

SITES  
RESERVOIR  
PROJECT

**CERTIFIED  
ORIGINAL**

**RDEIR/SDEIS  
VIRTUAL  
PUBLIC MEETING**

Wednesday, December 15, 2021

6:00 P.M.

Jennifer Geraty  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License No. 13350

**J.D. COURT REPORTING**  
30343 CANWOOD ST., STE. 208A  
AGOURA HILLS, CA 91301  
[818] 851-9910

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

Sara Katz,  
Meeting Moderator

Aly Forsythe,  
Sites Environmental Planning and Permitting  
Manager

Vanessa King,  
Bureau of Reclamation

Sarah Rossetto,  
Q&A Monitor

Mike Hendrick,  
Fisheries Biologist

1 Wednesday, December 15, 2021 at 6 p.m.  
2 Maxwell, California 95955

3 --oOo--

4  
5 SARA KATZ:

6 Good evening. The public meeting for  
7 the Sites Reservoir Revised Draft Environmental  
8 Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Statement  
9 will begin in four minutes.

10 Good evening. Welcome to the public meeting  
11 for the Sites Reservoir Revised Draft Environmental  
12 Impact Report/Supplement Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement. My name is Sara Katz, and I will serve as  
14 the meeting moderator tonight.

15 A Revised Draft Environmental Impact  
16 Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
17 is also referred to by its acronym, RDEIR/SDEIS, so you  
18 may hear us using these terms, or even Revised Draft  
19 EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS throughout tonight's meeting.

20 The purpose of this meeting is to provide an  
21 overview of the project and the draft environmental  
22 analysis, as well as to answer questions and accept  
23 official public comments on the Revised Draft  
24 EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS.

25 I will provide an overview of the meeting

1 agenda right now, before I introduce the Sites Project  
2 Authority and Bureau of Reclamation representatives.

3 First up will be the project presentation. At  
4 the end of the project presentation, we will review how  
5 to participate in the meeting. We will have a question  
6 and answer session, followed by formal public comment.  
7 The public meeting will then conclude.

8 A few housekeeping items: For your awareness,  
9 this meeting is being recorded, so we can post the  
10 meeting presentation later on the Sites project website  
11 for people who were unable to join. Closed captioning  
12 is also available during this meeting. If it doesn't  
13 appear automatically, you can click the CC icon, which  
14 is likely at the bottom of your screen. As we are in an  
15 online environment, we may experience some glitches or  
16 even temporary issues. Please bear with us and we will  
17 work through any unforeseen technical issues as swiftly  
18 as possible. And, finally, we ask that you hold all of  
19 your questions until the end of the project  
20 presentation. Once the presentation concludes, we will  
21 begin the question and answer session.

22 I'd now like to introduce Sites Environmental  
23 Planning and Permitting Manager, Ali Forsythe, who will  
24 be delivering the project presentation. We also have a  
25 representative from the Bureau of Reclamation, Vanessa

1 King.

2 ALI FORSYTHE: Thanks, Sara. Sorry about  
3 that. As Sara mentioned, I'm Ali Forsythe. I lead the  
4 environment planning and permitting efforts for the  
5 Sites Authority.

6 I'll lead us through about a 30-minute  
7 presentation before we get into the question and answer  
8 session. We'll start out with an overview of the Sites  
9 Reservoir Project. I'll then provide an overview of the  
10 California Environmental Quality Act and the National  
11 Environmental Policy Act requirements. And I'll finish  
12 out the presentation with an overview of the Revised  
13 Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, including an overview  
14 of the findings of the document and how to provide  
15 comments.

16 As Sara mentioned, we'll have a question and  
17 answer session at the end of the presentation, so you  
18 can provide your comments in the question and answer  
19 box. We'll also answer -- excuse me -- we'll answer  
20 those questions at the end of the presentation.

21 I suspect most of you on this call know this,  
22 but I wanted to start out with a high level overview of  
23 what Sites reservoir is. Sites is a proposed off-stream  
24 reservoir, west of the community of Maxwell, California  
25 in the Sacramento Valley. Being off-stream, the

1 reservoir would impound two local, intermittent creeks,  
2 but would not dam a major river or block salmon  
3 migration.

4 Sites would be filled with water diverted from  
5 the Sacramento River at the existing Red Bluff Pumping  
6 Plant and Hamilton City Pump Station during high flow  
7 conditions. You can see the locations of these two  
8 facilities on the top of the map on your screen there.  
9 This water would be conveyed down to the new Sites  
10 Reservoir using the existing Tehama Colusa Canal and the  
11 GCID main canal, and then water would be stored in the  
12 new reservoir for later use by cities, farms, and the  
13 environment.

14 Sites is being funded by a diverse group, the  
15 State, through Proposition 1, the Federal government,  
16 along with public water agencies located throughout the  
17 state. These funding organizations and the people of  
18 the State of California would receive the water supply  
19 benefits that result from the project, which includes  
20 environmental, recreation, and flood control benefits.

21 From the back to back record breaking dry  
22 years of 2014 and '15 to the nearly record breaking wet  
23 year of 2017, we can all see the huge variability in our  
24 climate in California. And the science indicates that  
25 this variability is going to continue into the future.

1 Sites is one tool in what should be a really vast  
2 toolbox of measures and actions to help restore  
3 flexibility, reliability, and resiliency to our state in  
4 the face of climate change.

5 Sites Reservoir would be built, owned, and  
6 operated by the Sites Project Authority.

7 Sites Reservoir isn't new. It's been  
8 discussed for many years now, originally as a State or  
9 Federally-owned reservoir, and now led by the Sites  
10 Project Authority. Back in 2017, the Sites Authority  
11 and Reclamation released a Draft EIR/EIS for the  
12 project, and the project envisioned in 2017 -- in the  
13 2017 document was larger, had a greater diversion  
14 capacity, including another intake on the Sacramento  
15 River at Delevan, along with a large hydroelectric  
16 pump-back generation facility. This was essentially the  
17 project formulated by the State and Federal government  
18 in the previous decade.

19 Starting in 2019 and continuing into 2020, the  
20 Authority made a number of refinements to the project.  
21 These were completed to reduce the cost of the project,  
22 but also to reduce the environmental effects, and we've  
23 heard you. A number of these refinements were also made  
24 in response to comments received on the 2017 document,  
25 along with discussions with tribal governments,

1 non-governmental organizations, and State and Federal  
2 regulatory agencies.

3 In this timeframe, the Authority considered 16  
4 new and modified configurations to the project. These  
5 modifications included changes in facility footprints,  
6 such as making the reservoir smaller, changes in  
7 operational criteria, which we'll discuss on a later  
8 slide, changes in conveyance and removal of the Delevan  
9 pipeline, which did reduce the overall Project's ability  
10 to divert water off the Sacramento River from about  
11 6,000 cubic feet per second to 3,900 cubic feet per  
12 second, or by about a third. Along with reliance on  
13 existing local infrastructure and the addition of the  
14 Dunnigan pipeline and use of the Colusa Basin Drain for  
15 new releases from the reservoir. The pump generation  
16 facility was also removed from the project.

17 These changes in the project in 2019/2020  
18 resulted in new or different project footprints and new  
19 or different project operations. Really, new  
20 alternatives to the project. As these alternatives were  
21 not previously analyzed in the 2017 document, the  
22 Authority and Reclamation decided to revise, supplement,  
23 and recirculate the previously released EIR/EIS.

24 Preparation of this Revised Draft  
25 EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS allows the Authority and



1 Reclamation the ability to address the changes made to  
2 the project, along with updating things in the 2017  
3 document that have also changed, such as our modeling  
4 baseline, the existing conditions, and some of our  
5 cumulative projects. In making these updates, the  
6 Authority and Reclamation also took into consideration  
7 the comments received on the 2017 document.

8           There are three action alternatives considered  
9 in this Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. This  
10 table provides a summary of them, and we'll walk through  
11 the footprint components for each of these in the next  
12 few slides.

13           The alternatives vary based on a few key  
14 factors. For local community, there are three -- excuse  
15 me -- there are different reservoir sizes, with  
16 Alternative 1 and 3 having a 1.5 million acre-foot  
17 reservoir. This would result in about 13,000 acres or  
18 20 square mile reservoir footprint. And Alternative 2  
19 would have a slightly smaller reservoir, at 1.3 million  
20 acre feet, with about a 12,000 acre or 19 square mile  
21 reservoir footprint. In addition, and from the local  
22 community perspective, the alternatives vary based on  
23 the route to the west side of the reservoir, with  
24 Alternative 1 and 3 having a bridge across the  
25 reservoir, and Alternative 2 having a road around the

1 southern end of the reservoir.

2 Alternatives also vary based on where water is  
3 released from the reservoir, back into the Sacramento  
4 River. Alternative 1 and 3 release water through the  
5 Dunnigan pipeline to the Colusa Basin Drain, which flows  
6 back into the Sacramento River at Knights Landing. And  
7 Alternative 2 extends the Dunnigan pipeline to the  
8 Sacramento River and releases water directly back to the  
9 river.

10 All alternatives include possible operational  
11 exchanges with Reclamation to benefit the cold water  
12 pool in Shasta and salmonids in the upper Sacramento  
13 River system. But the alternatives vary, based on how  
14 much Reclamation would invest in the reservoir.  
15 Alternative 1 includes a range of no investments, up to  
16 7 percent. Alternative 2 includes no investment by  
17 Reclamation. And Alternative 3 includes up to  
18 25 percent investment by Reclamation in the project.

19 The document also includes a no action  
20 alternative, or what would happen if the project were  
21 not built.

22 This slide is a map from the -- both the  
23 Executive Summary and the project description chapters  
24 and shows the project facilities in the area of the  
25 reservoir for Alternatives 1 and 3.

