

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

BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)
AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) PROCESS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2009
PUBLIC COMMENTS
6:00 P.M.

VETERANS MEMORIAL CENTER
203 EAST 14TH STREET
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: HE SUK JONG, CSR 12918

| | |
|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 Dave Breninger, president of Recreational 2 Boaters of California, 925 L Street, Suite 220, 3 Sacramento, California 95814, (530) 823-4860, 4 dbreninger@pcwa.net.</p> <p>5 MR. BRENINGER: Our issue is looking to 6 sustain accessibility for recreational boats to the 7 waters of the United States in the Delta as changes 8 are proposed.</p> <p>9 A couple of examples where we would very 10 much like to have further discussion: Wherever any 11 gates or barriers are placed across waterways, such as 12 Three-Mile Slough, Bacon Island, and other locations, 13 is that boat locks also be installed and operated at 14 times when the boating public wants to travel through 15 the Delta and that the locks be built and operated at 16 no expense to boaters since they're being placed 17 across waters of the United States.</p> <p>18 The second example we would give relates to 19 the proposed Through Delta Conveyance facility, which 20 basically would be along alignment of existing eastern 21 Delta waterways. And our concern, again, would be 22 that as new levees or barriers are installed across 23 existing waterways, that accommodation for 24 recreational boats, again, be provided and operated at 25 no expense to boaters.</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 neighboring farmland. This needs to be addressed in 2 the EIR process.</p> <p>3 Another point is in the issues and concerns. 4 There is no mention of the Knights Landing Ridge Cut 5 Canal, which flows into the Yolo Bypass just below 6 Fremont Weir. Additional water in the bypass may have 7 significant impacts on the water flows in the canal 8 and cause backup. That needs to be addressed, also, 9 in the EIR.</p> <p>10 The Knights Landing is the outlet of the 11 Colusa drain. One of the items that is mentioned as 12 an issue is effect on other terrestrial species. I 13 feel that this has not been thoroughly discussed in 14 the draft. There are listed species, such as 15 Swainson's hawk, that will be affected by the changes 16 in the bypass and the surrounding lands. In fact, 17 some of the mitigation areas for Swainson's Hawk will 18 be destroyed, perhaps, by additional water in the 19 bypass. So I feel that they are looking at increasing 20 habitat for one type of species that's listed, but, by 21 the same token, they are harming habitat for other 22 listed species, and that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>23 Another point that needs to be addressed in 24 the EIR/EIS process that is not mentioned is the 25 increased sedimentation that will occur in the bypass</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 --oOo--</p> <p>2 Lynnel Pollock, Resident, P.O. Box 468, 3 Yolo, California 95697, (530) 662-3570.</p> <p>4 MS. POLLOCK: I'm going to speak 5 specifically to the core element No. 1, which is to 6 modify Fremont Weir to provide higher frequency and 7 duration of inundation. As a background -- my 8 husband, Herb, and I are here -- we farm in northern 9 Yolo county next to Fremont Weir, so we're directly 10 affected, I feel, by the proposed changes at Fremont 11 Weir.</p> <p>12 There are many issues and concerns 13 delineated in the draft as proposed. The draft is of 14 January '09. That was the last draft that I saw. All 15 of these Issues and Concerns that are stated really 16 need to be addressed in the EIR/EIS process. They are 17 significant, in our minds. There are also some issues 18 and concerns that are not listed that I feel need to 19 be addressed in the EIR and EIS process.</p> <p>20 The No. 1 item that I see as a significant 21 effect of this proposal is seepage water that will be 22 coming from the bypass levees and affecting adjoining 23 farmlands. This is not mentioned, and we know now 24 that when water is in the bypass there is significant 25 seepage that comes through the levees and ends up on</p> | <p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 with additional water flows. There is no mention of 2 this. It periodically does have to be cleaned out and 3 sediment removed. And if more water is put in, 4 particularly at lower flows, it will cause increased 5 sedimentation. And much of this sedimentation is 6 laden with mercury, so the mercury issue does need to 7 be looked at.</p> <p>8 And I think the final thing that I would 9 like to mention -- a couple of things: The technical 10 details of how more water will be put into the bypass 11 needs to be looked at very carefully. It can be a 12 very expensive process, perhaps because of the levels 13 in the contours of the land there, and ongoing 14 maintenance costs that need to be looked at.</p> <p>15 And, finally, I would like to mention, in 16 talking about increased inundation of the bypass, the 17 availability of water really needs to be addressed 18 because, even if they are talking about winter flows, 19 that water has to come from somewhere. The existing 20 flows are probably deficient to provide the kind of 21 water that they're talking about over the duration of 22 time.</p> <p>23 (END OF COMMENTS.)</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> |