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites Reservoir Complex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Reservoir Inundation Area</td>
<td>1.3-MAF capacity (12,400 acres)</td>
<td>1.8-MAF capacity (14,200 acres)</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Dam, Sites Dam, Saddle Dams</td>
<td>9 dams (Golden Gate Dam; Sites Dam; Saddle Dams 1, 3, 5, 6, 8a, 8b, 10)</td>
<td>11 dams (Golden Gate Dam; Sites Dam, Saddle Dams 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Areas</td>
<td>Approximately 920 acres in inundation area; 200 acres northeast and east of the inundation area</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites Reservoir Inlet/Outlet Structure and Associated Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level valve tower and gate shaft; 4,000-foot-long tunnel; 220-foot-high structure; four 32-foot-diameter intake openings at seven levels; trash racks and fish screens; bridge; 15,200-cfs emergency release outlet capacity</td>
<td>Same as A but taller structure (260 feet); intake opening at nine levels</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites Pumping/Generating Plant and Electrical Switchyard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,900-cfs pumping capacity; 5,100-cfs generating capacity; 4-acre switchyard with overhead power line tower, at pumping/generating plant</td>
<td>3,900-cfs pumping capacity; 5,100-cfs generating capacity</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>5,900-cfs pumping capacity; no generation</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delevan Pumping/Generating Plant</td>
<td>2,000-cfs pumping capacity; 1,500-cfs generating capacity; approximately 6-acre substation near Funks/Holthouse Reservoir with power lines running east to Delevan</td>
<td>No pumping/generating plant (1,500-cfs gravity release flow); power line running east from Funks/Holthouse Reservoir not needed for Delevan</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>2,000-cfs pumping capacity; no generation; substation and power line for Delevan same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bridge and Roads</td>
<td>Temporary construction roads, several access roads to new facilities, and new roads to replace those currently in the inundation area; South Brigade to provide access between Maxwell and Ladoga</td>
<td>Same as A but slight difference related to access for Saddle Dam 10 for A</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B</td>
<td>Same as B but with a road to provide access to the community of Leesville; some southern roads not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td>Saddle Dam, Stone Corral, Antelope Island, Lurline Headwaters, Peninsula Hills</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Stone Corral, Peninsula Hills, boat ramp day use area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Office Maintenance Yard</td>
<td>Administration, maintenance buildings, asphalt batch plant (possible temporary location), and parking (also serves Holthouse Reservoir and TRR)</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
<td>Same as A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The table is meant as a comparison illustrating the main differences between the alternatives; not all facilities or features of the project are included in this table.*
The Authority will partner with the State and Reclamation to:

Provide usable storage capacity that fish and wildlife resource agencies can adaptively manage to produce environmental benefits when the needs are greatest.

1. **Sacramento River**: Improve water temperature and stabilize flows between Keswick Dam and Bend Bridge (through a water exchange).
   **Benefits**: All four Chinook salmon runs (including the endangered Winter Run) and Steelhead.

2. **Feather River**: Conserve coldwater storage to augment flows during late summer and fall months (through a water exchange).
   **Benefits**: Minimize redd dewatering, juvenile stranding and isolation of Chinook salmon.

3. **Lower American River**: Conserve coldwater storage to augment flows during late summer and fall months (through a water exchange).
   **Benefits**: Juvenile steelhead summer rearing and fall-run Chinook salmon spawning.

4. **Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough**: Provide pulse flows into the Yolo Bypass to push water high in phytoplankton and zooplankton directly into the Cache Slough area (through direct reservoir releases).
   **Benefits**: Endangered Delta smelt in an area where the population is currently improving.

5. **Refuges**: Provide incremental Level 4 wildlife refuge water (through direct reservoir releases and water exchanges).
   **Benefits**: Migratory birds, giant garter snake and tricolored blackbirds.
Station 2: Benefits of Coordinated Operations to Salmon

**Benefits:**
- Preserves coldwater pool
- Maintains flows to support migrating salmonids

1. Water deliveries in lieu of releases from Shasta storage
2. Exchange to Shasta
3. Releases for Salmon (July–November)
Station 2: Benefits of Coordinated Operations to Delta Smelt

Benefits:
Provides flows to Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough to support Delta smelt
Reliability: Example of Greater Deliveries in Dry Years

Station 2: Water Supply

2030 Projection

- Water Supply North
- Water Supply South
- Ecosystem and Water Quality Benefits (Proposition 1-eligible)
A Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared by the Sites Project Authority (Authority) and Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to identify and address the potential effects of the proposed Sites Project.

