

## Proposal Full View

Print

### APPLICANT INFORMATION

<b>Sites Project Authority *</b>	Sites Project			
<b>Tax ID</b>	900635251			
<b>Point Of Contact *</b>	<b>Division/Address List:</b>	General Manager		
	<b>Address1:</b>	122 Old Highway 99 West	<b>Address2:</b>	P. O. Box 517
	<b>City:</b>	Maxwell	<b>State:</b>	CA
	<b>Zip:</b>	95955		
	<b>First Name:</b>	Jim	<b>Last Name:</b>	Watson
	<b>Email:</b>	jwatson@sitesproject.org	<b>Phone (Direct):</b>	5304108250
<b>Point Of Contact Position Title *</b>	General Manager, Sites Project Authority			
<b>Proposal Name *</b>	Sites Project			
<b>Proposal Objective*</b>	<p>This application is submitted by the Sites Project Authority to secure investment funding as authorized under voter approved Proposition 1 in exchange for providing the State of California with eligible public benefits. The Sites Project will be an offstream reservoir independently owned, constructed, governed, and operated by the Authority under its own water rights and other regulatory requirements; but in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and California Department of Water Resources in their operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP), respectively. The summary objective of the Sites Project is to make California's water system more efficient, flexible, and reliable, which will provide local, statewide, and national benefits. The project helps to achieve the objectives of the California Water Action Plan by providing a substantial supply of high-quality water to support the economy and enhance the environment, particularly in the face of climate change. The public benefits for the Sites Project are to improve the survival of anadromous fish and other aquatic species, provide incremental Level 4 refuge water supply, provide opportunities for recreation, and reduce flood damage reduction. Non-Proposition 1 eligible benefits include water supply and hydropower generation. The Authority offers the State of California the first right of refusal for 710,000 AF (40% capacity) for public benefits provided by</p>			

the project. If the State accepts full responsibility for the public benefits, this would provide a long-term average of 195 TAF of water for public benefits. The submittals in this application assume the State would instead prefer federal participation with shared investment in public benefits at a level that reduces capital costs for the Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) program. This anticipates future federal funding under the Water Infrastructure for Improvements to the Nation (WIIN) Act.

**BUDGET**

<b>Other Contribution</b>	0
<b>Local Contribution</b>	2720000000
<b>Federal Contribution</b>	7300000000
<b>Inkind Contribution</b>	640000000
<b>Amount Requested *</b>	1662000000
<b>Total Proposal Cost *</b>	5176000000

**GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

<b>Latitude *</b>	<b>DD (+/-):</b> 39	<b>MM:</b> 18	<b>SS:</b> 31
<b>Longitude *</b>	<b>DD (+/-):</b> 122	<b>MM:</b> 20	<b>SS:</b> 17
<b>Longitude/Latitude Clarification</b>	The latitude and longitude correspond to the intersection of Sites and Huffmaster Roads, the current point of access to Antelope Valley. Sites Reservoir is a large project with a main reservoir of over 14,000 acres and approx. 13 miles of pipelines.		<b>Location</b> New reservoir in Colusa and Glenn Counties. New pipeline to the Sacramento River.
<b>County*</b>	Colusa, Glenn		
<b>Ground Water Basin</b>	Sacramento Valley-Colusa		
<b>Hydrologic Region</b>	Sacramento River		
<b>Watershed</b>	Colusa Basin (80)		

### LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

<b>Assembly District*</b>	3rd Assembly District
<b>Senate District*</b>	4th Senate District
<b>US Congressional District*</b>	District 3 (CA)

## Project Information

### PROJECT NAME: SITES PROJECT

#### SITES PROJECT

<b>Implementing Organization</b>	Sites Project Authority
<b>Secondary Implementing Organization</b>	
<b>Proposed Start Date</b>	1/1/0001
<b>Proposed End Date</b>	1/1/0001
<b>Scope Of Work</b>	
<b>Project Description</b>	
<b>Project Objective</b>	

### PROJECT BENEFITS INFORMATION

No records found.

