
From: karinne dadigan <karinnedadigan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 6:46 PM
To: EIR-EIS-comments@SitesProject.org
Subject: Public Comment

Hello,

My name is Karinne Dadigan. I am Yurok and a descendant of Wehlkwew village at the mouth of the Klamath River. I work with Save California Salmon.

I would like to start by saying The Sites Reservoir is NOT economically, financially, or environmentally feasible. NEW RESERVOIRS DO NOT CREATE WATER- We urge the Commission to carefully review and consider the legal requirements for Sites Reservoir given the impacts of CLIMATE EXTREMES, including severe drought,. These impacts have TESTED California's water system. Surface water storage is VULNERABLE to climate impacts, and NOT the most resilient form of water storage. SITES IS NOT ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE- The proposed Sites Reservoir Project is the MOST EXPENSIVE of the projects that received Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) funds. It received millions in taxpayer funding for design, permitting, and environmental work, however the Sites Authority does not have water rights. 5 times more water is allocated than exists and winters are getting dryer in California. The reservoir may not fill and water will be expensive. SITES DOES NOT BENEFIT LOCAL COMMUNITIES- Northern California can NO longer afford the cost of further WATER DIVERSIONS. The majority of project funding for Sites that is expected to come from urban State Water Project Contractors and diversions ONLY benefit the southern parts of the state. SITES HURTS THE ENVIRONMENT AND VIOLATES THE LAW: In the original draft Environmental Impact Review (EIR) the Site Authority, REJECTED the Department of Fish and Wildlife's proposed conditions on water diversions for the Sacramento River and admitted diversions will greatly reduce salmon production. The revised draft CONTINUES to propose diversions INCONSISTENT with flow recommendations. Sites Reservoir FAILS to provide an accurate project description or operations plan. It FAILS to use an accurate environmental baseline by utilizing the Biological Opinions issued during the Trump Administration and FAILS to adequately assess environmental impacts. SITES PUBLIC BENEFITS DO NOT EXIST- Operations remain dependent on conditions on diversions to be established by the State Water Resources Control Board, the construction of Delta transfer facilities such as the DELTA TUNNEL, and the needs of a still uncertain pool of buyers of the water diverted into Sites reservoir from the Sacramento River. A healthy degree of skepticism is warranted by the Commission on whether this Project will meet Proposition 1 objectives. SITES IS A THREAT TO NATIVE PEOPLE- Sites reservoir would inundate Native American burial grounds, ceremony sites, and three creeks and DEGRADE salmon runs that Tribes used to be able to rely on. SITES HARMS FISH-The Sacramento River used to have an abundant spring run, a fall run, a late fall run, a winter run and Coho salmon, but now all salmon populations except for one, the fall run, are now listed under the Endangered Species Act in California. In the Trinity River, which would also be impacted by the Sites Reservoir, the Coho and Spring Salmon are facing EXTINCTION. SITES HARMS DRINKING WATER FOR MILLIONS OF CALIFORNIANS rely on the Sacramento Bay Delta, but low flows have led to high concentrations of agricultural pesticides and toxic algae in drinking water supplies. Sites would not only divert more water, but also release hot, polluted water into the Delta.

Thank you,
Karinne Dadigan

Sent from my iPhone