

CERTIFIED COPY

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

Reported by Vickey L. Benson, CSR No. 8076

Be it remembered, that on Thursday,
December 7, 2017, commencing at the hour of 5:30 p.m.,
at 122 Old Highway 99 West, Maxwell, California, before
me, Vickey L. Benson, a Certified Shorthand Reporter,
empowered to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant
to Section 2093(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, the
following proceedings were had:

--o0o--

18:10: 9

STATEMENT BY JAMES MURPHY

--o0o--

18:10: 13

MR. MURPHY: I own from the town of Sites

18:10: 17

south for, I don't know, 1300 acres on both sides of

18:10: 25

the road, up where the towers are. I don't know if

18:10: 31

you're familiar with the property at all.

18:10: 33

Anyway, they brought three electrical towers

18:10: 36

up there on top, on the outside ridge. None of those

18:10: 44

maps show the waterline.

18:11: 1

(Discussion held off the record.)

18:11: 3

MR. MURPHY: Here's the road, I think, coming

18:11: 5

out from Maxwell.

18:11: 14

MR. TRAPASSO: That's the pipeline, I think.

18:11: 21

(Discussion held off the record.)

18:11: 30

MR. MURPHY: Out here, and the road goes

18:11: 33

south down the valley. So I guess they're going to put

18:11: 40

the dam north of here, and I don't think they'd be able

18:11:45 1 to do that.

18:11:46 2 MR. TRAPASSO: These are going to be the dam
18:11:48 3 here and the dam here.

18:11:50 4 MR. MURPHY: This is a dam, and that's a dam?
18:11:55 5 (Discussion held off the record.)

18:13:37 6 MR. MURPHY: See, what I'm trying to do is
18:13:40 7 I'm trying to describe what happened right now. And
18:13:44 8 I've got all kinds of water, probably more than anybody
18:13:48 9 else in the whole damn valley.

18:13:51 10 And what I want done is I want the top of the
18:13:57 11 ridge on the outside of that dam. Anything that's out
18:14:01 12 of the dam water, I want to keep. That belongs to me.
18:14:06 13 I don't want you guys stealing it.

18:14:11 14 Because every penny that you give me, you're
18:14:15 15 going to take back most of it in taxes of some kind.
18:14:20 16 And I'm not going to have a dam thing left. And I
18:14:24 17 haven't got a lot longer to live, either.

18:14:27 18 But dammit, I'm the one that built the thing
18:14:30 19 for the last 30 years. And I don't care if 1500 people
18:14:36 20 need my water. I'm not selling it. And I'm keeping
18:14:43 21 everything out of the dam, because I know I can do
18:14:46 22 that.

18:14:47 23 And if you guys -- because you guys are doing
18:14:49 24 it for the water. That's what you're saying. You're
18:14:53 25 confiscating the land and all that, taking it out of

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.

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 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

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

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.

1
18:49:48 2
3
4
18:49:56 5
18:49:58 6
18:50:01 7
18:50:05 8
18:50:07 9
18:50:13 10
18:50:17 11
18:50:20 12
18:50:24 13
18:50:29 14
18:50:35 15
18:50:39 16
18:50:42 17
18:50:42 18
18:50:44 19
18:50:47 20
18:50:50 21
18:50:53 22
18:50:55 23
18:51:00 24
18:51:05 25

--o0o--
STATEMENT BY GLEN HOLSTEIN
--o0o--

MR. HOLSTEIN: Well, good evening, folks.
I'm Glen Holstein, a chapter botanist for the
Sacramento Valley chapter of the California Native
Plants Society, which is -- the Native Plants Society
as a whole is a statewide nonpartisan membership group
throughout all of California, made up of people that
are brought together by one thing. They love our
wonderful flora here in California, our plants.

And you know, I had a chance to look at the
summary EIR for the first time tonight, just skimmed it
through. And a couple of things stood out. It didn't
look like there was any mention of a no project
alternative.