### BUDGET

<b>Other Contribution</b>	0
<b>Local Contribution</b>	2720000000
<b>Federal Contribution</b>	730000000
<b>Inkind Contribution</b>	64000000
<b>Amount Requested*</b>	1662000000
<b>Total Project Cost*</b>	5176000000

### GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

<b>Latitude *</b>	<b>DD (+/-):</b> 39	<b>MM:</b> 18	<b>SS:</b> 31
-------------------	---------------------	---------------	---------------

<b>Longitude*</b>	<b>DD (+/-):</b> 122	<b>MM:</b> 20	<b>SS:</b> 17
<b>Longitude/Latitude Clarification</b>	<p>The latitude and longitude correspond to the intersection of Sites and Huffmaster Roads, the current point of access to Antelope Valley. Sites Reservoir is a large project with a main reservoir of over 14,000 acres and approx. 13 miles of pipelines.</p>		<p><b>Location</b></p> <p>New reservoir in Colusa and Glenn Counties. New pipeline to the Sacramento River.</p>
<b>County*</b>	Colusa, Glenn		
<b>Ground Water Basin</b>	Sacramento Valley-Colusa		
<b>Hydrologic Region</b>	Sacramento River		
<b>Watershed</b>	Colusa Basin (80)		

**LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION**

<b>Assembly District*</b>	3rd Assembly District
<b>Senate District*</b>	4th Senate District
<b>US Congressional District*</b>	District 3 (CA)

**Section : ELIGIBILITY AND GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

**ELIGIBILITY AND GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION TAB**

**Q.1 Applicant Type:**

Specify which of the following describes the applicant:

Joint powers authority

**Q.2 Project Type:**

Please identify the appropriate project type for the application:

Surface Storage Projects Identified in the CALFED

**Q.3 Public Benefits:**

Please identify the public benefit categories for which Program funding is requested:

- a)  Ecosystem Improvements (must be included)
- b)  Water Quality Improvements
- c)  Flood Control Benefit
- d)  Emergency Response
- e)  Recreational Purposes

**Q.4:**

Explain why the proposed project does not adversely affect any river afforded protection pursuant to the California or Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. See section 6003(a)(1)(I) of the regulations.

The dams for Sites Reservoir would be constructed on Funks and Stone Corral Creeks. Neither watercourse is protected by the California or Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. No protected rivers would be impacted. See Chapter 6 (Section 6.3) in the Draft EIR/S (<http://sitesproject.org/information/DraftEIR-EIS>) for a detailed analysis of impacts to surface water.

**Q.5:**

Is the applicant an agricultural or urban water supplier as defined in section 6001 of the Program regulations? If not, enter "Not Applicable"; if so, has the applicant submitted complete Agricultural or Urban Water Management Plans to DWR? Have those plans been verified as complete by DWR? If not, explain how the applicant is working towards compliance with the requirements of Water Code section 10608.56. See section 6003(a)(1)(J) of the regulations.

The Sites Project Authority is composed of representatives of the potentially affected counties, and water management agencies within the Sacramento River watershed. The Sites Project Reservoir Committee participants include both urban and agricultural water suppliers. All participants that are required to submit plans have submitted plans to DWR. Some of the Urban Water Management Plans have already been approved. The remaining plans are currently under review by DWR. All applicants will work with DWR to resolve any future comments on their plans. The status for the plans of each individual agency participating in Sites Reservoir is provided in the Water Management Plan Summary in Attachment Sites\_A6B WMPs.xls of this tab.

**Q.6:**

Does the proposed project affect groundwater basins, as defined by Water Code section 10722 *et seq.*? If not, enter "Not Applicable"; if so, identify the affected groundwater basins and describe how the project would be integrated with future GSP(s). Explain how the project would reduce, eliminate, or have an effect on undesirable results (as defined in regulations section 6001(a)(85)) within the affected groundwater basin(s). Describe how the applicant would work with GSA(s) or adjudicated participants of the basin. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(K).