The Authority is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, and Reclamation is the lead agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

This Draft EIR/EIS describes:

- The Project
- Feasible range of alternatives
- Environmental setting
- Potential direct and indirect impacts that could result from implementation of Project alternatives
- Mitigation measures for potentially significant impacts
Station 3: Environmental Review Process

JANUARY 31, 2017 — MARCH 2, 2017
SCOPING
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING COMMENT PERIOD

AUGUST 2017
DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIR/EIS)

AUGUST 14, 2017 – JANUARY 15, 2018
PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

2019
FINAL EIR/EIS
## Station 3: Environmental Analysis

### Resource/Issue

**Areas Analyzed:** 26

**KEY:**  
- **Beneficial (7 total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource/Issue</th>
<th>Areas Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Biological Resources</td>
<td>![Fish]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Resources</td>
<td>![Plant]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faults and Seismicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control</td>
<td>![Water]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Geomorphology and Riparian Habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Minerals, Soils, and Paleontology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Quality</td>
<td>![Water]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Resources</td>
<td>![Water]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Trust Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation, Transportation, and Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Production and Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Environmental Hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Resources</td>
<td>![Park]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>![People]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Resources</td>
<td>![Water]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Biological Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Other Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Impact Areas Analyzed Across all 5 Alternatives:** 98
The following environmental commitments would be incorporated into any action alternative for all project-related construction as well as operations and maintenance activities:

- Worker Environmental Awareness Program
- Environmental Site Assessment
- Construction Management Procedures
- Fire Safety and Suppression
- Construction Equipment, Truck, and Traffic Management
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
- Erosion Control, Management, and Dewatering
- Compliance with the Requirements of RWQCB Order No. 5-00-175
- Spill Prevention and Hazardous Materials Management
- Mosquito and Vector Control
- Groundwater/Dewatering Water Supply
- Visual/Aesthetic Design, Construction, and Operation Practices
- Emergency Action Plans (e.g., Sites Dam, Golden Gate Dam, Saddle Dams)
Station 4: Draft Feasibility Report

- Completed by the Bureau of Reclamation and Sites Project Authority, in coordination with cooperating agencies, other resource agencies, Native American tribes, stakeholders and the public
- Presents the results of planning, engineering, environmental, social, economic and financial analyses
- Describes the potential physical accomplishments, benefits and impacts of the Sites Project Alternatives

Report Need:

The operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project systems has become increasingly constrained. These increasing constraints threaten the ability of the two systems to meet water use needs while protecting ecosystems and water quality.

Primary Objectives:

- Improve Water Supply and Water Supply Reliability
- Provide Incremental Level 4 Refuge Water Supply
- Improve the Survival of Anadromous Fish and Other Aquatic Species
- Improve Delta Environmental and Export Water Quality
Station 5: Landowner Information

YOU ARE HERE

2017
CALIFORNIA WATER COMMISSION PROP 1 FUNDING

2018
PLANNING & PERMITTING
Prepare Proposal
Application Review
Draft EIR/S
Final EIR/S
Permits

2019
ENGINEERING
Preliminary Design
Final Design
Construction Management

2020
CONSTRUCTION & COMMISSIONING

2022
Construction

2029
Early Operations
Full Operations

REAL ESTATE/RIGHTS OF WAY
Temporary Access
Acquire Permanent Rights of Way
Land Acquisition Process

YOU ARE HERE

Final Funding Agreement
Station 5: Project Location
Comments Due: January 15, 2018

Mail to: Draft EIR/EIS Comments
Sites Project Authority
P.O. Box 517
Maxwell, CA 95955

Email to: EIR-EIS-Comments@SitesProject.org

Submit oral comments to a court reporter at a public meeting
Follow the Project

Sign-up for email updates

www.sitesproject.org/sign-up/

Website: www.SitesProject.org