And another thing, too, there was no mention
of rare plants. Now, I know that there's probably
mention of them, maybe, in all those volumes that you
mentioned. But in the summary, apparently, they
weren't important enough to include here.

And I know the Sites Valley is within the
footprint of numerous rare plant species. And whether
adequate plant surveys were done there, I don't know.

18:51:08 1 Maybe in one of the volumes, it's hidden in there, and
18:51:11 2 I haven't had a chance to see it yet.

18:51:13 3 But as far as I know, there's been no
18:51:16 4 obvious, at least, discussion of what plant resources
18:51:19 5 may be there in Sites Valley right now that would be
18:51:23 6 impacted, you know, by this particular project.

18:51:28 7 And you know, there are an awful lot of
18:51:31 8 conservation initiatives here in California, but they
18:51:35 9 tend to have one characteristic, and that is that they
18:51:38 10 tend to be in the hills and the mountains.

18:51:41 11 And the areas that are not there included are
18:51:47 12 California's valleys. And these valleys like Sites
18:51:51 13 Valley were identified by the World Wildlife Fund as
18:51:54 14 being among, if not the most critically endangered
18:51:59 15 ecosystem in all of north America.

18:52:03 16 So this is a pretty serious thing we're
18:52:06 17 contemplating here. This is a valley. And you know,
18:52:10 18 we talk about concern about sea level rise flooding
18:52:17 19 into the Central Valley and maybe impacting coastal
18:52:21 20 regions, coastal valleys.

18:52:24 21 But here we're talking about taking an
18:52:26 22 existing, pretty natural valley and deliberately
18:52:30 23 flooding it, taking away all the values that it has and
18:52:34 24 burying them under many, many feet of water.

18:52:37 25 Now, I used to do a lot of plant surveys, but

18:52:41 1 I'm too gimpy to do them now. But I did go up into
18:52:45 2 Sites Valley, and I looked around a little bit.
18:52:47 3 And, you know, I don't just look at plants.
18:52:49 4 I look at bird life, too. And I've been -- I'm 77
18:52:53 5 years old. I've been looking at birds in California
18:52:56 6 for a long time.
18:52:58 7 There's an interesting family of birds,
18:53:00 8 famous singers, that has the Skylark in it, for
18:53:04 9 example, called the Lark family. And there are
18:53:07 10 hundreds of species all through Africa, Europe, Asia.
18:53:11 11 But here in North America, we only have one
18:53:14 12 species. But it's a pretty special species, because of
18:53:17 13 all the Larks in the world, all these hundreds of Lark
18:53:20 14 species, it's by far the most beautiful.
18:53:23 15 And I've seen these -- it's called the Horned
18:53:26 16 Lark. And I've seen Horned Larks here and there in
18:53:30 17 California for many, many years, but never very many.
18:53:33 18 But when I went up to Sites Valley, I saw a
18:53:36 19 pretty remarkable thing. I saw a thousand times more
18:53:40 20 Horned Larks in just an hour in Sites Valley than I'd
18:53:44 21 seen in a whole lifetime of exploring California.
18:53:47 22 Now, I'm not claiming that the Horned Lark is
18:53:50 23 an endangered species or listed species. But you know,
18:53:54 24 common species can be threatened, too. The most
18:53:59 25 common, abundant bird in North America was the

18:54:01 1 Passenger Pigeon, and it was one of the first to go
18:54:04 2 extinct.

18:54:05 3 There's thousands of caribou up on the north
18:54:08 4 slope of Alaska. There's concern because there's a
18:54:10 5 proposal to drill in the main part of their calving
18:54:14 6 ground that could impact this whole large population.

18:54:18 7 So to find this level of abundant life here
18:54:22 8 in this valley was pretty remarkable. And it may not
18:54:26 9 ever be captured in your environmental impact report,
18:54:30 10 even in all those volumes. But I think it's something
18:54:33 11 to be concerned about.