Sites Reservoir would help alleviate undesirable conditions in the Colusa Groundwater Basin. Desert Water Agency and the Coachella Valley Water Agency would use water from Sites for groundwater replenishment to address undesirable results in their basins. An attachment on Groundwater Management is provided in Attachment Sites\_A6C Groundwater Basins of this tab.

**A.1 Executive Summary:**

Attach the executive summary (max 20 pages). See regulation section 6003(a)(1)(A).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 ExecSum.pdf

#### A.2 Resolution:

Attach the Resolution, as required by regulations section 6003(a)(1)(C). See Program website for an example resolution.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Resolution.pdf

#### A.3 Project Description:

**Project Description.** Attach a description of the project that meets the requirements of section 3.3 of the TR. If a full project description is included in another attachment, identify the attachment name and beginning page number in this attachment.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A3 Project Description.pdf

#### A.4 Project Description Support:

Attach maps, schematics and engineering design drawings that support the project description, if not already available in other attached documents. See section 6003(a)(1)(B) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A4 Drawings.pdf

#### A.5 Attestation:

Attach a statement, under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California, attesting that the information provided in the full application is true and correct to the best of the applicant's knowledge. Scanned uploaded documents containing a scanned signature are sufficient. See section 6003(a)(1)(Y) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Resolution.pdf

#### A.6 Other Application Information:

**OPTIONAL:** Attach any other information that would support the application which does not fit easily in another category: for example, other studies or an index of the submitted application documents.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A6A Application Index.xlsx,Sites\_A6B WMPs.docx,Sites\_A6C Groundwater Basins.docx,Sites\_A6D Modeling Results Compendium.pdf,Sites\_A6E Letters.pdf

## Section : PHYSICAL PUBLIC BENEFITS

### PHYSICAL PUBLIC BENEFITS

#### A.1 Ecosystem Benefits:

Attach completed Ecosystem Priorities worksheets. Be sure to include the general information worksheet as well as worksheets for each priority being claimed for which funds are being requested. Identify at least one Program ecosystem priority for any ecosystem public benefit quantified. See section 6003(a)(1)(Q) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Ecosystem Priorities.docx

#### A.2 Ecosystem Benefits:

Attach supporting documentation requested in Ecosystem Priorities worksheets such as maps or other information not already provided elsewhere in the application.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Ecosystem Documentation.docx

#### A.1 Water Quality Benefits:

Attach completed Water Quality Priorities table(s). If the project is claiming water quality benefits that meet the water quality priorities, be sure to include the general application questions table as well as tables for each priority being claimed for which funds are being requested. Identify at least one Program water quality priority for any water quality public benefit quantified. See section 6003(a)(1)(Q) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 WQ General Questions.docx, Sites\_A1 WQ Priority 1.docx, Sites\_A1 WQ Priority 6.docx, Sites\_A1 WQ Priority 7.docx, Sites\_A1 WQ Priority 9.docx

#### A.2 Water Quality Benefits:

Attach supporting documentation requested in Water Quality Priorities tables such as maps or other information not already provided elsewhere in the application.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 WQ Maps.docx, Sites\_A2 Documentation WQ Priority 1.docx, Sites\_A2 Documentation WQ Priority 6.docx, Sites\_A2 Documentation WQ Priority 9.docx

**Q.1 Flood Control Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming flood control benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

If applicable, how will the project provide flood control benefits? If some project operations will be for flood control purposes, explain. Are the flood control benefits realized locally and/or throughout the larger flood control system? (TR section 4.9.2.1) Describe any negative impacts of providing the flood control benefit. (TR section 4.9.2.4)

The proposed project is located in the Colusa Basin watershed in Colusa and Glenn counties. It consists of constructing two main dams, Golden State Dam on Funks Creek and Sites Dam on Stone Corral Creek, and nine saddle dams on the northern end of the reservoir between the Funks Creek and Hunter Creek watersheds along the Glenn-Colusa county line. The existing Funks Dam is located on Funks Creek would be replaced with a new, larger Holthouse Reservoir. As an offstream reservoir, Sites Reservoir does not have a large, upstream watershed. Sites Reservoir can, nevertheless, be operated to provide local flood control benefits by capturing and attenuating flood flows associated with Stone Corral and Funks Creeks and the other local ephemeral watersheds. By capturing flows from extreme storm events, the project will reduce flood damages, such as the February 18, 2017 event that flooded the community of Maxwell and temporarily closed Interstate 5.

