From:	William Brooks
To:	comments, EIR@DeltaCouncil
Subject:	Draft EIR
Date:	Monday, December 19, 2011 4:24:53 PM
Attachments:	EIR_Comments_letter_Brooks_12-16-11.doc Requested EIR question.doc

---

Attn: Terry Macaulay,

Please see the attached letter, clarifying the public oral comments I made, on 15th Dec 2011.

Also attached is the "Requested Addition *(for)* Inclusion in the Environmental Report - Delta Stewardship Council - Dec/15/2011 (wrb)".
Mr. Isenberg acknowledged receipt of this.

Thank you for considering this,

Sincerely,
William Brooks

EIR Comments
Delta Stewardship Council
Attn: Terry Macaulay,
980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500,
Sacramento,
CA 95814

3241 Becerra Way
Sacramento
CA 95821

16th December, 2011

Re: **Comments** for **Draft Plan Environmental Impact Report**

Dear Terry Macaulay,

Further to my public oral comments, given at the Council Meeting on 15th December 2011, I would like to clarify these, and provide an additional copy of the questions I hope will be answered in a subsequent report. These were handed to, and verbally accepted by Mr. Isenberg, at the meeting.

1) Why is the pollution to the environment caused by the increased power production, to power the proposed Water Conveyancing Project, not mentioned in this Environmental Report?

CEC staff report stated in the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy, that Total Water Related Energy Use in the State was 48,000 GWh of electricity, and 4.2 billion therms of Natural Gas[1]. This is 19 % of all electricity and 32 % of non-generational natural gas use.

The report estimated that in 2001, water supply, conveyance, distribution and treatment used about 10,742 GWh of electricity, or 22% of total water-energy use in the State.
Recent studies indicate that figures are now much higher.

Currently the current single biggest user of electricity in the state, is the State Aqueduct. Pumping water from us, up over the 3000 feet tall Tehachapi's, to LA. This is over 2,200 kWh per acre foot of water.
The plans for the new proposed project indicate a total pump capacity, 5 times the current value.
Recent data indicates that is the equivalent of 2 new (average Californian) power stations and 5 times the current pollution, which is of significant concern to most Californian residents, I would say.

The EPA currently states the following concerning Coal, Petroleum and Gas Power Plants. These make up 40 % of California's current energy producers:

“The scrubbers at Power plants are the nation’s biggest producer of toxic waste in water: Plant wastewater often contains high concentrations of dissolved aluminum, arsenic, barium, boron, chromium, iron, manganese, cadmium, magnesium, mercury, nickel, and other heavy metals - that have been shown to contribute to cancer, organ failures and other diseases, according to state documents.”

And the EPA states the following concerning Power Plants and the Air: "Emissions of nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and particulate matter by these Plants represent a significant contribution to air pollution in the State.”

Yet I don't see these gases: Carbon Monoxide, Carbon Dioxide, Hydrocarbons, Nitrogen Oxides, Sulfur Oxides, listed anywhere in this Environmental Impact Report.

Furthermore, what about the increased environmental impact of the extraction of Coal, Petroleum, and Gas, plus the 300 chemicals from the Oil & Gas Fracking industry that are already polluting the groundwater of the Delta.

The EPA recently reported fracking to be the “source of subterranean reservoir pollution in some locations. Among the list of carcinogens measured are formaldehyde, naphthalene, methanol, diesel, and chemicals in the BTEX compound group (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene), kerosene, 2-BE, diesel fuel, and ethylene glycol, which have been associated with birth defects and other disorders.”

Should there not be some mention somewhere, of likely <u>increases</u> in all of the chemicals and gasses associated with these polluting power plants, and any subsequent health and environmental problems? Otherwise I would say that this is a flawed report.

2) I understand that these new pumps, 5 times the size of the current Aqueduct project, have the capability of actually draining the Sacramento river, in the summertime.
In the Report I see no mention on the effects that this tremendous loss of water will have on the Environment?

All the literature states that the plan will: “Protect, <u>restore</u> and enhance the Delta <u>Ecosystem</u>”. All evidence indicates that major water loss will have an adverse effect on the Ecosystem. This sentence needs to be explained, corrected or totally removed from all the Delta Stewardship documentation.

Sincerely,

William Brooks

Note: Attached document submitted to Mr. Isenberg: “Requested Addition *(for)* Inclusion in the Environmental Impact Report – Delta Stewardship Council - Dec/15/2011 (wrb)”

p.s. I think that all Californians have the right to water and I support necessary sustainable power production, but how about an environmental report on: spending this same tax payers money on some great alternatives, such as **giving every southern californian a free dual flush toilet**, and **every farmer a free drip feed system**, and spend the rest of this money on water conservation projects, efficiency, storm water capture, groundwater recharging, grey water treatment and landscaping, cooling tower water conservation projects, low flow fixtures, water assessment help and so many other ideas, and the subsequent jobs these could create.
It could save the same amount of water and cost the tax payers much less in the long term.

Requested Addition Inclusion in the Environmental Impact Report
– Delta Stewardship Council – Dec/15/2011 (wrb)

THE PROPOSED DELTA WATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEM:

Total Proposed Energy requirements (max/min/mean): _____ kWh / acre foot of H2O

Total Proposed Pump capacity (max/min/mean): _____ m^3 per second

Anticipated INCREASES in EPA listed, environmental pollutants, due to the necessary power generation for the Proposed Conveyance System:

Power Plant wastewater (dissolved)**:**
Aluminum: _____
Arsenic: _____
Barium: _____
Boron: _____
Chromium: _____
Iron: _____
Manganese: _____
Cadmium: _____
Magnesium: _____
Mercury: _____
Nickel: _____
Other heavy metals: _____

Power Plants Air pollution:
Nitrogen Oxides: _____
Carbon Monoxide: _____
Carbon Dioxide: _____
Sulfur Oxides: _____
Hydrocarbons: _____
Particulate matter: _____

Gas extraction and Fracking water table pollution:
Formaldehyde: _____
Methanol: _____
Diesel: _____
Naphthalene: _____
BTEX compound group (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene):_____,_____,_____,_____
Kerosene: _____
2-BE: _____
Ethylene glycol: _____

Requested Addition Inclusion in the Environmental Impact Report
– Delta Stewardship Council – Dec/15/2011 (wrb)

THE PROPOSED DELTA WATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEM:

Total Proposed Energy requirements (max/min/mean): _____ kWh / acre foot of H2O

Total Proposed Pump capacity (max/min/mean): _____ m^3 per second

Anticipated INCREASES in EPA listed, environmental pollutants, due to the necessary power generation for the Proposed Conveyance System:

Power Plant wastewater (dissolved)**:**
Aluminum: _____
Arsenic: _____
Barium: _____
Boron: _____
Chromium: _____
Iron: _____
Manganese: _____
Cadmium: _____
Magnesium: _____
Mercury: _____
Nickel: _____
Other heavy metals: _____

Power Plants Air pollution:
Nitrogen Oxides: _____
Carbon Monoxide: _____
Carbon Dioxide: _____
Sulfur Oxides: _____
Hydrocarbons: _____
Particulate matter: _____

Gas extraction and Fracking water table pollution:
Formaldehyde: _____
Methanol: _____
Diesel: _____
Naphthalene: _____
BTEX compound group (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene):_____,_____,_____,_____
Kerosene: _____
2-BE: _____
Ethylene glycol: _____