1                   Water would be diverted for the project at the  
2 existing Red Bluff Pumping Plant and Hamilton City Pump  
3 Station during high flow conditions. This water would  
4 be conveyed to the new Sites Reservoir, using the  
5 existing Tehama Colusa Canal and the GCID main canal.  
6 Most of these facilities are off this map, but you can  
7 see the two existing canals in yellow running  
8 north/south on this map in front of you. Water would be  
9 pumped up into the new reservoir, which would be 1.5  
10 million acre feet, from either the existing Funks  
11 Reservoir or the new Terminal Regulating Reservoir-East.  
12 This would require two new pump-generating plants,  
13 associated pipelines, and power facilities.

14                   In these two alternatives, you can see the  
15 bridge across the reservoir, which continues to connect  
16 the communities of Maxwell and Lodoga, over to the west,  
17 which is shown in pink. There are two main dams on  
18 Funks and Stone Corral Creeks, and a number of saddle  
19 dams and dikes on the northern end of the reservoir.

20                   There would be a number of road improvements  
21 and realignments in both -- in all of the alternatives,  
22 both for construction access and to ensure landowners in  
23 the area can continue to access their property.

24                   All of the alternatives include three new  
25 recreation areas, two shown in green on this map

1 adjacent to the reservoir footprint, along with a new  
2 boat ranch -- excuse me -- boat-launched ramp, and day  
3 use area on the west side of the reservoir.

4 This map shows the release facilities for  
5 Alternatives 1 and 3. Water would come down the Tehama  
6 Colusa canal, seen there in yellow in the left-hand side  
7 of the map, and would be released into the new Dunnigan  
8 pipeline, shown in pink. The Dunnigan pipeline would  
9 cross Interstate 5 and the Richie Brothers Auction Yard  
10 and then terminate over at the Colusa Basin Drain.

11 Alternative 2 includes many of the same  
12 facilities as Alternatives 1 and 3. However, the  
13 location of the Terminal Regulating Reservoir is a  
14 little bit different in Alternative 2. It's located on  
15 the west side of the GCID main canal. Also notable is  
16 the extension of Huffmaster Road into the South Road to  
17 provide access from Maxwell over to Lodoga. There would  
18 be no bridge in Alternative 2.

19 The main dams would be a little smaller in  
20 this alternative and the -- as the reservoir is a little  
21 smaller, and there would be fewer saddle dams and dikes  
22 in the northern end of the reservoir.

23 This map shows the release facilities for  
24 Alternative 2. Similar to the other alternatives, water  
25 would come in -- or excuse me -- would come down the

1 Tehama Colusa canal, seen there in yellow, and be  
2 released into the New Dunnigan pipeline, also in yellow.  
3 But in this alternative, the Dunnigan pipeline would  
4 extend to the Sacramento River. There would be the  
5 ability to release some water into the Colusa Basin  
6 Drain for environmental purposes, but most of the  
7 releases would be directly to the Sacramento River in  
8 this alternative.

9 As I mentioned on the maps, all of the  
10 alternatives include three new recreation areas. These  
11 would include camp sites, picnic sites, hiking trails,  
12 and boat launch facilities. The Authority intends to  
13 phase the approach to building these recreation areas to  
14 match the interests.

15 And all of the alternatives would provide  
16 flood control benefits to Maxwell and adjacent  
17 agricultural, including reducing flooding of Interstate  
18 5 in a 100-year flood event. This, of course, is  
19 important to the local economy and community, but also  
20 importantly, regionally, and state-wide to reduce  
21 flooding of Interstate 5, a major thoroughfare for our  
22 state.

23 There's a tremendous effort underway to  
24 evaluate and develop the project. We are currently  
25 targeting the end of next year to complete the

1 environmental review process. Our permitting and water  
2 rights efforts are underway and we expect to complete  
3 our key permits in mid-2023.

4 There's also quite an engineering design  
5 process for the project of this magnitude, with a lot of  
6 involvement and approval from the Division of Safety of  
7 Dams. We expect to complete all of the engineering  
8 design efforts in late 2025.

9 Construction would start in mid-2024 and would  
10 be sequenced over time. We'd likely build roads and the  
11 bridge, if that's selected first, both to get  
12 construction equipment to the site, but also because we  
13 need to keep a route from Maxwell over to Lodoga open  
14 during construction. Things like main dams, saddle dams  
15 and dikes would likely follow once the roads were in  
16 place to access the construction sites. And things like  
17 the terminal regulating reservoir, pipelines, including  
18 the Dunnigan pipeline would follow later in the  
19 construction period.

20 So some folks may be wondering why we've  
21 prepared for this Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft  
22 EIS. We are doing this to comply with the California  
23 Environmental Quality Act, generally abbreviated as  
24 CEQA, and the -- the National Environmental Policy Act,  
25 NEPA. CEQA is a state law and requires that all

1 discretionary approvals by state agencies -- excuse  
2 me -- CEQA is a state law and applies to all  
3 discretionary approvals by state agencies. Thus, the  
4 Authority has to comply with CEQA prior to moving  
5 forward with the project.

6 NEPA is a federal law and applies to all major  
7 federal undertakings, and, thus, Reclamation has to  
8 comply with NEPA prior to deciding to invest in the  
9 project or to issue approvals for the project.

10 Both CEQA and NEPA require that agencies  
11 analyze the environmental effects of actions that they  
12 are planning to undertake to inform decision makers and  
13 the public of the effects of these actions. They both  
14 foster informed, transparent decision-making and  
15 encourage public participation in the decision-making  
16 process.

17 An EIR is required under CEQA and an EIS is  
18 required under NEPA when there will be one or more  
19 significant or adverse impacts on the environment. The  
20 EIR/EIS dis -- discloses -- excuse me -- the  
21 environmental effects of a project identifies possible  
22 ways to minimize those effects and describes reasonable  
23 alternatives to the project.

24 The Authority is the lead agency for the EIR  
25 under CEQA, as the Authority will decide whether to

1 build and operate the project.

2 And Reclamation is the lead agency for the EIS  
3 under NEPA, as Reclamation will decide whether to  
4 provide funding for the project, and will also decide  
5 whether to issue project permits, such as a land lease  
6 and a water wheeling agreement, commonly called a Warren  
7 Act contract under the Reclamation law.

8 The EIR/EIS project began -- or excuse me --  
9 the EIR/EIS process began back in 20 -- 2001, when  
10 Reclamation and the California Department of Water  
11 Resources issued a Notice of Intent and Notice of  
12 Preparation, respectively, for the project. The  
13 Authority issued a second Notice of Preparation in 2017,  
14 when we took over the lead agency role from DWR.

15 We are now at the green line you see on this  
16 slide -- the public and agency review of the Revised  
17 Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. Your comments are  
18 very important to the process and very important to us.  
19 They will help us continue to refine the project and  
20 reduce environmental effects.

21 After the public review period ends, the  
22 Authority and Reclamation will prepare the final  
23 EIR/EIS, which will include revisions to the project  
24 based on all comments received. The final document will  
25 also include responses to all of the comments received.



1                   And after the final EIR/EIS is released, the  
2 Authority and Reclamation, separately, will decide  
3 whether to carry out their respective portions of the  
4 project and complete the associated agency decision  
5 documents and noticing.

6                   The Revised EIR/EIS is quite a supple -- or  
7 excuse me -- quite an extensive document. Chapters 1  
8 through 4 include the introductory materials, the  
9 project description, and an overview of the analysis.  
10 These are really the foundational chapters that set up  
11 the rest of the document.

12                   The document includes an analysis of  
13 environmental resources in 26 chapters and 73  
14 corresponding appendices. The last few chapters include  
15 analyses like cumulative, growth inducement, and other  
16 required sections.

17                   When preparing an EIR or EIS, the lead agency  
18 must consider the direct and indirect effects of a  
19 project. Impacts are determined by comparing to  
20 baseline physical conditions. The baseline or existing  
21 conditions in the case of CEQA and the No Action  
22 Alternative in the case of NEPA.

23                   CEQA and NEPA use slightly different  
24 terminology when assessing impacts, and this terminology  
25 is shown on the screen in front of you.

1           There were nine resource areas, really,  
2 chapters in the document that had no effect, no adverse  
3 effects, or less than significant impacts for the entire  
4 area for all of the components analyzed in that chapter.  
5 These include fluvial geomorphology, groundwater,  
6 minerals, recreation, energy, noise, population and  
7 housing, public services, and public health.

8           There were three resource areas that have  
9 impacts that require mitigation, but the resulting  
10 impacts, the impacts after mitigation is applied were  
11 less than significant or not adverse. These include  
12 aquatic biological resources, which is our fisheries  
13 chapter, greenhouse gas emissions, and Indian trust  
14 assets.

15           And, finally, there were a number of resource  
16 areas with at least one impact in the chapter would be  
17 significant and unavoidable or adverse and substantial.  
18 Keep in mind that -- that this -- that -- excuse me --  
19 keep in mind that it's not that every impact in these  
20 chapters is substantial, but at least one was. These  
21 are listed on the screen in front of you and include  
22 surface water quality, vegetation and wetland resources,  
23 wildlife resources, geology and soils, land use,  
24 agriculture, traffic, air quality, cultural resources,  
25 tribal cultural resources, visual resources, and

1 environmental justice and socioeconomics. Many of the  
2 individual impacts that were substantial in these  
3 chapters are related to construction of the project.

4 I'd now like to highlight a few analyses and  
5 chapters that we know are of substantial interest. The  
6 first is water quality. And there's quite a bit on this  
7 slide, so let's walk through this.

8 For water quality, we've analyzed the quality  
9 of inflow or source water, including the Sacramento  
10 River and the local creeks, Funks and Stone Corral  
11 Creeks. We also took a look at in reservoir processes  
12 and then analyzed release water quality to different  
13 locations downstream of the reservoir. We completed  
14 this analysis for metals, pesticides, temperature, and  
15 also looked at things like the potential for harmful  
16 algal blooms and invasive aquatic vegetation.