**Q.2 Flood Control Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming flood control benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

What methods were used to calculate flood damage reduction? Identify which of the following methods was used to quantify physical flood control benefits:

1. Modeling provided with feasibility study
2. New modeling using historical flood events or historical hydrology
3. New modeling using the climate change hydrology data set provided

If 1 or 2 is used, explain how benefits might be different under the provided future climate and sea levels projections.

Provide justification for any methods not identified in section 5.4.3 of the TR. See also regulations section 6004(a)(1)(F).

New modeling using historical flood events or historical hydrology was used to determine physical flood damage reduction benefits. Flooding in the watershed currently occurs between October and April due to rainfall-runoff. If rainfall run-off timing and duration are affected by climate change, it is anticipated that the project will provide additional flood damage reduction benefits. Additional information is provided in Attachment A1 (Sites\_A1 Flood Control under the PHYSICAL PUBLIC BENEFITS TAB).

**A.1 Flood Control Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming flood control benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

Attach any relevant flood damage reduction supporting documentation, such as hydraulic and hydrologic modeling studies, and property flood damage analysis (TR section 4.9.4). If information to support this question is located in another attachment, provide the location.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Flood Control.docx

**Q.1 Emergency Response Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming emergency response benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

If applicable, how will the project be operated to provide emergency response benefits? Identify the types of emergency benefits the proposed project could provide. (TR section 4.11.1). If additional information to support this question is located in another attachment, provide the location.

The Authority is committed to working with the state and federal water managers and emergency personnel to provide water to support emergency events such as, but not limited to, firefighting, drought relief, and Delta levee failures. Instead of dedicating a volume of water that may not be called upon by the state until at least a one-in-ten year event (or longer) occurs, the Authority proposes that should water from Sites Reservoir be used to aid in responding to or recovery from an emergency, that repayment would occur through a mutually-acceptable exchange or transfer of water. As such, this benefit was not monetized and the Authority is not requesting Proposition 1 funding for this purpose. Should the Water Commission be interested in acquiring water to reserve storage for a qualifying Proposition-1 emergency event, the Sites Project Authority will work with the Water Commission to evaluate the concept and, if appropriate, prepare an amendment to this application for the Water Commission's consideration.



**A.1 Emergency Response Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming emergency response benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

Attach a description of the amount or share of stored water to be provided for the emergency benefits and define the conditions under which water would be made available. Describe how the applicant can commit to the conditions under which the emergency benefits would be made available. (TR section 4.11.2)

**Q.1 Recreation Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming recreation benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

If applicable, how will the project be operated to provide recreation benefits? If additional information to support this question is located in another attachment, provide the location.

Sites Reservoir will provide new opportunities for surface-water recreation, such as boating, fishing, and swimming. New shoreline facilities at the reservoir will be constructed to support camping, hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, picnicking, and sightseeing. The project includes two new recreation areas, Stone Corral and Peninsula Hills. Two boat ramps would provide access to the reservoir. Day-use and overnight camping facilities would be constructed on the shore. Sites Reservoir operations would also support the maintenance of higher water levels at Shasta and Folsom Lakes. Beneficial effects were noted in some instances where additional storage in existing facilities resulting from the operation of Sites Reservoir would provide more frequent access to boat ramps at these facilities. Additional recreational benefits will be provided for fishermen in the Sacramento and American River watersheds as a result of increased populations of Chinook salmon and steelhead. Additional information is provided in Sites\_A2 Recreation under the PHYSICAL PUBLIC BENEFITS TAB.

