

CERTIFIED COPY

Unlocable

Public Meeting Regarding
SITES PROJECT DRAFT EIR/EIS
Thursday, December 7, 2017

Jel
5.9.19

LED
5.8.19

Reported by Vickey L. Benson, CSR No. 8076



18:14:56 1 the tax rolls and all that so somebody else can have
 18:14:59 2 water, and you guys can sell it and make a lot of
 18:15:02 3 money.

18:15:02 4 And I don't care whether the state makes a
 18:15:06 5 lot of money out of it. And I've taken it, I've
 18:15:11 6 developed it, and you guys are taking it away from me.

18:15:15 7 But anyway, I know I can't stop you
 18:15:18 8 completely. But I can sure put a thorn in your side.
 18:15:22 9 And I'm going to do everything I can to stop everything
 18:15:25 10 above the waterline.]

11

12

--o0o--

13

[STATEMENT BY STEVE EVANS

14

--o0o--

18:44:46 15 MR. EVANS: [I appreciate the opportunity to
 18:44:49 16 speak again. I spoke briefly at the Sacramento
 18:44:53 17 meeting. I'm a consultant for Friends of the River,
 18:44:55 18 which is a statewide river conservation group. I live
 18:44:59 19 in Sacramento. FOR has an office there.

18:45:04 20 I want to thank the JPA for allowing public
 18:45:08 21 comment at public meetings in response to the draft EIR
 18:45:13 22 and extending comment deadline. This is a huge
 18:45:17 23 document to review, obviously, so every additional day
 18:45:21 24 counts. We'll be submitting extensive and detailed
 18:45:24 25 written comments.]

SRP 0147

Unrecorded

18:45:25 1 [In general, the DEIR lacks important details,
18:45:28 2 making it difficult for the public to provide useful
18:45:32 3 comments. It's a huge document. But it depends a lot
18:45:37 4 on averages and homogenization, that it's very hard to
18:45:42 5 tease out actual facts from it.

18:45:47 6 And it's also based on environmental
18:45:50 7 baselines, including existing Sacramento River flow
18:45:54 8 standards and existing biological opinions that are
18:45:57 9 outdated or inadequate.

18:46:00 10 [Friends of the River]
[We have concerns about many of the potential
18:46:04 11 environmental impacts of this project. But our
18:46:06 12 foremost concern is the impact of Sites diversions on
18:46:10 13 the Sacramento River flows and its flow-dependent
18:46:13 14 ecosystem and fish and wildlife species, many of which
18:46:17 15 are threatened or endangered:

18:46:19 16 The draft EIR claims no significant impact on
18:46:20 17 Sacramento River fluvial morphology, ecosystems and
18:46:24 18 fish and wildlife habitat. But data buried in the
18:46:27 19 various appendices raises concerns.

18:46:31 20 According to Appendix 6B, I believe, during
18:46:35 21 dry and critically dry years, alternative C would
18:46:39 22 reduce flows in the Sacramento River by 17 percent in
18:46:43 23 April below Keswick Dam, 19.4 percent in March below
18:46:48 24 the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, 24.1 percent in March
18:46:54 25 below Hamilton City and 22.3 percent in March below

0400116

0400004

18:46:58 1 Delevan diversion site.

18:46:59 2 We don't know what a reduction -- that kind

18:47:02 3 of reduction in flows means for the Sacramento River

18:47:05 4 ecosystem, and I have yet to find anywhere in the DEIR

18:47:11 5 where that issue is fully addressed.

18:47:14 6 Another big issue is will Sites comply with

18:47:18 7 the development of new inflow and outflow standards for

18:47:22 8 the bay Delta ecosystem, which is being developed

18:47:26 9 currently by the Water Board.

18:47:28 10 The Water Board is proposing a change in the

18:47:30 11 Bay Delta plan to ensure the comprehensive protection

18:47:33 12 of the Bay Delta ecosystem. And the major addition of

18:47:38 13 that plan will be new tributary inflow requirements.

18:47:43 14 Currently, the plan only specifies minimal

18:47:46 15 flows for the main stem Sacramento River for a small

18:47:49 16 part of the year and does not address the critical

18:47:52 17 importance to the ecosystem of flows within

18:47:55 18 tributaries.

18:47:57 19 And the plan will specifically propose new

18:48:00 20 year-round inflow requirements for the Sacramento River

18:48:04 21 and the Delta. And it's essential that Sites, which is

18:48:08 22 going to be dependent on diversions from the Sacramento

18:48:11 23 River, build that into their project.

18:48:14 24 Current science into -- and this is all --

18:48:19 25 I'm paraphrasing from the Water Board's fact sheet on

110004

18:48:22 1 its water plan update. The current science indicates
18:48:27 2 that higher inflows up to beyond 75 percent of
18:48:31 3 unimpaired flows are most protective of the ecosystem.

18:48:35 4 Ultimately, the board's decision on the range
18:48:37 5 for inflow objectives will be a balancing decision to
18:48:42 6 determine reasonable protection considering the
18:48:45 7 competing uses of water, environmental, economic and
18:48:48 8 other considerations.

18:48:49 9 But the range under consideration by the
18:48:51 10 board will be somewhere from 35 to 75 percent of
18:48:55 11 unimpaired flows and generally does not provide for
18:48:59 12 flows lower than existing conditions. And remember, I
18:49:03 13 just quoted a number of reductions in flows that is --
18:49:07 14 that, in your own DEIR, is mentioned that will happen
18:49:11 15 with the Sites project.

18:49:12 16 The board's approach recognizes that flow is
18:49:16 17 the lifeblood the watershed. It's more than just a
18:49:19 18 quantify of water, but it is a process that transports,
18:49:22 19 distributes, mixes and transforms chemicals, nutrients,
18:49:26 20 aquatic organisms, sediments, gravel and other
18:49:30 21 materials up and down the watershed. The functioning
18:49:32 22 of the upstream processes in the watershed is integral
18:49:36 23 to the downstream processes in the Bay Delta.]

18:49:41 24 [And with that, I will conclude and thank you
18:49:44 25 for the opportunity. Thank you.]]