17 Based on this analysis, we found that there  
18 would be no substantial increase in salinity and  
19 temperature in or downstream of the reservoir. This  
20 includes releases to the Sacramento River, and no  
21 violation of water quality objectives. We also found  
22 that levels of nutrients, organic carbon, dissolved  
23 oxygen in releases would not violate water quality  
24 standards. Harmful algal blooms have been in the news  
25 quite a bit this past year, and we do expect to have

1 these at Sites. The mechanisms for what drives these is  
2 not well understood at this time.

3 We would address these through monitoring and  
4 public notification, similar to what -- how they are  
5 addressed at numerous reservoirs throughout the State.

6 The Project would also result in the potential  
7 for elevated concentrations of some metals and  
8 pesticides in the Yolo Bypass, really as a result of  
9 moving water from the Colusa Basin Drain into the Yolo  
10 Bypass. We included a monitoring program and would stop  
11 delivery of water into the Yolo Bypass if elevated  
12 concentrations of metals and pesticides were to occur.

13 The Project may also result in the potential  
14 for elevated concentrations of some metals in Stone  
15 Corral Creek downstream of the reservoir, really due to  
16 the depth from which water is withdrawn for releases  
17 into that -- that creek. We believe we can address this  
18 in the final design process.

19 We also found the potential for substantial  
20 increases in methylmercu -- excuse me -- in methyl --  
21 methylmercury concentrations. I wanted to say  
22 methylization, but we also found the potential for  
23 substantial increases in methylmercury concentrations  
24 downstream of the reservoir, primarily due to the  
25 initial filling of the reservoir, and for up to 10 years

1 after. We have a number of measures in the document to  
2 reduce the potential for methylization of mercury in the  
3 reservoir, but conservatively call this impact  
4 substantial and adverse.

5 The second area to highlight is fisheries, and  
6 I have focused this slide on diversion criteria and the  
7 effects to salmon and steelhead. The fisheries chapters  
8 cover a number of species, but I'm only focused on our  
9 salmonids here, really meaning our fish in the salmon  
10 family.

11 In consideration of the comments on the 2017  
12 document, and discussions with the fisheries resource  
13 agencies, the Authority has made a number of changes to  
14 the project diversion criteria since the 2017 document.  
15 The revised diversion criteria are reflected in the  
16 project description chapter, chapter 2, and include  
17 criteria for a Wilkins Slough bypass flow, pulse flow  
18 protection, and protection of the Fremont Weir notch  
19 project. The project would also only divert water when  
20 the Sacramento River is not fully appropriated, which is  
21 September 1st to June 15, and when the Delta is in  
22 "excess conditions" as determined by the Reclamation and  
23 DWR.

24 And I want to share that we are -- we're not  
25 saying that there is excess water or -- ex -- or water

1 is somehow wasted to the ocean when we say "excess  
2 conditions." We understand that the water in our river  
3 systems serve important ecological and water supply  
4 value for our State. "Excess conditions" is a term of  
5 art, so to speak, that identifies when there is water in  
6 the system in excess of the needs of the State Water  
7 Project and Central Valley Project.

8 And, finally, the project would only divert  
9 water when there are flows available above those needed  
10 to meet applicable laws, regulations, biological  
11 opinions, incidental take permits, and court orders in  
12 place at the time of diversion. These diversion  
13 criteria are quite a bit more protective and restrictive  
14 than -- than the criteria used in the 2017 Draft  
15 EIR/EIS, really to avoid and reduce the effects to the  
16 fishery.

17 In the Aquatics Resource Chapter, chapter 11,  
18 we have identified the potential for significant  
19 operational effects to salmonids, including steelhead.  
20 Although the diversion criteria are quite protective, we  
21 have included a mitigation measure to further those  
22 protections. The measure would require that if -- the  
23 project diversions from the Sacramento River in March  
24 through May of all water year types would not occur if  
25 flows in the river are or would be below 10,700 cubic

1 feet per second, as measured at Wilkins Slough. This  
2 mitigation measure effectively modifies the project  
3 diversion criteria in chapter 2 and makes those even  
4 more protective of the fishery.

5 There have been a number of concerns related  
6 to the project's potential effects to the Trinity River.  
7 I want to show you the project would not effect the  
8 Trinity River system or the Klamath.

9 It would not effect or change the operations  
10 of the Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division  
11 facilities, including those facilities in Clear Creek.  
12 Reclamation would condition to operate consistent with  
13 all applicable statutory and legal requirements and  
14 obligations. Really included, but not limited to the  
15 Trinity River Record of Decision, the 2017 Record of  
16 Decision for the long-term plan for the lower Klamath  
17 River, and the provisions of the Trinity River Division  
18 Central Valley Project Act of 1955. The Project would  
19 not result in changes to any of these statutory, legal,  
20 and contractual obligations of the Trinity River, and,  
21 thus would not affect the Trinity River system.

22 And last area I'd -- that I'd like to  
23 highlight is our efforts to reach out to Tribes. The  
24 Authority, as the State Agency is responsible for  
25 compliance with Assembly Bill 52 requirements, commonly

1 called AB52. As part of this effort, the Authority  
2 reached out to seven tribes in 2 -- 2020 these seven  
3 tribes are those that had traditional or cultural  
4 affiliation with lands in the project footprint. We  
5 sent hard copy letters to these tribes, emailed them,  
6 and also followed up with phone calls. Two tribes  
7 responded, and we are in on-going consultation with  
8 those tribes.

9           Although the project's changes in flows in the  
10 Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers are minor,  
11 we've reached out to seven additional tribes in 2021.  
12 These seven tribes are those that have -- are  
13 traditionally or culturally affiliated with locations  
14 where the project operations have the potential to  
15 change river flows. We sent hard copy letters to these  
16 tribes, emailed them, and also followed up with phone  
17 calls. To date, none of these tribes have responded.

18           These outreach efforts are detailed in chapter  
19 23 of the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS.

20           The Authority continues in AB52 consultation  
21 with the two tribes that have responded. Based on  
22 previous surveys, we know that there are Native American  
23 human remains and other tribal resources in the  
24 footprint of the reservoir. The Authority is working  
25 closely with the tribes that's have historically



1 inhabited the reservoir footprint to address these  
2 impacts to these resources and assure that Native  
3 American human remains -- remains are addressed  
4 consistent with the tribes' requests.

5 Reclamation as the Federal lead agency is  
6 responsible for compliance with the National Historic  
7 Preservation Act, typically called Section 106  
8 compliance. In 2021, Reclamation reached out to nine  
9 tribes. Very recently, one tribe has responded. But  
10 Reclamation has not received responses from the other  
11 eight tribes. Reclamation plans to reach out to these  
12 same tribes again in the coming year. As described in  
13 chapter 29 of the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft  
14 EIS, the project does not occur in an area that would  
15 affect Indian hunting or water rights, nor is the  
16 project on Indian trust lands.

17 We want to hear from you. Your comments are  
18 important to us and really help us through this process.  
19 Your comments help us continue to refine -- refine the  
20 project and make adjustments to continue to reduce  
21 environmental effects. Comments are best when they  
22 focus on a substantive comment -- content of the  
23 document. Comments should be limited to the  
24 environmental analysis in the Revised Draft  
25 EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, and all comments on the

1 document must be postmarked or received by 5 p.m.  
2 Pacific Standard Time on January 11th, 2022. The  
3 Authority and Reclamation will respond to all  
4 substantive comments received in the comment period in  
5 the final EIR/EIS.

6 And as a reminder on how to submit your  
7 comments, we'll be taking verbal comments after our  
8 question and answer session later in this meeting, and  
9 you can also submit writ -- written comments via email  
10 to EIR-EIS-comments@sitesproject.org or via e -- or  
11 excuse me -- or via mail to either the Authority at P.O.  
12 Box 517, Maxwell, California 95955 or to Reclamation at  
13 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2830, in Sacramento,  
14 California 95825. A reminder that comments must -- must  
15 be mailed and postmarked by January 11, 2022.

16 This concludes our presentation portion of  
17 this meeting, and I'll hand this back to Sara to lead us  
18 through the question and answer session.

19 SARA KATZ: Thanks, Ali. We will now begin  
20 the Q&A session. This is your opportunity to get your  
21 questions about the project and Revised Draft  
22 EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS answered.

23 Approximately 20 minutes have been allotted  
24 for answering questions. The last hour and  
25 approximately ten minutes of the meeting is exclusively

1 for accepting verbal public comments on the Draft  
2 Environmental Document. Please hold on providing  
3 comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS  
4 until the question and answer session has concluded. It  
5 will only be at that time that we will begin accepting  
6 verbal comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental  
7 Draft EIS. A court reporter will be preparing a  
8 transcript to assist us in ensuring we have captured all  
9 comments during the formal public comment portion of the  
10 meeting.

11 If you would like to ask a question, please  
12 raise your hand to ask it verbally or type your question  
13 into the Q&A box. My colleague, Sarah Rossetto, will be  
14 monitoring the Q&A box and reading the questions out  
15 loud.

16 From your computer, or on the Zoom App, click  
17 "raise hand."

18 From your phone, dial star 9 to raise your  
19 hand.

20 Once your name or the last few digits of your  
21 phone number have been called as the next speaker, we  
22 will allow you to unmute yourself. At that time, you  
23 will receive a notice asking you to unmute. For those  
24 online, just click the "unmute" button and you will be  
25 able to speak. For those on the phone, unmute your

1 phone, and dial star 6 to speak.

2 Questions will be answered in the order  
3 received. Repeat questions will be consolidated.

4 So if you are interested in asking a question,  
5 please do so by raising your hand, and we will begin to  
6 call on the speakers.

7 SARAH ROSSETTO: In the meantime, while we  
8 wait for anyone to raise their hand to ask a questions,  
9 we do have two questions in the Q&A box. The first  
10 being, when will public commenting begin?