**Q.2 Recreation Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming recreation benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

By providing new recreation benefits, does the proposed project negatively affect any existing recreation activities either at the proposed project site, at another facility, or nearby recreation area? (TR section 4.10.1.1)

Recreational impacts are evaluated in Chapter 21 of the Draft EIR/EIS (Posted at <http://sitesproject.org/information/DraftEIR-EIS>). No potentially significant impacts were identified. There are no existing recreational activities in the project footprint. Beneficial effects were noted in some instances where additional storage at nearby recreation areas (e.g., Shasta Lake) will result from the operation of Sites Reservoir, providing more frequent access to boat ramps at these facilities.

**Q.3 Recreation Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming recreation benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

Describe the proposed recreation physical benefits including the size of the facility, recreation activities allowed, recreation facilities associated with these activities, and their capacities and seasonal closures and conditions in which facilities are not usable or activities cannot occur. Any supporting analysis should be attached in A.1 below. (TR section 4.10.1.2)

Sites\_A2 Recreation under the PHYSICAL PUBLIC BENEFITS TAB contains a description of the proposed recreation facilities.

**A.1 Recreation Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming recreation benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

Attach recreation visitation estimates including documentation of estimation methodology.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Recreation Visitation.docx

**A.2 Recreation Benefits: If the proposed project is not claiming recreation benefits, leave the following questions blank.**

Attach or provide links to any relevant recreation studies associated with the proposed project.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Recreation.docx

## **Section : FEASIBILITY & IMPLEMENTATION RISK**

### **FEASIBILITY & IMPLEMENTATION RISK**

**A.1 Feasibility Documentation:**

Attach feasibility studies or documentation that demonstrates the proposed project's technical, environmental, economic, and financial feasibility as described in TR section 3.5. See also regulations section 6003(a)(1)(O).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Feasibility.docx

**A.2 Permit List:**

Provide a listing and status of all local, state, and federal permits, certifications, and other approval necessary for the construction and operation of the project. See section 6003(a)(1)(W) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Permits.docx

**A.3 Schedule:**

Attach an estimated schedule for the proposed project until the first year of operation. If the schedule is included in another attachment, identify the location. See section 6003(a)(1)(G) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A3 Schedule.pdf

**A.4 Environmental Document:**

Attach the most recent publicly available environmental document for the proposed project. If the document is available on a website, provide a link to the document(s). See section 6003(a)(1)(S) of the regulations.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A4 Environmental.pdf

**A.5 Impacts and Consultation:**

Summarize the project's impacts on environmental or cultural resources and how the project will mitigate or minimize impacts to those resources, or identify where in the CEQA document this information can be found. If any environmental or cultural impacts will not be fully mitigated, explain. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(T).

If applicable, identify whether Tribal consultation has been initiated for the project. If it has, provide supporting documentation, or identify the location in the CEQA document. If consultation has not been initiated, state whether consultation is expected and when consultation is expected to be initiated. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(U).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A5 Impacts and Tribal.docx

## **Section : BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, and RESILIENCY**

### **BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, and RESILIENCY**

#### **Q.1:**

Did the applicant use the model products and assumptions described in section 6004(a)(1) of the regulations? See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(CC). If no, provide a description of the models and assumptions used to determine the without-project future conditions for years 2030 and 2070.

The analyses conducted for the Sites Reservoir Project utilized the model products and assumptions described in section 6004(a)(1). This includes the 2030 and 2070 future conditions CalSim II and DSM2 models provided by the California Water Commission on November 2, 2016. The models provided by the commission were modified to include the facilities and operation of the Sites Project as described in the Project Description and Assumptions section. The with- and without-project current conditions analyses were based on the DWR State Water Project Delivery Capability Report 2015 (DCR 2015) - CalSim II base scenario. The DCR 2015 base scenario, provided by DWR, was modified to include the facilities and operation of the Sites Project. The project description and assumptions for the with-project current condition are the same as for the 2030 and 2070 with-project conditions. The analyses also included the use of other analytical tools that were updated for future 2030 and 2070 conditions. These tools include: - USRDOM - Upper Sacramento River Daily Operations Model - Sacramento River HEC5Q model - SALMOD - American River CE-QUAL-W2 Model - CWEST - SWAP - LTGEN - SWP Power - NODOS Power