18:54:34 12 And there's an awful lot other things. I
18:54:36 13 don't know how adequate all your surveys were, but some
18:54:39 14 of these things need to be looked at, and they should
18:54:43 15 at least be mentioned in the summary.

18:54:45 16 As far as I could see, they're not mentioned
18:54:47 17 in the summary. If they exist at all, they're buried
18:54:50 18 in one of those volumes that most of us have not read
18:54:54 19 all the way through.

18:54:55 20 So looking at it as it is now, you have a
18:54:58 21 huge resource in this unflooded, beautiful Sites
18:55:04 22 Valley, one of those rare things. There aren't many
18:55:08 23 valleys like that in all of California.

18:55:10 24 And that valley, as far as I'm concerned,
18:55:12 25 unflooded, is worth a heck of a lot more than a dam.

18:55:17 1
2
3
4
18:55:27 5
18:55:27 6
18:55:39 7
18:55:43 8
18:55:46 9
18:55:50 10
18:55:52 11
18:55:55 12
18:55:57 13
18:55:59 14
18:56:03 15
18:56:06 16
18:56:10 17
18:56:14 18
18:56:17 19
18:56:19 20
18:56:23 21
18:56:26 22
18:56:27 23
18:56:31 24
18:56:34 25

Thank you very much.

--o0o--

STATEMENT BY LUCAS ROSS MERZ

--o0o--

MR. MERZ: Good evening. I want to talk to the public as well the board or the representatives up here, because one of the main reasons that we're having this meeting is because it's our tax dollars, right, that are going to pay for a lot of this project. And we're talking about the whole California spread of how we're going to fix this.

I don't want to echo all the concerns that Steve went over very eloquently. It's kind of been stated this document is knowingly inadequate because it had to meet a timeline. Right. They had to get the document done to qualify for funds from Proposition 1.

So a lot of these surveys and other things may not have been done in time or done adequately. So we're viewing a document that's going to need more work, and it's going to need a lot of engagement.

At the same time, we're talking about the Bay Delta water quality plan, updates and how we're going manage the delta. We're also working on the new conservation strategy, the flood planning update.

18:56:35 1 So the central valley flood planning update
 18:56:38 2 in 2017 adopted a conservation strategy. And that's a
 18:56:43 3 whole 'nother piece to this puzzle: Storing water on
 18:56:49 4 flood plains, storing water in valleys, how we create
 18:56:54 5 supply benefit for California in an already overly
 18:56:57 6 applicated system. So fixing this supply issue in
 18:57:00 7 California is much more dynamic when dealing with
 18:57:04 8 climate change and just this one project.

18:57:08 9 And so I think when it comes to Sites, one of
 18:57:10 10 the frustrating pieces is not knowing the details. And
 18:57:13 11 we've already spent over 20 million dollars on this
 18:57:16 12 project since 1957.

18:57:19 13 And so when we've already created an
 18:57:22 14 administrative draft EIR from the Department of Water
 18:57:26 15 Resources, we've worked on this project, looked at this
 18:57:28 16 project for a very long time, it is frustrating for
 18:57:31 17 those groups, the Sacramento River Preservation Trust,
 18:57:34 18 that works for you and all of us to make sure that the
 18:57:38 19 best project is built that benefits all of us, that
 18:57:41 20 helps us have healthy streams, have productive
 18:57:44 21 agriculture and leave a better place for the next
 18:57:48 22 generation of California.