11 ALI FORSYTHE: We will start the public  
12 comment period in taking verbal public comments in about  
13 20 minutes from now. So right around -- it looks like  
14 that would put us around -- right around 6:55, 6:50,  
15 6:55.

16 SARAH ROSSETTO: And the second question in  
17 the Q&A box is, has there been ample studies on the  
18 impact of wildlife in salmon in and around the Trinity  
19 River and Sacramento River, and have the Tribal Councils  
20 of these areas been consulted?

21 ALI FORSYTHE: That's a great question. Two  
22 questions there. So, we have looked very closely at the  
23 Trinity River and whether or not the project would have  
24 any affect to the Trinity River. And working through  
25 that, as I indicated in the presentation, we would not

1 result in impacts to the Trinity River system. So we're  
2 not -- there's nothing in the project that would change  
3 the overall legal regulatory requirements that operate  
4 the Trinity River system, along with the statutory  
5 requirements that Reclamation follows.

6 I do want to also share that this project  
7 would not result in diversion of Trinity River water  
8 into Sites. We do not have a water right to -- and we  
9 do not anticipate applying for a water right at this  
10 time that would result in the re-diversion of Central  
11 Valley Project water into Sites reservoir. Reclamation  
12 would actually need to change their water right to move  
13 CVP water into Sites reservoir. So, we do not foresee  
14 any impacts to the Trinity River system.

15 I think there was another question there about  
16 the Sacramento River system. We have looked closely at  
17 affects to the Sacramento River system. Those are  
18 mostly identified in our fisheries chapter. And I went  
19 through those on the slide today. We're really looking  
20 closely at our diversion criteria and have made quite a  
21 number of changes to our diversion criteria, really to  
22 be very protective of the fishery on the Sacramento  
23 River system.

24 SARA KATZ: Thank you.

25 ALI FORSYTHE: And I think the last question

1 within that was, have tribal governments been consulted?  
2 And as I mentioned on the tribal slide, we did reach out  
3 to 14 tribes in total, and have been working with those  
4 tribes that had responded to us. I will say that we  
5 have not reached out directly to those tribes on the  
6 Trinity or the Klamath River systems, because it simply  
7 won't affect those systems. So, there's nothing really  
8 to consult on, because we have no impact there in those  
9 systems.

10 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Ali. We do have a hand  
11 raised. I'm gonna call on Regina Chichizola. If you  
12 could go ahead and unmute yourself, and please state  
13 your name and ask your question.

14 REGINA CHICHIZOLA: Hi. This is Regina  
15 Chichizola. I have a couple questions. One of them is,  
16 the last time there was an EIR/EIS, there was actually a  
17 discussion of possible impacts to the Trinity River.  
18 And now it just says, we're not gonna impact the  
19 Trinity. It said that last time too, but then when we  
20 dug into the actual operation, there was an impact.  
21 This time around, it seems like there's not much of an  
22 operations plan, and a lot of things are to be decided  
23 later on, as far as, like, will the BOR be a partner? I  
24 mean, if the BOR is a partner, then there could be  
25 Trinity River impacts. If there's too much water

1 diverted and there's -- then there could be Trinity  
2 River impacts. So it seems to me like it's disingenuous  
3 not to include the discussion in the EIR.

4 So, I just wanted to know when an operations  
5 plan is going to be out that -- where we can actually  
6 make an analysis of what the impacts will be, and when  
7 we were -- are going to know if the BOR is going to be a  
8 partner, 'cause obviously if the BOR's gonna be a  
9 partner and store water in Sites, they're going to need  
10 to change their water rights.

11 So those are questions, pretty much to be,  
12 like, when can we actually see the details of this  
13 project? And I know last thing I heard is there will be  
14 a really in-depth operations plan for the biological  
15 opinion. And if that's true, will there be a public  
16 comment period on that? 'Cause how will we comment once  
17 there's more information?

18 Okay. I know that's, like, a lot of  
19 questions, and I'm sorry, but it's basically like I'm  
20 wond -- I'm wondering when there's gonna be more  
21 complete analysis, what the operations will actually be.  
22 So -- because I don't just trust you saying there won't  
23 be impacts. So that's boiling down all my questions  
24 into just one, hopefully. So that -- and then, I also  
25 was wondering if you are going to be continuing tribal

1 consultation, 'cause I -- from what I've seen, the  
2 tribal consultation isn't sufficient under NEPA, as of  
3 this point. Quite a few tribes complained, even today,  
4 about not being consulted -- or feeling like they  
5 haven't been consulted. So those are how I would boil  
6 it down to two questions. When are we gonna get a  
7 complete operations plan that actually proves that  
8 you're not having the impact that you say you're not  
9 having, and will there be public comment around that  
10 operations plan, and is there gonna be a continued  
11 tribal consultation, so that the requirement of central  
12 consultation are met.

13 ALI FORSYTHE: Yes. Those are great  
14 questions.

15 REGINA CHICHIZOLA: Sorry I was so  
16 long-winded. It took me a -- it took me a minute to  
17 get -- get my first question into one question, so I  
18 apologize for that.

19 ALI FORSYTHE: No, no, that's great. I  
20 appreciate that.

21 So we are working on an operations plan. It  
22 has -- we've described operations pretty extensively in  
23 the chapter 2, the project description of the Revised  
24 Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, but we are working on  
25 a separate operations plan, really, that would help us



1 manage day-to-day operations of the reservoir, and that  
2 will be -- we expect that to actually be available in  
3 January to -- for folks to take a look at. I do want to  
4 caution folks that there's a lot that we're working on  
5 with Reclamation, with the State, in terms of how the  
6 Prop 1 benefits would operate and how that -- those  
7 would work, along with what does Reclamations investment  
8 look like, which was one of your -- kind of one of your  
9 questions, too, Regina. So we expect that operations  
10 plan to change over time. We've written it based on  
11 what we know today and what we can anticipate today, but  
12 we do anticipate that we will have additional versions  
13 of that operations plan in the future as -- as new  
14 agreements, as how we're gonna operate Prop 1 water, as  
15 all of that really comes together over the next couple  
16 of years on that.

17           And then the second question in terms of  
18 continuing tribal consultation, my understanding is,  
19 yes, Reclamation will continue tribal consultation.  
20 They are working through the Section 106 process, and I  
21 believe they're getting ready to reach out to tribes  
22 again in the 2022 timeframe.

23           Vanessa, I'm not sure if you have anything to  
24 add to that or if that --

25           VANESSA KING: Thanks, Ali. No, I don't have

1 anything to add regarding the tribal consultation. I  
2 did want to address one point, which is regarding if BOR  
3 participates, then we would be storing our water in  
4 Sites, and I do want to clarify that there's no current  
5 plan to source CVP water in Sites. All the water in  
6 Sites would be under Sites water rights, and we would  
7 basically pay for a portion of storage, similar to how  
8 other participants are doing it, so we wouldn't be  
9 moving our CVP water into Sites.

10 ALI FORSYTHE: Thank you, Vanessa.

11 SARA KATZ: Thank you both. Our next question  
12 is from Steve Evans.

13 Steve, if you could unmute yourself.

14 STEVE EVANS: Good evening. I'm Steve Evans.  
15 I'm the River Director, California Wilderness Coalition.  
16 Long-time resident of Northern California. Been  
17 monitoring this project for a little over 30 years now.

18 On what -- I noted with interest the slide  
19 that said that no diversions from -- to Sites would be  
20 allowed if the flow at Wilkins Slough -- Slough dropped  
21 below 10,500 CFS. On what study is that based on?

22 ALI FORSYTHE: That is based on a 2021 study  
23 done by Chelleh Mitchell with -- with the National  
24 Marine Fisheries Service, over at the Science Center in  
25 Santa Cruz is the basis of that study. And I'm not sure

1 we have Mike Hendrick on the phone, our fisheries  
2 biologist. If Mike -- I think there was -- oh -- only  
3 that there are -- see if you have additional questions  
4 on that study.

5 STEVE EVANS: So, if it was a study, I -- if I  
6 understand you correctly, it was commissioned by the  
7 National Marine Fisheries Service?

8 ALI FORSYTHE: It was completed by the  
9 National Marine Fisheries Service and their Science  
10 Center.

11 STEVE EVANS: So it -- the flow bypasses based  
12 on the needs of fisheries -- the Nagermans (phonetic)  
13 fisheries that MM -- the -- the fishery services that  
14 regulate -- regulatory agency force -- excuse me.

15 ALI FORSYTHE: Yes. Yes. That is correct.  
16 So National Marine Fisheries Service did this study.  
17 Chelleh Mitchell works for the National Marine Fisheries  
18 Service, and they looked at, analyzed the survival of  
19 juvenile salmonid as they move down the Sacramento River  
20 system, based on different water year types and  
21 different conditions. And in that study, it was found  
22 that there was a circumstantial increase of juvenile  
23 salmonid as they move down the system, when flows  
24 reached 10,700 cubic feet per second in the Sacramento  
25 River, as measured at Wilkins Slough, or greater. The

1 study actually found a decreasing survival on the very  
2 upper ends, but it's really that 10,700 CFS number at  
3 Wilkins Slough that the study -- I'll say -- kind of  
4 found like a -- a -- a break point in terms of survival  
5 of juvenile salmonids through the system.

6 And -- and, Mike, I'm not sure, I -- I think  
7 I've characterized all of that correctly, but if there's  
8 anything that you have to add or -- or to correct just  
9 in case, as the fisheries biologist here.

10 MIKE HENDRICK: I -- I don't think there's any  
11 need for a fisheries biologist on this call. You did a  
12 great job. But, yeah -- yeah, you did a good job of  
13 characterizing that 10,700 was identified as sort of a  
14 critical breaking point for survival, as measured at  
15 Wilkins Slough for some of these listed salmonid  
16 species.