#### **A.1 Project Conditions:**

Attach description and assumptions of with-project conditions for years 2030 and 2070, as defined in section 6004(a)(2) of the regulations, as well as a description of the with- and without-project current conditions. See also regulations section 6003(a)(1)(BB).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Modeling.docx

#### **A.2 Preliminary Operations Plan:**

Attach the preliminary operations plan for the proposed project. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(H) for details. If the preliminary operations plan is located in another attachment, identify the attachment and provide the location.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Operations.docx

#### **A.3 Monetized Benefits Analysis:**

**Attach the analysis of all public and non-public monetized benefits. Identify at least one Program ecosystem or water quality priority for any ecosystem or water quality public benefit quantified. For each public and non-public benefit, describe the methods used to derive the physical and economic benefits and impacts at a level of detail that allows reviewers to verify your analysis.**

**Description must include:**

- The physical changes that are being monetized, consistent with information requested in the Physical Public Benefits Tab, and describing linkages between physical benefits and monetized benefits. See regulations sections 6004(a)(3) and 6004(a)(4); and
- The monetization method and sources for data used. See regulations section 6004(a)(4).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A3 Physical Monetized.docx

#### **A.4 Mitigation and Compliance Obligation:**

**For each net public benefit claimed, where applicable, identify any existing environmental mitigation or compliance obligations that are accounted for in each net public benefit as of the date of the CalSim-II model product in section 6004 (a)(1).**

- Applicants that use the CalSim-II and DSM2 models to analyze their projects can indicate “within models” for any existing environmental mitigation and compliance obligations contained in those models.
- If applicable to their claimed net public benefit such projects shall also list and account for the non-flow related mitigation and compliance obligations of the State Water Project and Central Valley Project.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A4 Mitigation.docx

#### **A.5 Quantification Support:**

**Provide additional information that supports the physical and monetary quantification of the public and non-public benefits and impacts of the project as required by subsection 6004(a)(4) of the regulations. This includes data, assumptions, analytical methods and modeling results, calculations and relevant sources of information. For reference documents or studies relied upon, applicants may provide links to an existing website in lieu of attaching those documents to the application.**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A5 Documentation.docx

#### **A.6 Monetization Table:**

**Attach a table displaying each future economic benefit in 2015 dollars for each year of the planning horizon as required by section 6004(a)(4)(A) of the regulations.**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A6 Annual Benefits Table.docx

#### **A.7 Non-Monetized Benefits:**

**If applicable, provide a summary of public benefits that cannot be monetized. Provide the following information for each non-monetized benefit.**

- Justification why benefit cannot be monetized,
- Qualitative description of importance of benefit (who is affected, how and how often),
- Evidence to show how the physical change is beneficial and important to Californians.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A7 Non\_Monetized.docx

#### **A.8 Total Project Cost Estimate:**

**Attach an estimate of the total project costs that includes construction cost, interest during construction, land acquisition, monitoring, environmental mitigation or compliance obligations, operations and maintenance, repair, and replacement costs during the planning horizon using methods described in TR section 6. If the project costs are located in another attachment, identify the location.**

*The project cost estimates must be reviewed, approved and signed by an engineer licensed by the California Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists.*

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A8 Estimate.pdf

#### **A.9 Benefit and Cost Analysis:**

**Attach the benefit and cost analysis for the proposed project. If the analysis is located in another document, identify the location. See regulations section 6004(a)(6).**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A9 BCA Results.docx

#### **A.10 Cost Allocation:**

**Provide a proposed allocation of total project costs to all project beneficiaries, including the Program, and an explanation of how the allocation was calculated, consistent with TR section 8 and section 6004(a)(7) of the regulations. If this information is included in another attachment, identify the location.**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A10 Allocation.docx

#### **A.11 Physical and Economic Summary Table:**

**Attach the Physical and Economic Benefits Summary tables. These tables can be downloaded from the Commission website and uploaded with the application. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(N).**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A11 Physical and Economic Benefits Summary Tables.xlsx

