



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

September 30, 2013

SHASTA RESERVOIR STUDY BRANDED A SHAM

The Bureau of Reclamation has published a plan to increase storage capacity of Shasta Reservoir by raising the dam height 18.5 feet, according to their recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The California Environmental Water Caucus finds the project a waste of the \$1.2 billion cost, providing little additional water yield for an exorbitant price tag and which would be a travesty for American taxpayers. In addition, the claimed beneficial effect on salmon populations is illusory and amounts to an attempt to shift part of the cost burden (\$654 million) to the public instead of having the real beneficiaries pay for their water supply, according to Tom Stokely of the California Water Impact Network.

The stated purpose of enlarging Shasta Dam is to meet the two primary project objectives of increasing water supply for Central Valley agriculture and to increase the survival of Sacramento River anadromous fish populations. The claimed benefits to salmon allow two thirds of the project cost to be shifted to taxpayers and away from the true beneficiaries – the Central Valley farming corporations. However, the favored alternative is based on inflated and illusory benefits for natural salmon production and it will not increase survival of anadromous fish in any substantial way.

While the preferred alternative will increase storage capacity by more than 600,000 acre feet (compared to the present capacity of 4.5 million acre feet), the average supply yield will be only 47,300 acre feet; a very poor return for more than a billion dollar investment of public funds.

This project is a sham foisted once again upon the taxpayers of the United States to have them pay for the dam enlargement while the beneficiaries do not pay their share. The allocation of \$654.9 million in costs on the public because of claimed fishery benefits is a hoax.

As pointed out by Steve Evans of Friends of the River, federal law clearly requires consideration of Wild & Scenic protection for the McCloud River as an alternative to the proposed dam raise and reservoir enlargement; it is also required for the upper Sacramento and Pit Rivers and all other streams on public lands tributary to Shasta Reservoir. No such assessment of Wild & Scenic Rivers is provided in the DEIS.

Raising Shasta by 6.5-18.5 feet will flood from 1,470 feet to 3,550 feet of the segment of the McCloud River eligible for National Wild & Scenic River protection. The DEIS also admits that this flooding will adversely affect the McCloud's free flowing character, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable Native American cultural, wild trout fishery, and scenic values.

The raising of Shasta Dam is a threat to the very existence of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe and the ability to bring back the salmon and a way of life that the Creator gave to the Tribe. The Winnemem Wintu's efforts are about preserving a beautiful natural world, with abundant salmon, clean water, and ecologically healthy and diverse forests, that has been and continues to be flooded, logged, cut up by roads, mined, subdivided, sold, and destroyed acre by precious acre. The DEIS fails to assess and acknowledge the full scope of the devastating and irreparable impacts this Project would have on the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, stated Colin Bailey, Executive Director of the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water.

These findings also strongly suggest that were an honest and adequate Benefit-Cost Analysis performed on this proposed project, its ratio of benefits to costs would not be adequate to justify the project. Nick Di Croce, from the Environmental Water Caucus, urges the Bureau to perform an honest Benefit-Cost Analysis for the project and look toward more cost effective alternatives such as water conservation and recycling, the retirement of drainage-problem lands, reoperation of Shasta Dam and Reservoir, and a host of projects recommended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the public which were not considered or rejected due to Reclamation's bias toward justifying an enlarged Shasta Dam.

The Environmental Water Caucus requested that the Bureau abandon this ill-conceived project and save the dollars, the environmental damage, and the affront to Native American interests that this project would generate if pursued by the Bureau.

CONTACTS:

Colin Bailey, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
colin@ejcw.org, 916- 432- 3529

Nick Di Croce, Co-Facilitator, Environmental Water Caucus
troutnk@aol.com, 805-688-7813

Steve Evans, Friends of the River
sevans@friendsoftheriver.org, 916-708-3155

Tom Stokely, California Water Impact Network
tstokely@att.net, 530-524-0315

*AquAlliance
Butte Environmental Council
California Coastkeeper
Alliance
California Save Our Streams
Council
California Sportfishing
Protection Alliance
California Rural Legal
Assistance Foundation
California Striped Bass
Association
California Water Impact
Network
California Water Research
Center for Biological
Diversity
Clean Water Action
Citizens Water Watch
Desal Response Group
Environmental Justice
Coalition for Water
Environmental Protection
Information Center
Earth Law Center
Fish Sniffer Magazine
Food & Water Watch
Foothill Conservancy
Friends of the River
Institute for Fisheries
Resources
The Karuk Tribe
Klamath Riverkeeper
Lower Sherman Is. Duck
Hunters Association
Northern California Council,
Federation of Fly Fishers
Pacific Coast Federation of
Fishermen's Associations
Planning & Conservation
League
Restore the Delta
Sacramento River
Preservation Trust
Santa Clarita Organization
for Planning & Environment
Sierra Club California
Sierra Nevada Alliance
Southern California
Watershed Alliance
Winnemem Wintu Tribe*