17 ALI FORSYTHE: Thanks, Mike. Appreciate it.

18 SARA KATZ: Thank you both. Sarah Rossetto,  
19 are there any questions that have come in via the Q&A  
20 box?

21 SARAH ROSSETTO: Yes. We have several  
22 questions in the Q&A box. I'll touch on two about, I  
23 guess, wintertime flows and flooding. The first  
24 question is, what is the estimated change in winter  
25 flows from Funks and Stone Corral Creek to Colusa Basin

1 during -- during the winter?

2 ALI FORSYTHE: That is a great question. And  
3 this is something that we are still working on. We  
4 need -- we need to do quite a bit of study on Funks and  
5 Stone Corral Creeks, both to look at the creeks  
6 themselves, how much water can they handle, what has  
7 been their historical flows in the creek, and look at  
8 downstream water right holders, to make sure that we're  
9 not harming the ecological function of the creek, and --  
10 and harming the ability for fish to remain in good  
11 condition in those two creeks, but also to make sure  
12 that we're not interfering -- impacting -- excuse me --  
13 downstream water right holders with building Sites  
14 reservoir. So there is still work to do on Funks and  
15 Stone Corral Creeks. But, generally, we'd be looking to  
16 reduce those high flow events, those flow events that,  
17 frankly, flooded Maxwell in 2017 -- flooded our own  
18 offices in 2017.

19 So we do anticipate a reduction in flow,  
20 especially those high flows from these two creeks into  
21 the Colusa Basin Drain during the wintertime, really for  
22 those flood control benefits.

23 SARAH ROSSETTO: Thank you. And that's  
24 actually the next question in the queue. Do you expect  
25 that all flooding of I-5 in Colusa County will be

1 eliminated by the project?

2 ALI FORSYTHE: I think based on our  
3 engineering analysis that we don't expect all flooding,  
4 because there are creeks north of the Sites reservoir  
5 that would continue -- that are not being impounded by  
6 Sites -- that would continue to have really, flashy  
7 flows, as these creeks do, and potentially they flood  
8 I-5. It would be Funks and Stone Corral Creeks that we  
9 would be impounding and be able to control that flooding  
10 of I-5. So I do believe that some of the other local  
11 creeks -- I believe Hunter -- Hunter's Creek to the  
12 north, and a couple of creeks to the south may also  
13 result in flooding of I-5. We're hopeful that -- just  
14 that having the reservoir there reduces the depth of  
15 flooding and the amount of flooding, really because when  
16 we have storms that significant, I-5 may be a -- a  
17 evacuation route for other areas or for other  
18 situations. We're trying to make sure that I-5 stays  
19 open. It's obviously important to the communities in  
20 the Sacramento Valley.

21 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Ali. Sarah, are there  
22 any other ones in the Q&A box?

23 SARAH ROSSETTO: Yes. Two related to  
24 earthquake analysis. So, the first, is there a map  
25 showing existing faults in the Sites to print, so if

1 that's somewhere in the document, directing there, and  
2 then, how large of an earthquake are you considering in  
3 the project scenario analysis? Is there a 1906  
4 earthquake scenario analysis?

5 ALI FORSYTHE: Yeah. I'm gonna -- I'm gonna  
6 ask Henry to come in for -- for just a second to help me  
7 with these two. But there is a map showing the faults  
8 in the footprints, in the -- in the document. I believe  
9 that's in our geology and soils section. And as part of  
10 the project, we will need to look very carefully at all  
11 of these faults, do quite a bit analysis on these  
12 faults, and go through a very rigorous effort by the  
13 division of Safety of Dams to analyze movement on those  
14 faults, and how they may -- that may result in movements  
15 of the dam facilities and pipeline facilities.

16 So, Henry, is there thoughts on that in how we  
17 go through that process?

18 HENRY LUU: You captured that well, Ali.

19 Certainly, we do have a lot more to analyze as  
20 part of the requirements for DWR, DSOD, we will analyze  
21 every single existing fault that has been identified,  
22 and then also analyze the potential for an event to  
23 occur, designing it with -- designing our project  
24 facilities with a safety factor to mitigate the severity  
25 of the potential damages. And so, I guess, to keep it

1 short, we -- we have a lot more analysis before we can  
2 get to a design where we are providing a safe reservoir.

3 ALI FORSYTHE: And all of that is overseen by  
4 the Division of Safety of Dams, which we will fall under  
5 their jurisdiction. And at -- chapter 12 is the geology  
6 and soils chapter, and it looks like faults might be  
7 identified in figure 12-4.

8 SARAH ROSSETTO: Thank you. One more request  
9 for a map in the Q&A box. Can you provide a map showing  
10 the footprint of the Colusa Subbasin and the Sites  
11 footprint?

12 ALI FORSYTHE: We definitely have a footprint  
13 of -- in the -- of the Sites Sub -- or excuse me -- of  
14 the Sites project in the environmental document. When  
15 the commenter says, "Subbasin," I think about  
16 groundwater and groundwater subbasins. We have an  
17 analysis of groundwater in the documents. I don't  
18 remember offhand what chapter that is, but there is a  
19 really extensive analysis of groundwater. We generally  
20 won't be effecting groundwater, have less than  
21 significant effect to the local groundwater system,  
22 primarily because once we're up in operations, we --  
23 we're not using groundwater extensively, but we'll also  
24 have recharge benefits to the groundwater system. And I  
25 just remembered that groundwater tip -- take a quick



1 look, it's in chapter eight.

2 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Ali.

3 I think that exhausts the questions in the Q&A  
4 box. Sarah, can you confirm that?

5 SARAH ROSSETTO: We have -- actually, we have  
6 quite a few more questions in the Q&A box, but we are  
7 nearing the end of the 20 minute time period, so I guess  
8 we can take a couple more, if that's acceptable for  
9 going into public comment.

10 SARA KATZ: Ali, would you like to allow just  
11 a couple more minutes?

12 ALI FORSYTHE: Sure. We can do a couple more  
13 minutes and then move on to public comments. Let's go  
14 to six -- like, 6:55, 56 or so.

15 SARA KATZ: Thank you.

16 ALI FORSYTHE: Just to make sure we allow  
17 ample time for public comments.

18 SARA KATZ: That will give us three more.

19 So, Sarah, let's take one more from the box,  
20 and then we'll see if Steve's question is very short.

21 SARAH ROSSETTO: Okay. We have a -- we have a  
22 process question. Will the public comment period be  
23 extended beyond the current deadline?

24 ALI FORSYTHE: That's a great question. We  
25 have received a request for extension of the public

1 comment period. We've received that, I think, just a  
2 couple of days ago, and we are considering that this  
3 week with our Board, and also with the Bureau of  
4 Reclamation. So I don't -- I don't have a -- a -- a  
5 outcome, a result of that right now, but we are  
6 considering that request. And if we do extend the  
7 comment period, we would so post that on our website and  
8 most likely send out an e-blast too so that folks  
9 understand that and see that.

10 SARAH ROSSETTO: Two more questions.

11 Please describe any positive environmental  
12 effects of the project and whether these will be  
13 analyzed in the EIR.

14 ALI FORSYTHE: Yeah. So we do have a number  
15 of positive effects of the project. The one that --  
16 that comes quickly -- the two that come quickly to mind  
17 for me are the ecosystem benefits. The first through  
18 the Proposition 1 activities, both the State has  
19 provided -- is looking -- I shouldn't say has -- is  
20 still considering the Sites Project to provide for  
21 ecosystem benefits under Proposition 1. These would be  
22 benefits to refuges and providing refuge water supply,  
23 and then also for water into the Yolo Bypass, to provide  
24 benefits to Delta Smelt, in moving food resources  
25 through the Yolo Bypass for Delta Smelts.

1                   We're also looking and working extensively  
2 with Reclamation to provide benefits for anadromous  
3 fish. This would be through assisting Reclamation and  
4 managing the cold water pool, looking to help  
5 Reclamation manage fall flows and stabilize fall flows  
6 for spawning the salmonid in the upper Sacramento River  
7 system, and also potentially helping Reclamation as they  
8 look to provide a spring pulse flow for the benefit of  
9 juvenile salmonids in the Sacramento River system.

10                   So quite a bit of environmental effects.  
11 These are all really built into the project description.  
12 And, unfortunately, CEQA doesn't good -- do a really  
13 good job -- or NEPA -- doesn't do a really good job of  
14 bringing out the benefits of a project. They're both  
15 really focused, you know, frankly, on the negative, on  
16 the impacts, which I can -- I can understand and  
17 appreciate. But it's -- they're -- I think these  
18 benefits really aren't adequately reflected in the  
19 document, just by the nature of the requirements that  
20 we're working to meet in the document.

21                   SARA KATZ: So, Steve, we have one minute  
22 left, if you can make your question short, and, Ali,  
23 your response short, then we can close the Q&A session  
24 and move onto the comments.

25                   Steve, if you can unmute yourself.

1 STEVE EVANS: Okay. It just popped up.

2 Yeah. I -- it was a follow-up question about  
3 the bypass flow at Wilkins Slough, which apparently has  
4 been established for fisheries. What about flows in the  
5 Sacramento River to maintain its riparian habitat? Has  
6 there been any studies? Are there numbers available?

7 ALI FORSYTHE: Yes. So we have looked at --  
8 at changes in flows in the Sacramento River, as a result  
9 of the project. And the resulting affects to riparian  
10 habitat and juvenile -- that riparian habitat generally  
11 provides benefits for juvenile salmonids rearing -- and  
12 rearing habitat. That analysis, I believe, is in  
13 chapter 11 of the documents.

14 SARA KATZ: Thank you, both. That gives us  
15 just enough time for a question, I guess, in the Q&A box  
16 about Maxwell.