#### **A.12 Uncertainty Analysis:**

**Attach the uncertainty analysis. See regulations section 6004(a)(8).**

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A12 Uncertainty.docx

## Section : PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

### PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

#### Q.1:

**Describe how the project improves the operation of the state water system. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(M).**

Sites Reservoir would improve operational flexibility and reliability of the state water system, especially within the service areas of both the SWP and CVP, in addition to allowing California resource agencies to purposely allocate water for the benefit of environmental uses. CALSIM modeling results indicate that average long-term end of May storage in Lake Oroville would increase by 26 TAF in 2030 and further increase by an additional 31 TAF in 2070 through exchanges with Sites Reservoir. This demonstrates the resiliency of the improvement in the SWP. Likewise, long-term average storage in CVP reservoirs would also increase. End-of-May storage in Shasta Lake would increase by 59 TAF in 2030 and then increase by an additional 80 TAF in 2070. Storage in existing reservoirs that are cooperatively managed with the Sites Project would increase in all year types. This additional storage would provide the state water system greater flexibility in operating the overall system without negative impacts to water supplies and providing California resource agencies with a water supply dedicated to the environment. Sites Reservoir would be operated collaboratively with the SWP and CVP. The SWP and CVP would make their annual allocations and deliveries as normal. Exchanges with water stored in Sites Reservoir would help to maintain supplies in the existing reservoirs and produce the public benefits described for the project. Sites Reservoir would provide supplemental water that is much needed when allocations are low. Sites Reservoir Project would augment deliveries for both water supply and public benefits, especially during drought years. Sites Reservoir is beneficially located where it can support the operations of existing reservoirs north of the Delta, provide water to the Yolo Bypass for ecosystem restoration, deliver water to be picked up at the North Bay Aqueduct, and export water to the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California. In addition to preserving water in existing SWP and CVP reservoirs through exchange, Sites Reservoir would facilitate water transfers, one of the initiatives in the California Water Action Plan. Water from Sites could be moved south of the Delta to fill Diamond Valley Reservoir or provided for groundwater recharge to Coachella Valley Water District and Desert Water Agency. This topic is further discussed in the Executive Summary (Sites\_A1 ExecSum under the ELIGIBILITY AND GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION TAB).

#### Q.2:

**Describe how the project provides a net improvement in ecosystem and water quality conditions required by Water Code section 79750.**

Sites Reservoir would deliver an average of 125 TAF/yr from 2030 to 2070 for improving ecosystem and water quality conditions. This is an unprecedented amount of water that the State resources agencies will be able to directly manage for environmental benefit. Furthermore, cooperatively managing the operation of Sites Reservoir with State and Federal facilities will preserve higher water levels in the existing reservoirs and thereby protect the coldwater pools, improve temperature conditions downstream for existing reservoirs, and provide flows to support the migration of aquatic species in a variety of life stages. The potential benefits of the project for fish were modeled using SALMOD. Modeling results predict net improvements in fish populations for Chinook salmon (including endangered winter-run) under 2015, 2030, and 2070 conditions. By

providing releases to the Yolo Bypass, Sites Reservoir Project can also benefit Delta smelt, however, there are insufficient studies to characterize the magnitude of this benefit at this time. Sites Reservoir Project would excel in providing opportunities for in lieu use of surface water, thereby reducing the chronic lowering of groundwater levels, an undesirable result under SGMA. Sites Reservoir will also support the delivery of water for basic human needs to disadvantaged communities. See Sites\_A4 Mitigation under the BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, AND RESILIENCY TAB and Sites\_A5 Documentation under the BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, AND RESILIENCY TAB for further analysis.

---

**Q.3:**

**If applicable, summarize how the applicant is coordinating with the owners and operators of water system facilities not owned or operated by the applicant or project partners that may be affected by the project. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(P).**

The Authority is coordinating the development of operations with the Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. This coordination includes the future development of Principles of Agreement governing operations. See Sites\_A6 Annual Benefits Table under the BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, AND RESILIENCY TAB. A list of project partners is provided in Sites\_A1 Feasibility under the FEASIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION RISK TAB.

