



# EIR/EIS Public Comment Update/Summary

February 2018



- Public meetings input
- Written comments
  - Federal/state/local
  - NGOs/environmental interests
  - Individuals
  - Primary issues/concerns
- Comment response approach
  - “Thematic” responses
  - Potential analysis
- Next steps



# Public Meetings

## Sacramento (12/5) and Maxwell (12/7)

- Both well attended
- Sacramento meeting included support statements from labor interests as well as environmental interest concerns
- Maxwell session included individuals and environmental interest concerns



# Written Comments

136 letters/e-mails to date

- Tribes (3)
- Federal (3)
- State (6)
- NGOs (10)
- Individuals (103)
  - Including one petition (1001 signatures)



# Tribal Comments

Letters received from Colusa Indian Community Council, California Indian Water Commission, and Winnemem Wintu

- Colusa ICC
  - Indian Trust Assets (ITA) need to be identified (Reclamation)
  - Potential impacts to Tribal water demands (potentially met by Sites)
  - Geomorphology impacts to ITAs
  - Burial grounds within reservoir footprint and Sacramento River diversion
- California Indian Water Commission
  - Requests extension for review
  - ITA discussion inadequate
  - Ecocultural effects not analyzed – support no action
- Winnemem Wintu
  - Signatory to Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman’s Association



# Federal Agencies

## Letters received from EPA, NMFS, WAPA

- Additional detail
  - Final operational approach (including bypass flows and weirs) – *NOAA (NMFS), EPA and WAPA*
  - Water quality – *EPA and NMFS*
  - Fish screens – *NMFS*
  - Wetlands - *EPA*
- Power benefits methodology – *WAPA*
- *USFWS comments to be provided through FWCA report*



**NOAA**  
**FISHERIES**





# State Agencies

Letters from CDFW, SWRCB, Delta Stewardship Council, Cal FIRE, Caltrans, Department of Conservation

- Proposed diversions/bypass flows and impacts to fisheries – additional alternatives
- Water quality (including river and reservoir temperatures)
- Terrestrial resources impacts
- Delta species impacts
- Enforceable mitigation measures/detail
- Avoid run-off to state roads/highways
- Fire suppression and access
- First responders and required communications
- Conversion of agricultural lands – conservation easements



# Local Agencies

## Letters from:

- Colusa Board of Supervisors
- Maxwell Fire Protection District
- Kanawha Fire Protection District
- County of Humboldt Board of Supervisors
- Northern California Power Agency
- Woodland-Davis Clean Water Agency (WDCWA)
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)
- Metropolitan Water District (MWD)
- Contra Costa Water District (CCWD)





# Primary Local Agency Concerns

- Fire potential during construction and access
- Recreational use and implications to county operations
- Land use impacts
- Impacts to CVP power customers
- Electrical transmission interconnections
- Potential Trinity River impacts
- Potential Woodland-Davis effects
- Potential impacts to CCWD water supply quality
- Support project



# Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Letters from:

- NRDC et al (including Defenders of Wildlife, Bay Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, PCFFA)
- PCFFA, Institute for Fisheries Resources, Save California Salmon, Winnemem Wintu Tribe, San Francisco Baykeeper
- AquAlliance
- Friends of the River
- Sierra Club
- Save California Salmon (1001 individuals)



# Primary NGO Concerns

- Range of alternatives – include decreased diversions
- Baseline assumptions – need to include future/very recent actions (e.g. Shasta storage, Yolo Bypass weir)
- Climate change should be part of baseline
- Outdated modeling approach
- Operational impact to fisheries
- Impacts to terrestrial species
- Impacts to cultural resources
- Impacts to Trinity and Delta
- Additional cumulative impacts



# Individuals

103 individual letters/e-mails (including petition signed by 1001+ individuals)

- Property owner concerns including grazing and general access
- Petition focuses on no surplus water available statewide and does not include protections for fish (including Trinity River) and flows
- Water quality impacts
- Range of alternatives
- Aquatic and terrestrial resources impacts
- Location of powerlines
- Impacts to public roads
- Cultural resources impacts
- Delta outflows
- Additional conservation is necessary





# Potential Thematic Responses

Propose development of thematic responses (number of letters/e-mails referencing) including:

- Additional analyses required - primarily fishery related (87)
- Delta flow impacts (68)
- Terrestrial/botanical impacts (54)
- Tribal, ITA, cultural resources (47)
- Climate change and sea level rise (45)
- Economic/financial impacts (45)
- Range of alternatives (16)
- Bypass flows and flow reductions (13)





# Suggested Additional Analyses

- More analysis on fisheries impacts and direct relationship between Project diversions and Delta outflow (most)
- Suggest use of updated (2015) CALSIM model (CDFW, NRDC, PCFFA et. al.)
- Suggest use of daily modeling related to fishery/WQ impacts (CDFW, NRDC et. al., PCFFA et.al.)
- Concern for analytical approach that relies on 2030/existing conditions as well as climate change baseline assumptions (CDFW, PCFFA et. al., NRDC et. al.)
- Additional analysis of water quality impacts (most)
- Suggest including water residence times and accounting for seasonal warming from intakes to Sites (CDFW)



## Next Steps

- Identify proposed response approach for letters/categories of comments
- Complete Reclamation summary comment/response memo
- Support discussions with permitting agencies
  - NMFS
  - USFWS
  - CDFW
- Prepare for Phase 2 work effort





# EIR/EIS Public Comment Update/Summary

February 2018