17 Sarah, if you could ask that, please?

18 SARAH ROSSETTO: Yes. When the project is  
19 completed, it will change the town of Maxwell. What is  
20 being done to offset the changes that will occur, such  
21 as traffic, schools, fire, emergency services?

22 ALI FORSYTHE: Yeah. Yeah. Sorry, I had to  
23 make sure I wasn't on mute myself. Yes.

24 The Project will result in changes in the town  
25 of Maxwell, and that's something that we are very aware

1 of as the Authority, and have been thinking quite a bit  
2 about some of those changes are analyzed in the  
3 documents, such as traffic. During construction, we are  
4 requiring that construction traffic go around the town  
5 of Maxwell, and not actually go through downtown. It's  
6 important to us, because some of the schools in Maxwell  
7 are right near the mayor -- major thoroughfare of Oak  
8 Street. We want to be careful and protective of  
9 those -- of those kids going to and from school. So  
10 we're looking at some components, especially traffic and  
11 construction, but also the long-term traffic from the  
12 recreational benefits of the project.

13 A number in -- for those -- that long-term  
14 traffic, we're preparing a traffic management plan and  
15 are looking at traffic-controlled measures that we would  
16 potentially consider for the long-term for traffic going  
17 through Maxwell and operations. Things like school and  
18 fire, EMS services, those are a little bit harder  
19 because CEQA doesn't really have a parameter for those.  
20 We -- and this is something that we continue to have  
21 discussions with the school district, with the fire  
22 district, and also with the local law enforcement  
23 agencies, the reservoir and just the Authorities needs  
24 will increase fire and law enforcement needs, but our  
25 long-term employment may also change some of the

1 components of the school district. So these are things  
2 that aren't captured well in a CEQA/NEPA document and  
3 that we are working -- and will continue to work with  
4 the local agencies off to the sides to make sure that we  
5 are addressing these concerns and addressing any affects  
6 to their -- to their agency and being able to provide  
7 services into the future.

8 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Ali.

9 Unfortunately, we're out of time for anymore  
10 questions, but there are two other methods. You can  
11 certainly submit a question to the Sites website, and  
12 there's also another meeting at 9 a.m., so if your  
13 schedule can permit, we can have another chance to get  
14 to your question then.

15 But as we conclude the question and answer  
16 session, we will now be accepting verbal comments on the  
17 Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. The Sites  
18 Project Authority and the Bureau of Reclamation are  
19 seeking substantive comments on the adequacy and the  
20 accuracy of the analysis presented in the document.

21 All verbal comments will be part of the public  
22 record for the project and will be responded to in the  
23 Final EIR/EIS. There will not be a verbal response.  
24 Any questions will be treated as a comment and will be  
25 part of the public record.

1                   We will be calling on people in the order  
2 their hands are raised, so please raise your hand now if  
3 you would like to provide a formal verbal comment.

4                   As a reminder, from your computer or your Zoom  
5 App, click "raise hand." From your phone, dial star 9  
6 to raise your hand.

7                   Once your name or the last few digits of your  
8 phone have been called as the next speaker, we will  
9 allow you to unmute yourself. At that time, you will  
10 receive a notice asking you to please unmute.

11                  For those online, just click on the "unmute"  
12 button and you will be able to speak. For those on the  
13 phone, unmute your phone and dial star 6 to speak.

14                  Once you are unmuted, please state and spell  
15 your name for the record. In addition, if you are  
16 representing an agency or an organization, please  
17 include and state the name of that agency or  
18 organization.

19                  Each speaker will have two minutes to provide  
20 their comment. Please be respectful so everyone has a  
21 chance to comment.

22                  Once you are unmuted and have identified  
23 yourself, and if you're with an agency, we will start  
24 the two-minute timer clock, and you may provide your  
25 comments.

1                   Currently, I see two hands, it appears, to be  
2     raised. And our first speaker will be Steve Evans.  
3     After that, the next few speakers in the queue are Isaac  
4     Kenny and Regina Chichizola.

5                   So, Steve, if you could unmute yourself,  
6     please state and spell your name before providing your  
7     comment.

8                   STEVE EVANS: My name is Steve Evans. That's  
9     E-v-a-n-s. I represent California Wilderness Coalition.  
10    I'm the -- their Rivers Director. I live and -- and  
11    base my work out of Sacramento.

12                  I'm a little concerned -- well, I'm more than  
13    a little concerned that the EIS/EIR is focusing on  
14    impacts on fisheries. That's important. We've watched  
15    the Delta Smelt go extinct in its native habitat,  
16    essentially, in the Delta, and we've seen continued  
17    declines in winter and spring run -- salmon in  
18    Sacramento River. So those are important. That's an  
19    important issue in terms of this project. Leaving  
20    enough water in the river for those fisheries to  
21    survive.

22                  I -- it appears to me, however, that this  
23    document and the Sites partnership has not done a very  
24    good job trying to assess impacts on the Sacramento  
25    River ecosystem, partic -- particularly, it's riparian



1 habitat. The riparian habitat along the Sacramento  
2 River is some of the most healthiest in the State. I've  
3 run a lot of rivers in the State. I can tell you that  
4 Sacramento River remains one of the few rivers that  
5 looks natural, and it's because it has sufficient flows,  
6 despite hosting the largest dam and reservoir in  
7 California -- in Shasta Dam Reservoir. There are  
8 sufficient flows from tributaries to provide for erosion  
9 and deposition of sands and that cre -- recreate  
10 riparian habitat over the years, and henna (phonetic)  
11 and riparian habitats a number of rare and endangered  
12 and threatened wildlife species, and I can find nothing  
13 in this document so far that reflects any substantial  
14 assessment of impacts on this -- from this Project. So  
15 I would urge you to do that.

16 Secondly, I would urge you to extend the  
17 comment deadline, because this is a huge document,  
18 released just before the holidays, and it just is  
19 important for the -- give the public the time they need  
20 to review and comment on it. Thank you.

21 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Steve, very much.

22 Our next question is from Isaac Kinney --  
23 Kinney. Isaac, if you could please unmute yourself.

24 ISAAC KINNEY: (Spoken in Yurok dialect) Isaac  
25 Kinney, with (spoken in Yurok dialect.)

1 Hello. My name is Isaac Kinney. I'm the CEO  
2 of Watershed Regenerative Adventures. I'm calling as a  
3 business owner, in California, Californian new business  
4 owner, just reminding, the State of California has  
5 contributed to the genocide of California Indians. So  
6 me being here, as a business owner, is a huge testimony.  
7 I also want to oppose this project. Using Prop 1  
8 funding on this project so far does not show the public  
9 benefit. This project is unstable, obsolete  
10 infrastructure, using unstable, obsolete mechanisms to  
11 pay for it, as well as unstable ways of looking and  
12 analyzing.

13 Being -- you know, trying to move the money  
14 before the environmental document is done is very  
15 disrespectful to the tribal engagement that's been going  
16 on -- the lack of tribal engagement that's been going  
17 on. The ability and -- and because of the use and how  
18 much this project depends on the State water project,  
19 all tribes included along the tributaries of the State  
20 water project need to be included. This project also  
21 will contribute to the detriment and to the extinction  
22 of California salmon and the markets that come with  
23 them.

24 I also want to, again, make sure that you do  
25 extend the comment deadline for this project. Being

1 that it's being rushed is super unstable, obsolete way  
2 of doing things, and we need to change that. Being able  
3 to give the comment -- extend the comment period gives  
4 tribes a chance to understand what all the ramifications  
5 are, what happens when you flood a whole village site,  
6 when you take these resources away for generations.  
7 That's what has not been addressed in the EIR/EIS yet  
8 and needs to be addressed is the way cultural resources  
9 will be protected when you flood and create a new  
10 ecological ecosystem. This is a --

11 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Isaac.

12 ISAAC KINNEY: -- again, a place that we  
13 cannot --

14 SARA KATZ: Thank you for your comment.

15 ISAAC KINNEY: This is a place we cannot keep  
16 on doing business as usual. This --

17 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Isaac.

18 Our next speaker will be Regina Chichizola.  
19 If you could please unmute yourself.

20 REGINA CHICHIZOLA: Hi. Thank you -- that is  
21 my child. Sorry.

22 Hi. My name is Regina Chichizola, and I am  
23 the Co-Director of Save California Salmon. I wanted to  
24 say that I feel like this EIR and EIS includes a lot of  
25 assumptions that are not proven in fact. And there's a

1 lot of holes. And I feel like there's a lot of putting  
2 the cart before the horse.

3 First of all, the Sacramento is completely  
4 over -- system. I think five times as much water is  
5 allocated than actually exists. And you're def --  
6 you're trying to get -- relying on water that doesn't  
7 necessarily exist, and climate change is not really  
8 factored into the modeling. The environmental baseline  
9 is not based in reality, as it's based on the Trump-era  
10 of biological opinions, which are illegal and are -- are  
11 killing all of the salmon off.

12 Also, it's gonna impact Delta outflows, which  
13 is at -- already right now, Delta outflows are severely  
14 impacted. And, hopefully as you know, the water quality  
15 analysis shows pretty -- pretty extreme impacts to water  
16 quality, and when you don't have as much water going  
17 into a system, that means that agricultural chemicals  
18 also are concentrated. So this could really impact the  
19 State's water supply as far as the drinking water  
20 quality for anyone who gets water out of the Delta.

