

## Ruth Morlas

I read the EIS for this project and it looks like a total environmental disaster in return for very minuscule level of flood protection if at all. The report states that this will cause "significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on wildlife, wetlands, streams" and "significant and disproportionate adverse impacts on communities of color and low-income populations". Even with these significant adverse impacts, the report also states that many areas would still remain flooded for more than 24hrs. So, what is the point of doing all this damage then? Our planet is at a breaking point and instead of wasting taxpayer dollars on such a monstrous project, we need to only look at alternatives that restore ecosystem function, projects that only protect and enhance wildlife habitat, and projects that respect low-income communities, especially tribal or indigenous communities. This can be in the form of moving structures in danger of flooding to better suited locations and other alternatives. This reports is also very vague-for example it talks about widening forest roads having less than significant impacts. This is a concerning conclusion, how can increasing fragmentation, deforestation, and ecological damage along entire forest roads have "less than significant impacts"? How did this study arrive at that conclusion, exactly?

The study also reports that local-scale alternatives can meet the same goal without all this environmental damage. This is a no-brainer and this project should never be approved.