

UnCodeble

Sites Reservoir Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report/
Environmental Impact Statement

December 5, 2017

1:00 p.m.

Public Comment

gled
5.9.19

gled
5.6.19

SP 0044

210004

SP 0142
Unlocable

210004

Unlocable

1 MARK COWAN: [I'm an Irishman. I moved here
 2 recently from Ireland to get married, so I have a
 3 passionate familiarity with rainstorms and flooding.
 4 I live in a town called Athlone, which is on
 5 the River Shannon, so because of the town where I'm from
 6 on the River Shannon, and Ireland is a very agricultural
 7 nation, has been for the past 800 years, there are very
 8 few floodplains for the water to be collected, natural
 9 deposits, or reservoirs.
 10 So out of a concern for this happening here in
 11 Sacramento and the ever present danger of flooding, I
 12 would like to wholeheartedly express my support for the
 13 Sites project.]
 14 Thank you.]
 15 [REGINA CHICHIZOLA: [So I'm going to write
 16 written comments because I'm sure there are some issues
 17 I will find out that I'm wrong about or get more
 18 information about as I'm able to finish more and more of
 19 the EIS, which is pretty extensive, obviously.]
 20 [I drove here today from the Klamath River where
 21 the Trinity meets it, so I have a lot of concerns as far
 22 as what impacts could be to the Trinity River.]
 23 [And I also work for the Pacific Coast
 24 Federation of Fisheries Association, and I represent
 25 some community groups on the Trinity and Klamath Rivers.



1 I've actually worked on trying to remove some
 2 dams on the Klamath River for a long time now. They're
 3 actually on the river and block it.]

4 So one is [I think there's a lot of information
 5 that -- I feel like there's a lot of information that is
 6 going to be coming out in the next couple of years that
 7 should be -- the project should be basing itself on.

2/15/04

8 That has not happened yet, which makes me feel
 9 like the EIS is slightly premature. It feels like it's
 10 moving very quickly, even though the, for instance,
 11 Water Rights Application has not gone forward yet, even
 12 though the Phase II Delta changes have not happened yet,
 13 which are going to increase winter flows hopefully in
 14 the Sacramento River.]

15 As you said, [there is a lot of science coming
 16 out based on floodplains and what floodplains means to
 17 fisheries. And what wet water years means to fisheries.

18 As people who depend on fisheries, both through
 19 the union that I work for that represents commercial
 20 fishermen and for people on the Klamath and Trinity
 21 River, which is extremely rural, I think that a lot of
 22 the science on what floodplains means and what high
 23 flows mean, needs to come out, and also what standards
 24 are needed for the flows in the Sacramento River to help
 25 fish need to come out before we can decide how much

2/15/04

1 should be diverted.

2 I also think that consultation with fish and
3 wildlife service, government to governments with tribes,
4 things like that should have happened already.

5 Because how are you going to read an EIS when
6 you don't have all the information.]

7 [Another issue I have with this -- and I'm not
8 saying that I think that this has to be a detriment to
9 the environment or has to be good for the environment, I
10 just think there is a lot of information that I find is
11 missing at this point.]

12 [One thing that I really did not like when I
13 read the -- when I read the EIS, or the parts of it that
14 I've been able to get through, is this assumption that
15 in the baseline that contracts are like -- contracts
16 are -- that water use is going to increase a lot and
17 contracts are met.

18 There are very few years where contracts are
19 met, and if you're assuming that the contracts are met
20 to the Sacramento River, then you're assuming that a lot
21 more water is being used currently than is actually
22 being used because in many years those contracts aren't
23 met.]

24 [Some information that I've read in the document
25 that I find to be conflicting or should be explained

2/5/00A

2/1/00A

5/16/00A

1 better in the final EIS is that there are -- in the
2 fisheries assessment there are things said like, they'll
3 be an eight -- eight percent decrease in wet water years
4 of fish production, but a 14 percent --

5 These are not the actual numbers because
6 obviously different years there's different numbers, but
7 a 14-percent increase in dry water years.

8 Well, in wet water years, there's a lot more
9 fish than in dry water years, so what are those actual
10 numbers?

11 Is -- is the decrease 20,000 fish, but the
12 increase is only a thousand fish because you're going
13 five percent inches?

14 This is the kind of information we would need
15 to know to be able to support a project like this. And
16 so without knowing that, right now it's hard to support.]

17 [Another concern that I personally have is that
18 a lot of these tributaries that you're saying have extra
19 water or that you can get water rights for are some of
20 the most important tributaries to the Spring Chinook
21 Salmon, and the Spring Chinook Salmon are doing really
22 terrible right now, and because these are not --

23 I don't see how there's anything above Sites
24 Reservoir that -- a lot of the areas above Sites
25 Reservoir seem like they are not going to be helped by

22,000

1 this. Maybe they can be, maybe you're trying to figure
2 out where they can be, but at this point, the Spring
3 Chinook spawning tributaries are not going to be helped
4 like this; instead you're claiming water.

5 And I understand you'll be taking in the
6 winter, but like I said, those winter flows are very
7 important. And they're not just very important in one
8 storm event because I did see that. You said you would
9 protect flows during certain storm events, but they're
10 important a lot of the time.

11 The times that we have good fisheries, and we
12 are making money is the times when there are wet water
13 years and how water is allowed to flow down the river.

14 I mean, floodplain inundation is very
15 important, so I just don't see how the fish are being
16 protected, and I don't want to be rude, but I have a
17 hard time thinking that the Sites Project Authority is
18 going to always be protecting the fish as the lead
19 agency because it is so many irrigators and farmers.

20 And I don't see who the person who speaks for
21 the fish on the Authority is, and without a biological
22 opinion out yet, and without all this information from,
23 you know, the Phase II process out yet, and the State
24 Board weighing in on that, I just have a hard time
25 believing this is going to be a benefit.

Hoover



1 I hope it is, and I hope we can go forward and
 2 figure out ways to make it a benefit, but I have a lot
 3 of concerns, and I feel like this feels premature
 4 because those concerns have not been addressed in the
 5 fishing community.]

6 And then the last thing I wanted to say, is I
 7 think there should be hearings in more areas that are
 8 impacted besides just in the communities that are
 9 farming communities.

100000A(9)

10 I mean, obviously people in the Trinity River
 11 have a lot of questions. You know, are the extra flows
 12 that we get to keep the Klamath Salmon alive, are they
 13 protected in this project? Is that considered in this
 14 project?

15 There are people in the upper Sacramento who
 16 probably have a lot of concerns too, so if you're going
 17 to alleviate those concerns and make sure everyone feels
 18 involved, you should probably open the process up a
 19 little more and provide some more information on
 20 consultations.]

21 Thank you very much.]

SRP0143

22 STEVE EVANS: [So my name is Steve Evans. I'm a
 23 consultant for Friends of the River, which is a
 24 Statewide river conservation group. We've been
 25 following this project for several years.

Went to the