21 I also think that the fact that the tribal  
22 consultation has not been robust is a huge issue. I  
23 think that it's disingenuous to say that bypass flows  
24 are protected, because they're not. The 1800 CFS only  
25 applies to two months out of the year, and then

1 the flows will go way down through other months when  
2 it's critical for fish to have -- have that water,  
3 including spring salmon. So, I really feel like the EIS  
4 and EIR is trying to put lipstick on a pig or, you know,  
5 it's trying to make it sound like building dams and  
6 reservoirs is good for fish and good for the  
7 environment, but it's not. It's a water grab, and it's  
8 a -- largely gonna go out of the area, and it's gonna  
9 take much more water from our rivers. And I also think  
10 that we have --

11 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Regina, for your  
12 comment. The --

13 REGINA CHICHIZOLA: I would --

14 SARA KATZ: The -- the next speaker is Ashley  
15 Overhouse.

16 Ashley, if you could please unmute yourself.

17 ASHLEY OVERHOUSE: Thank you. If you can hear  
18 me?

19 SARA KATZ: Yes, we can.

20 ASHLEY OVERHOUSE: Thank you. This is Ashley  
21 Overhouse. I'm the Resilient Rivers Director with  
22 Friends of the River, and on Monday, December 13th,  
23 Friends of the River Pacific Coast of Federation  
24 Fishermen's Association, Institute for Fisheries  
25 Resources, California Native Plant Society, and Sierra

1 Club California submitted a letter to Sites Authority  
2 requesting an extension of time to provide public  
3 comments on the RDEIR and SDEIS. The cir -- the  
4 documents, we understand, thousands of pages, including  
5 appendices was circulated for review on November 12th,  
6 making the deadline for public comment January 11th.  
7 We're requesting, respectfully, an additional 31 days,  
8 making the comment deadline February 11th, 2022.

9 We expect this will not impact the overall  
10 project deadlines. As said earlier today at the  
11 California Water Commission Meeting and on your website,  
12 the expected completion for the finalized documents is  
13 not until late summer or early fall. There's a  
14 discrepancy there, but I understand that this is going  
15 to take quite a bit of time to go over, review, and time  
16 to finalize the documents, so we respectfully request  
17 additional time to provide you that substantive feedback  
18 that will help you do so.

19 We understand the alternatives include  
20 reservoir sizes, from 1.3 to 1.5 million acre feet.  
21 And, of course, with those alternatives comes a variety  
22 of different as -- you know, impacts, as well as  
23 technical material to review. And as you've heard from  
24 others, today we share some of those concerns about  
25 those impacts. FOR and others need to have the time to

1 provide that meaningful feedback, and we would like to  
2 be able to do so. So, respectfully, especially with the  
3 holidays and the other projects that are happening, as  
4 well as the fact that there was a commission meeting  
5 today, on the same day of this public comment period --  
6 no rest for the wicked. We would just really appreciate  
7 an extension of time.

8 Thank you so much, again, for holding this  
9 public comment workshop and the opportunity to comment.  
10 Thank you for your time.

11 SARA KATZ: Thanks -- thank you, Ashley.

12 I would like to remind the speakers that we  
13 have a two-minute limit per individual, and then also to  
14 spell your name, and if you are representing any  
15 organization.

16 Our next speaker will be Grant.

17 Grant, if you could please unmute yourself.

18 GRANT PREHEIM: Hi. My name is Grant,  
19 spelled, G-r-a-n-t, last name's, P-r-e-h-e-i-m.

20 I'm currently a California resident, and I'm  
21 concerned about having safe drinking water for myself  
22 and my kids one day. Mostly, I would like to thank  
23 Isaac and our other speakers for standing up for  
24 ourselves, our rights, and what we believe in.

25 I would like to say, think about what we are

1 doing here and continue forward with love in your heart.

2 Thank you.

3 SARA KATZ: Thank you so much, Grant.

4 Our next speaker is Max Steiner.

5 Max, if you could please unmute yourself.

6 MAX STEINER: Ah, a prompt. Thank you.

7 My name is Max Steiner. I'm the Democratic  
8 candidate for Congress in District 1. I've talked to  
9 thousands of people in this part of the State. I think  
10 that most people are pretty set in whether they oppose  
11 or do not oppose Sites. I have not heard anyone  
12 complain about a lack of study of this 25-year project.  
13 And I -- I hear the complaint about people asking for an  
14 extension on -- on a time to comment. I do not think  
15 that's necessary. I don't think anyone thinks that's  
16 necessary on the left who lives here. Definitely, they  
17 don't think so on the right.

18 Listen, I think Sites is a -- is a contentious  
19 project, and I -- I -- you know, good job on engaging  
20 with it and for hosting these calls. I think that's  
21 excellent. I will just say that I'm a supporter of this  
22 project. I think with increasing precipitation, falling  
23 as rain, and not as snow, we need to increase surface  
24 capacity. We have serious groundwater issues in the  
25 north state. We have serious water issues in the north



1 state. We have a very, you know, oversubscribed water  
2 flow out of the Sacramento Basin, and I think that some  
3 part of the solution will be increased service capacity.

4 So, I thank you again for your time, as  
5 someone who has spoken to -- you know, I've handed out  
6 7,000 pamphlets. I've probably talked to 10,000 people.  
7 The first issue is not Sites. It is fire and forestry.  
8 But water is always number three. And everyone knows  
9 what Sites is. Everyone who lives here, from Shasta  
10 to -- to Chico knows what Sites is, knows what the plan  
11 involves, knows the options. And -- and I think that  
12 this has been studied enough. It's time to make a  
13 decision and build or not build.

14 Thank you very much for your time.

15 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Max. Clearly  
16 appreciate that.

17 It looks like we have Isaac Kinney requesting  
18 to speak again. And if I don't see any other hands, I  
19 will go ahead and ask Isaac to unmute himself and please  
20 respect the two-minute timer.

21 ISAAC KINNEY: Hello. Yes, again, Isaac here.  
22 Trying to make sure that, you know, we're really doing  
23 our due diligence. This project cannot be just pushed  
24 through. Although there has been extensive studies,  
25 this project has changed, continues to change as we move

1 the goal posts. We can't continue to expect that we're  
2 gonna have a level that we're going forward with right  
3 now. We need the extra time to analyze ourselves, as  
4 the people. Don't forget, 48,000 people have written in  
5 and opposed this project. I'm not sure how this  
6 document includes all of the opposition. I'm not sure  
7 how this project includes, again, all of the different  
8 court cases that come down, regarding tribal  
9 sovereignty, treaty law. These are all things that need  
10 to be in place, as well as the jobs, as well as the  
11 environmental soundness of this document. We can do it.  
12 I'm very in supportive of options for groundwater, but  
13 we can -- we have to listen to the people. We can't  
14 just keep on doing private, sanctioned, unstable  
15 infrastructure like this and think that we're gonna be  
16 combating climate change. We're gonna keep on getting  
17 the same issues that we voted against when we voted for  
18 Prop 1, when we voted for good water. We didn't think  
19 of this type of centralized, unstable, obsolete  
20 infrastructure. We have to do something different.  
21 Now's our chance to show the world, is California being  
22 a leader? We can do things different. We can build  
23 differently. We can do our water politics differently.  
24 We don't have to buy into the corporate. We don't have  
25 to continue to rely on the unstable marketplace, that is

1 New York Stock Exchange. We have to make sure to  
2 understand that people have voices, Indigenous people  
3 have the most understanding to combat climate change,  
4 and that has the driver's seat in moving forward with  
5 any kind of environmental document analysis report.

6 SARA KATZ: Thank you so much, Isaac, for your  
7 comment.

8 Our next speaker will be Sher -- Sheridan  
9 Noelani Enomoto.

10 Sheridan, if you could unmute yourself.

11 SHERIDAN: [Inaudible], can you hear me?

12 SARA KATZ: Yes, we can.

13 SHERIDAN: Okay. Hello, mi kiko. My name is  
14 Sheridan Noelani Enomoto. I'm also a  
15 Co-Director of State of California Salmon, and also a  
16 team member of that.

17 I agree with Isaac, and I also just want to  
18 say that I disagree with the previous caller about the  
19 awareness of this project. I think there's actually a  
20 lot of ignorance around what's been happening, all the  
21 way from Poya Poya Gra (phonetic), Mount Shasta, all the  
22 way to Mechoopda, or Chico, need of land, specifically  
23 because it hasn't been included in the process. And I  
24 don't think everybody has been made aware, and I also  
25 want to add that we should not take lightly all of the

1 adverse and cum -- cumulative impacts that are mentioned  
2 that are still being studied in this process, that we  
3 still have to recognize. They're gonna be drastic  
4 changes, and we don't want to take that lightly.

5 I also want to add that we do need to have an  
6 extension. We do need to look at these details, because  
7 once these changes are made, they're irreversible, and  
8 we can't -- we -- we can't afford -- I mean, we're  
9 already looking at a world where salmon are -- are on  
10 the brink of extinction. We're looking at situations  
11 where, you know, if salmon aren't thriving, we're not  
12 thriving.

13 If our -- if our watersheds are not healthy  
14 and in the condition in which they were originally made  
15 really and truthfully, if we hadn't messed with them, I  
16 don't think we would be in the situation right -- we're  
17 simply in. So, everything -- I really do support the  
18 fact that we need to take our time, that we need to be  
19 more inclusive in this process, and not to take any kind  
20 of decision-making lightly or feel that we're gonna be  
21 too rushed in this process, because one thing we can  
22 change, that's it.

23 Thank you.

24 SARA KATZ: Thank you very much.

25 Seeing no other hands, Regina, if you would

1 like to unmute yourself and go ahead and make your  
2 comment.

3 REGINA CHICHIZOLA: Yeah. My comment is  
4 actually process-related.

5 I just wanted to say that I don't think a lot  
6 of people did know about this meeting. I don't think it  
7 was really noticed how to get on this meeting, to  
8 participate very well. I asked when -- when there was  
9 gonna be a Zoom link on Monday. Forty-nine thousand  
10 people, almost, have -- have sent in letters against  
11 this project. I think at least 30, but maybe up to 50  
12 people commented today at the California Water  
13 Commission Meeting. Those comments were 95 percent  
14 against California funding this project.