---

**Q.4:**

**Describe how the project advances the long-term objectives of restoring the ecological health and improving water management for beneficial uses of the Delta. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(R).**

The operations proposed for Sites Reservoir Project were developed with the intent of contributing to the attainment of the co-equal goals for the Delta of ecological health and improving water management for beneficial use. As a result, the annual yield from the Sites Project is divided between environmental and water supply purposes. The Sites Project would provide a unique opportunity to allocate reservoir storage and establish the first firm asset Ecosystem Enhancement Account in California. Based on the operations assumptions included in this application, the allocated storage would deliver approximately 125 TAF/yr (in 2030 through 2070 (with deliveries of up to 200 TAF/yr in critically dry years) that would be managed by the State (CDFW, SWRCB, and DWR) and Federal government to perform restoration actions beyond existing regulatory requirements. Conceptually, this account would use Sites Reservoir project assets to support modified operations that facilitate habitat enhancement actions. A Sites Reservoir Ecosystem Enhancement Governance Board would be created to manage the water account. The water account would be managed to adaptively support operational actions and respond to changing future conditions throughout the Sacramento River watershed and Delta. Sites Reservoir would also provide water for beneficial uses throughout the State, including water for agriculture and M&I purposes, and State and Federal wildlife refuges. Project participants include agencies in the Sacramento River Valley, Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Southern Desert, and South Coast regions of California.

---

**Q.5:**

Describe how the applicant will ensure that the proposed project will comply with and be consistent with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations, including existing environmental mitigation or compliance obligation requirements. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(V).

The Authority has initiated pre-applications discussions with several of the critical resource management and regulatory agencies in order to expedite compliance with all required laws and regulations. This early and diligent effort to understand the evolving concerns for regulatory compliance will reduce the overall compliance schedule and help ensure compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws in the planning, construction, and operation of Sites Reservoir, including mitigation requirements. The EIR/EIS (attached at <http://sitesproject.org/information/DraftEIR-EIS>) describes the impacts and mitigation measures that when implemented would reduce or avoid impacts and support compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and statutes. This includes all applicable regulations regarding water operations on the Sacramento River. Regulations are identified in Sites\_A2 Permits under the FEASIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION RISK TAB. The Authority's commitment to mitigation is further described under Sites\_A4 Mitigation under the BENEFIT CALCULATION, MONETIZATION, AND RESILIENCY TAB.

**A.1 Delta or Tributary Measurable Improvement:**

What measurable improvements to the Delta ecosystem or tributary to the Delta does the project provide? Where is the location of the improvement? If the project is not within the watershed of the Delta, what specific water rights or water contracts would be created or amended to ensure public benefits to the Delta ecosystem? Provide supporting documentation of the willingness of these water right or water contract holders to enter into such contracts or amendments. Explain how these changes would assure measurable improvements to the Delta ecosystem. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(L).

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Measureable Benefits.docx

**A.2 Cost Effectiveness:**

Provide documentation indicating the proposed project is cost-effective. If there is at least one feasible alternative means of providing the same amount or more of the total public and non-public physical benefits as provided by the proposed project, calculate, display and document the least-cost of these alternative means and justify the proposed project by comparison.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A2 Cost Effectiveness.docx

**Section : EARLY FUNDING REQUEST**

**EARLY FUNDING REQUEST**

**Q.1:**

Is early funding for completing environmental documentation and/or permits requested? If yes, answer the following question and provide the requested information. See regulations section 6003(a)(1)(X).

Yes.

**Q.2:**



**What is the requested amount?**

Requesting 50% of \$91,851,000 or \$45,925,500.

**A.1 Early Funding Scope, Schedule, Budget:****Attach a schedule, scope of work, and budget.**

- Keep in mind that the applicant must provide a 50 percent cost share and reimbursable costs can only go back to November 4, 2014.
- Scope of work must include an explanation of why early funding is critical to the project, the viability of the project in the absence of this funding and how the project will proceed once early funding is expended.
- The scope of work cannot include work performed prior to submittal of the application.
- The tasks in the schedule, scope of work and budget should match.

Last Uploaded Attachments: Sites\_A1 Scope.docx