Sites Reservoir Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement December 5, 2017

1:00 p.m.

Public Comment

(0000)

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

SKP0143 22

endedi 25

(916) 787-4277

I personally have lived near and along the Sacramento River for over 30 years. So -- and --

As my wife points out to me, every time we drive over a river, I remark about how high or how low the flows are, and she thinks I'm kind of a nut, but it does give me interesting background.

For example, the premise that Sites will largely be storing water from tributaries of the Sacramento River rather than water from the Sacramento River, which is largely owned by the Bureau of Reclamation, and other existing entities, that sort of makes sense, but one of the issues is during drought, say the third year of a drought when Shasta Reservoir is very low, and there's not a lot of water coming in above Shasta Reservoir to fill that reservoir, and you get a storm event, that means the reservoir starts filling, flow releases from Shasta Dam are relatively limited so the reservoir will fill, so most of the flow in the river will be from its undammed tributaries, which is a good thing. It keeps the river alive.

But these are the flows that the Sites JPA are proposing to defer to store in the Sites, and that's a big concern in multiple drought years.

I know DWR is not part of this project anymore, but they had an example on their website a couple of

years ago during 2014, height of the five-year drought, saying that --

If you'll recall, 2014 started out very dry, and then we had a lot of rain in December for about a three-week period, and DWR said, under current environmental standards, we could have diverted X amount of water into Sites, under that, and that's true.

That's because the environmental standards, both flow standards and biological opinions on the Sacramento River are inadequate. If they were adequate, we wouldn't have to claim fisheries heading towards extinction.

So, in fact, during that exact period, I crunched the numbers and found that diversions from the Sacramento River, fill sites in December 2014 would have diverted more than half the flow of the river for a three-week period, more than half the flow of the river.

That's a huge impact. It's hard to quantify because ecosystems are not only more complex than we think, they're more complex than we can think, so we don't have all the answers.

But there are huge questions associated with the operation of this project that need to be answered.

And first of all, I think you have to consider that the water development industry in California has a

Now Series

credibility problem when it says that we're going to build this dam, and it's going to provide environmental benefits.

In fact, every major dam in the Central Valley was premised on providing environmental benefits.

Salmon runs in the Trinity and Sacramento River would not only be unharmed by Shasta and Trinity Dams, they would be improved.

Well, we know that hasn't happened.

So, you know, it's a big issue particularly when you're seeking State taxpayer bond money to build part of this project in terms of, are you going to actually provide a level of benefits that are being claimed, and --

And you may have the intent as the proponents of this project to do so, but others have a say on whether you meet that goal.

Congress, for example, which continues to pass writers and laws that weaken the environmental -- the endangered species protection and biological opinions for Sacramento River Salmon and Delta Chinook, and so you can say that this project will provide X number of benefits, but ultimately Congress can do something in the future the negates those benefits.

So this is a big issue. It's one that you

2.4

really need to address with a certain level of certainty, and I'm not sure that's being done in the EIR.

I'm very concerned about flow impacts on the Sacramento River, as I mentioned. Not only the ability of Sites to reduce flood flows, which are essential for the Sacramento River ecosystem, but also the fact that Sites can actually reduce flows during drought years to minimum levels.

As I mentioned, the flow standards for the Sacramento River are inadequate, and this assessment of impact in this EIR are largely based on inadequate standards of biological opinions and flow standards for the river. So in many ways, I think the assessment of impacts is inadequate because of that.

Interestingly enough, a scientific journal just recently, just last month, the end of last month came out with a study report on the flood needs of riparian ecosystems, and I'd like to quote part of the abstract for that.

This is from a paper called, Flow Regime

Alteration Degrades Ecological Network for Riparian

Ecosystems by JD Tonkin. It's published in the Journal

of Nature Ecology and Evolution, November 27th, 2017.

Rivering ecosystems are governed by patterns of

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

-Okay.

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

temporal variation in river flows. This dynamism will change due to climate change in the near-ubiquitous human control of river flows.

The most influential component of flow alteration was flood reduction, with drought and flow homogenization, both having greater simplifying community-wide consequences than increased flooding.

These findings suggest that maintaining floods under future climates will be needed to overcome the negative long-term consequences of flow modification on riverine ecosystems.

So if Sites wants to provide an environmental benefit for the Sacramento River, it really needs to look at ensuring that the Sacramento River floods often enough to maintain its ecosystems.

You're giving me -- can I have 30 more seconds?

And just as an example of my concern about flows, I was going through a ending 6B in the DEIR, which identified, for example, Alternative C, will reduce average monthly flows in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam from March through October by up to five percent, and that's the average over the 80-year period that was assessed, but during dry and critically dry years by more than 17 percent in the month of April. whoolde

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23 24

That may not sound like much, but if I suddenly had 17 percent less money in my bank account, I'd be concerned.

There are a lot of other examples of that nature, and I'll put them in my written comments.

I do want to mention one thing. I think there's a number of irregularities in DEIR, and it comes from the basis of this document coming from DWR originally, and -- and we'll be noting areas that need to be cleaned up.

But one last thing.

The DEIR does admit, it's not certain how Alternative C will affect the shaded riverine and aquatic habitat that occurs along the banks of the Sacramento River.

And that's getting back to my point about what are the impacts of this project on the Sacramento River'∮ ecosystem?

Thank you.

JEREMY SMITH: | Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jeremy Smith. I'm here on behalf of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California. We represent throughout California over 400,000 construction workers.

We're here to support the project, obviously

13