18:57:49 23 The Sites project had different alternatives.
 18:57:52 24 I've been hearing about this project since I was born.
 18:57:55 25 I was born and raised in Northern California. It was

18:57:59	1	going to have power, maybe not have power. We finally
18:58:01	2	now know what this project is.
18:58:03	3	So we've heard about the project for a very
18:58:06	4	long time. This is our first time to really get our
18:58:08	5	teeth into a document and look at different versions of
18:58:11	6	a defined project and try to figure out what its true
18:58:14	7	impacts will be.
18:58:15	8	And that's the hard part right now, is
18:58:19	9	there's dollars on the table. There's other competing
18:58:22	10	projects throughout the state that may have less
18:58:25	11	benefit to the state of California. And we're going to
18:58:28	12	have to work really hard as a community and as partners
18:58:36	13	to meet.
18:58:36	14	Having a Joint Powers Authority allows for
18:58:39	15	streamlining of a lot of different elements within this
18:58:44	16	process, although I do feel that we have not been
18:58:48	17	approached as much as has been talked about in the past
18:58:51	18	with regard to trying to bring it to us ahead of time
18:58:54	19	on this document.
18:58:56	20	And now we're going to have to really dive in
18:58:58	21	and put a lot of time into this to try to make sure
18:59:01	22	that the soil scientists, the rare plants concerns, the
18:59:04	23	potential damage to our fish food run, right, our fall
18:59:05	24	run of salmon. The Sacramento River is one of only
18:59:09	25	five rivers in the world that has four runs of Shinook

18:59:14	1	Salmon.
18:59:14	2	We live in one of the most beautiful valleys
18:59:17	3	in the world. And our river is already forever
18:59:20	4	changed. And so these flow conversations about
18:59:23	5	instream flows -- how many of the people have been on
18:59:26	6	the river in a boat? Jet boat, powerboat, trip boat,
18:59:31	7	canoe, kayak?
18:59:32	8	You reduce the flow by 20 percent, some of
18:59:35	9	those get a lot more dangerous. Some of those places
18:59:38	10	are going to have a lot more gravel bars, a lot more
18:59:40	11	sandbars.
18:59:40	12	The trust was formed in 1984 to defeat a
18:59:44	13	project from Chico to Red Bluff that wanted to cut down
18:59:47	14	the riparian lands and habitats on the outside bends of
18:59:51	15	the river between Chico and Red Bluff. And it had an
18:59:55	16	inadequate biological opinion. And from that has
18:59:59	17	spurred a lot of amazing things, including the
19:00:02	18	Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge.
19:00:04	19	So in talking dollars and trying to make
19:00:06	20	sense and move forward and do the right thing for
19:00:08	21	California, I think we also need to look at potential
19:00:10	22	impacts to the millions and millions of dollars we've
19:00:13	23	spent on acquiring public lands to allow for this
19:00:17	24	geomorphology, this living river to move and to create
19:00:21	25	habitats that we fish and hike and camp and hunt and

19:00:24 1 enjoy. And that's our public benefits. It also gives
19:00:27 2 a lot to the ecosystem.

19:00:33 3 So I really want to just -- with regard to
19:00:36 4 Sites right now, it's exciting. I personally -- and
19:00:39 5 with our board, we've looked at the other -- you know,
19:00:42 6 all 12 projects.

19:00:44 7 This has significant potential impacts. It
19:00:48 8 also has significant potential benefit to cold water
19:00:51 9 pool, to other things. We're discussed that in
19:00:54 10 partnership and in meetings over years.

19:00:56 11 And so right now, we really just want to get
19:00:58 12 down to the brass tacks, be able to see how things are
19:01:02 13 really going to work and get those details. Because
19:01:04 14 it's hard to want to buy a truck if you can't see how
19:01:09 15 it runs. They can show you the engine. But if it's
19:01:12 16 not in the truck, and you can't start it, that's a
19:01:15 17 truck with an engine out here.

19:01:17 18 So trying to put everything into this
19:01:19 19 project, understand how it's going to work, what
19:01:23 20 potential water quality concerns are, and how it's
19:01:25 21 going to benefit the state for those public dollars
19:01:26 22 that will go into this project.

19:01:28 23 We look forward to submitting written
19:01:32 24 comments and continuing to work with the JPA and the
19:01:34 25 bureau and all the other partners.