15 I don't think people know where the water is  
16 supposed to go to, or the fact that Metropolitan Water  
17 District is 25 percent holder of the water, so that's  
18 not a lot of benefits for the north state. I live in  
19 the north state. Almost everyone who's a member of the  
20 State of California Salmon lives in the north state, so  
21 I definitely take offense to, like, everyone supports  
22 this. I think almost hardly anyone even knows about it.  
23 And when we tell people about it, they don't think it's  
24 a good idea. So I definitely ask for the extension too,  
25 but I think along with the extension, there should be

1 a -- maybe as a consideration of another public comment  
2 meeting after the holidays, because I think -- I mean,  
3 an EIS and an EIR is when all this is supposed to hit  
4 the table, when you're supposed to know. And everything  
5 I hear is we're gonna study this later. We're gonna  
6 talk to the community about this later, and that's not  
7 how a public process is supposed to play out. And it's  
8 not what makes people feel safe about a project. So  
9 my -- I'm keeping my comments just to not feeling like  
10 this was a well-noticed hearing, or a well-noticed  
11 project. And -- yeah, I mean, all the meetings I've  
12 gone to on this, very few people have gone to. But,  
13 literally, tens of thousands of people have told me that  
14 they're opposed.

15 So -- yeah, I think there needs to be more  
16 information out there and more discussion. That's the  
17 -- that's the only reason I would have raised my hand  
18 again, by the way.

19 SARA KATZ: Thank you. Thank you so much.

20 Is there anyone on the phone that would like  
21 to ask a question? And if so, please press star 9 to  
22 raise your hand. We will be accepting comments until  
23 8:00 p.m. And so, right now, I don't see any other  
24 hands raised.

25 Again, if there's anyone else that would like

1 to ask a question, please -- I'm sorry -- to make a  
2 formal comment, please -- please indicate so, and we  
3 will allow you to read your comment into the record.

4 Again, we will be accepting comments until  
5 8:00 p.m.

6 We have a hand raised by Amanda -- it looks  
7 like Amanda Moore. I hope I have that correct. And  
8 let's see if we can get this -- okay, Amanda, if you  
9 would like to unmute yourself and read your comment into  
10 the record.

11 AMANDA MOORE: Hi. Am I unmuted?

12 SARA KATZ: You are, yes, thank you.

13 AMANDA MOORE: My name is Amanda Moore,  
14 M-o-o-r-e. I'm a resident of Colusa, and I'm just, kind  
15 of really grateful to have these meetings to flood into.  
16 I just feel -- returned here a year ago. I just want to  
17 note that -- I -- well, the point of my raising my hand  
18 was to second or third or fourth all the opinions asking  
19 for a longer consideration period, and -- and,  
20 specifically, consultation period.

21 I asked people around here in this little  
22 town, you know, about it. They don't know. I'm -- I --  
23 I find it interesting that so much of our environmental  
24 around here is decided without -- without the process  
25 or -- or the -- even the curiosity, and I -- I think

1 that there are folks that would have an opinion and  
2 would have a veal (sic) to, you know, understand the  
3 project of this dimension. Also, I just want to say,  
4 you know, when I flunked out of college in '91, I got  
5 commissioned by the SOD Buster to go up to -- I guess it  
6 was Stonyford -- I forget -- it's the tavern there to  
7 interview people about what they thought about water  
8 projects that were going on then -- or proposed then,  
9 and I just think it's funny to come back here and think,  
10 oh, my God, they're still trying to move forward with  
11 this reservoir idea in -- in the face of climate change,  
12 and the depleted stocks of salmon on our entire, you  
13 know, west coast. I just think it's a travesty and an  
14 outdated project, and I can't believe we're still here.

15 But for -- at the very least, I think that --  
16 I -- I appreciate all the comments about people's  
17 interest in getting other -- other folks involved and  
18 more voices represented.

19 Thanks for your -- for allowing me to speak.

20 SARA KATZ: Thank you, Amanda.

21 I currently don't see any hands raised. We  
22 will be here until 8:00 p.m. to take formal comments.

23 We have a hand raised by a Robert Kunde. If  
24 you could state your name and any organization that you  
25 represent and unmute yourself, you're welcome to read



1 your comment.

2 ROBERT KUNDE: Can you hear me, Sara?

3 SARA KATZ: I can.

4 ROBERT KUNDE: So, thank you for the  
5 opportunity to comment. My name is Robert Kunde,  
6 K-u-n-d-e. I represent the Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water  
7 Storage District on the Sites Reservoir Project  
8 Committee, and I'd like to -- I don't have a comment on  
9 the -- but I do have a comment on the process.

10 The Sites Project Authority has adopted a  
11 number of core principles, as part of its Mission  
12 Statement. One of those core principles is  
13 transparency. The Sites -- the Sites project has a  
14 website that's very well constructed, called  
15 Sitesproject.org. The Sites Project is being led by the  
16 Sites Project Authority, which is a public agency. As a  
17 public agency, they're -- all of their meetings have to  
18 be noticed, publically, and they are noticed on the  
19 website, along with a schedule of the meeting dates.

20 As a member of that Project, I would encourage  
21 all members of the public to attend meetings. In order  
22 to have -- to have a successful project, we need to have  
23 the best input from the best minds, and lots of input,  
24 even from not the best minds, and I'm putting myself in  
25 that category.

1           We are committed to transparency, and there is  
2 a -- a public process for notifying people what we're  
3 doing. That process is open to the public through these  
4 meetings. There is a Reservoir Project Committee that  
5 is similarly required to provide notices of its  
6 meetings, and I'm not sure what else can be done in  
7 terms of public outreach to making sure as many as  
8 people -- as possible know about the project.

9           You know, there -- there's a website. There's  
10 press releases. There's public email blasts. I don't  
11 think CEQA requires Sites to send a mailing to everyone  
12 who lives north of San Jose. So, perhaps some party  
13 would be -- have some input that would help us in terms  
14 of providing better notice to the public.

15           Thank you for giving me the opportunity to  
16 comment.

17           SARA KATZ: Currently, we do not have any  
18 other hands raised, but we will be staying here until  
19 8:00 p.m. to receive public comment.

20           As a reminder for those on the phone, if you  
21 are interested in making public comment, you can dial  
22 star 9 to raise your hand to provide a comment, and then  
23 star 6 to unmute yourself and speak.

24           For anyone who have may -- may have recently  
25 signed on, this the formal public comment period for the

1 Sites Reservoir Project. And if you're interested in  
2 making a formal comment, please raise your hand and you  
3 will be invited to unmute yourself, state your name and  
4 any organization you are affiliated with, and read your  
5 formal comment into the record. We will be staying here  
6 until 8:00 p.m. to take all formal comments. Thank you.

7 I see we have a hand raised with the last four  
8 numbers of 4482. If you could please unmute yourself,  
9 state and spell your name and any affiliation you might  
10 have, and then enter your comments into the formal  
11 record.

12 Unmute yourself. There you go.

13 MEREDITH HACKLEMAR: Hi, can you hear me?

14 SARA KATZ: We can, yes.

15 MEREDITH HACKLEMAR: Thank you for allowing me  
16 to comment. My name's Meredith Hacklemar;  
17 M-e-r-e-d-i-t-h, H-a-c-k-l-e-m-a-r, and I have been a  
18 visitor, settled here in the State of California for 30  
19 years. I moved all over the State, and everywhere I go,  
20 I see how water infrastructure has destroyed the natural  
21 landscape and the flow and all the habitat. And the  
22 last thing we need is another piece of infrastructure.  
23 There's no more water to divert.

24 I believe strongly in Indigenous sovereignty,  
25 and I support the rights of California Indians and their

1 land and water rights. And to destroy and flood another  
2 sacred site with cultural resources is unconscionable,  
3 so I'm really against this project, and I thank you for  
4 allowing me to comment.

5 SARA KATZ: Thank you so much.

6 Again, we will be accepting comments until  
7 8:00 p.m.

8 Our public meeting will end at 8:00 p.m.  
9 tonight and be accepting comments until 8:00 p.m., and  
10 then we'll have two closing slides as it relates to how  
11 to submit formal written comments. Thank you.

12 We have five more minutes that we will be  
13 accepting formal public comments. Again, as a reminder,  
14 from your computer or on the Zoom App, just click "raise  
15 hand." And from your phone, simply dial star 9 to raise  
16 your hand. We will then call on the individual and  
17 unmute you so you can read your comment into the record.  
18 Thank you.

19 If you could please advance to the next slide.  
20 You can comment after today's -- tonight's meeting by  
21 providing a written comment. Please do so by emailing  
22 your comments to [EIR-EIS-Comments@Sitesproject.org](mailto:EIR-EIS-Comments@Sitesproject.org).

23 You can also mail your comments to the Sites  
24 Project Authority, P.O. Box 517, Maxwell, California  
25 95955, or to the Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage

1 Way, Suite W-2830, Sacramento, California 95825.

2 Comments must be postmarked or received by 5  
3 p.m., Pacific Standard Time on January 11th, 2022.

4 Thank you so much for your participation in  
5 tonight's public meeting. As a reminder, if anyone  
6 joined late and missed the presentation, the recording  
7 of the meeting presentation itself will be posted for  
8 viewing on the Sites' Project website, Sitesproject.org  
9 within one week.

10 You can also participate in the remaining  
11 public meeting that will be held tomorrow, December  
12 16th, from 9 a.m. until 11 a.m. Our presentation will  
13 be the same for both public meetings, but you're  
14 certainly more than welcome to join us again.

15 Thank you again for participating this  
16 evening. We will now conclude the meeting. Thank you  
17 so much.

18 (End of meeting.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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, JENNIFER GERATY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the said meeting was taken down by me in stenotype at the time stated, via Zoom, and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction and that the transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings held.

I further certify I have no financial interest in, nor am related to any parties of this cause. Dated this 29th day of December, 2021.

*Jennifer Geraty*

---

JENNIFER GERATY, CSR No. 13350