19:01:42 1 I think that flood plains are really the
19:01:46 2 future. And so this is one part. But you will see
19:01:50 3 that in California, we're in this newer era where flood
19:01:56 4 plain storage as well as surface storage, because it's
19:01:59 5 in the short term. But flood plain storage is what
19:02:03 6 we'd like to see.

19:02:04 7 And if this is going to impact opportunities
19:02:06 8 for other pieces of the puzzle, for economic benefit,
19:02:10 9 environmental benefit, and the long-term goals of the
19:02:13 10 state of California with how we're going to work with
19:02:16 11 our water resources, then we'll have to deal with that
19:02:19 12 in the details.

19:02:20 13 So thank you so much for comment period and
19:02:23 14 the time. The extension was wonderful. It is a big
19:02:26 15 document, so we really appreciated that. And thank you
19:02:29 16 all for being here, because it's very important.

17

18

--o0o--

19

STATEMENT BY JIM BROBECK

20

--o0o--

19:02:38 21 MR. BROBECK: My name is Jim Brobeck. I'm
19:02:40 22 the water policy analyst for Aqua Alliance. We're
19:02:45 23 located in Chico.

19:02:46 24 The DWR 2013 preliminary administrative draft
19:02:47 25 percents discusses in some detail the saline, selenium,

19:02:52 1 aluminum, arsenic, copper, iron manganese, mercury,
19:02:54 2 nickel and phosphorus concentrations that are mobilized
19:02:58 3 by water and found in Antelope Valley streams.

19:03:00 4 Page 27 of chapter seven of this EIR/EIS
19:03:06 5 mentions, quote, "DWR observed alluminum, arsenic,
19:03:09 6 copper, iron, manganese, mercury, nickel and phosphorus
19:03:13 7 in Funks Creek and in Stone Corral Creek near Sites
19:03:17 8 station during intermittent water quality sampling.
19:03:21 9 The concentrations appear to be higher during and
19:03:24 10 immediately following storm events," unquote.

19:03:27 11 The Sites draft omits a detailed analysis of
19:03:31 12 the obvious presence of toxic minerals that exist in
19:03:34 13 the area of inundation. These substances are common in
19:03:38 14 the geological setting that is on the western edge of
19:03:40 15 the central valley.

19:03:41 16 The Sites draft certainly describes some
19:03:44 17 existing concentrations of these substances in the
19:03:47 18 creeks that gently flow out of the primary area, but
19:03:51 19 fail to analyze how inundation and evaporative
19:03:56 20 enrichment can cause elevated concentrations in
19:03:57 21 terminal water bodies, downstream ecosystems and
19:04:00 22 irrigated landscapes.

19:04:04 23 I would like to site the November 17, 2017,
19:04:08 24 comment letter sent to you by Jerry Bowles. He's the
19:04:11 25 former chief of water quality of the northern district

19:04:14 1 of the Department of Water Resources.

19:04:16 2 Quote, "High concentrations of metals that
19:04:19 3 exceed water quality criteria exist in source waters to
19:04:25 4 the proposed project," unquote. Mr. Bowles provides
19:04:27 5 data from the Department of Water Resources Water data
19:04:30 6 library that show high concentrations of toxic metals
19:04:36 7 that can be expected during the high flow months of
19:04:38 8 winter, when diversions would be occurring to the
19:04:41 9 proposed reservoir.

19:04:42 10 The high concentrations of metals in the
19:04:44 11 source water will adversely impact Sites Reservoir
19:04:48 12 water quality for most, if not all, the proposed
19:04:51 13 beneficial uses of the stored water.

19:04:53 14 These concentrations of metal in the river
19:04:55 15 that exceed water quality criteria cannot be regulated
19:04:59 16 by governmental entities, since they are natural
19:05:02 17 occurrences.

19:05:02 18 But once confined artificially in a
19:05:06 19 reservoir, subjected to increased contamination through
19:05:09 20 onsite soluble salts and metals and concentrated by
19:05:14 21 cumulative evaporative enrichment, any releases in the
19:05:18 22 reservoir will likely be subject to review by water
19:05:22 23 quality regulatory agencies to ensure that such
19:05:25 24 releases do not adversely affect downstream resources.

19:05:29 25 The contribution of additional metal loads

19:05:32 1 from summer releases into the river from Sites could
 19:05:35 2 cause concentrations of metals in the Sacramento River
 19:05:38 3 to exceed criteria and standards, or at least be
 19:05:41 4 subject to the Water Board anti-degradation policy that
 19:05:45 5 prohibits releases that can cause criteria or standards
 19:05:49 6 to be exceeded by downstream input.

19:05:56 7 Soil salinization is a global phenomenon that
 19:06:00 8 threatens the sustainability of agriculture production
 19:06:04 9 at a time when food demand is increasing.

19:06:07 10 Chapter 7 of the draft explains that, quote,
 19:06:09 11 "Saline water has been observed to seep from
 19:06:12 12 underground salt springs within the proposed inundation
 19:06:14 13 area of Sites Reservoir. The deeper water in the salt
 19:06:17 14 lake appears to be approximately 15 acres based on
 19:06:21 15 observations in 2017. The depth of the water has not
 19:06:24 16 been monitored."

19:06:27 17 Chapter 7 of the Sites draft admits the
 19:06:31 18 saline water will increase the salinity of the water in
 19:06:35 19 storage and introduces an inaccurate estimate on the
 19:06:38 20 impacts by grossly estimating the volume of salt lake
 19:06:41 21 and assuming that the amount of salt that is springing
 19:06:44 22 from the ground under current uninundated conditions
 19:06:49 23 will not change.

19:06:50 24 Not only have the proponents failed to
 19:06:53 25 accurately survey the depth of hydrodynamics of salt

19:06:55 1 lake, they failed to imagine how much more acrid the
19:06:58 2 saline springs would be remember if the reservoir was
19:07:01 3 inundated.

19:07:02 4 Proponents are willing to admit that the
19:07:05 5 saline damage is worth investing money and effort into
19:07:07 6 the grouting of the salt springs that filled the salt
19:07:10 7 lake, but they admit their efforts may be ineffective.

19:07:14 8 The draft explains, in the section titled
19:07:17 9 "Irreversible or Irretrievable Resource Commitments"
19:07:21 10 that, quote, the permanent conversion of a vegetative
19:07:26 11 landscape to the project and its associated facilities
19:07:29 12 would be a major change in the Landscape.

19:07:32 13 Reservoir construction and operation always
19:07:35 14 results in denuding the areas of inundation. The draft
19:07:40 15 mentions that the vegetative landscape would be
19:07:43 16 converted without disclosing the obvious. There will
19:07:46 17 be an intentional and total elimination of vegetation
19:07:50 18 that currently serves to reduce storm run-off erosion.

19:07:55 19 The analysis must disclose the inevitable
19:07:58 20 increase in erosion of soils that are exposed during
19:08:01 21 the filling and refilling of the reservoir. The draft
19:08:04 22 fails to disclose the toxic mineral contents of the
19:08:08 23 soils in the footprint of the reservoir that will be
19:08:12 24 exposed to repeated and unmitigated storm run-off
19:08:16 25 erosion.

19:08:16 1
19:08:19 2
19:08:23 3
19:08:27 4
19:08:31 5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

The Sites draft must survey the project area to determine the presence or absence of naturally occurring contaminants and describe how the project might mobilize contamination deposits that occur in this region.

--o0o--


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing proceedings in the within-entitled cause were reported at the time and place therein named; that said proceedings were reported by me, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter and a disinterested person, and were thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said cause of action, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said cause of action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of December, 2017.


Vickey L. Benson
CSR # 8076

19:08:33