

John MacDonald

I have briefly reviewed the draft EIS and as a layman, it seems that this is a solution looking for a problem. The apparent scope of the upstream disruption and destruction of native fish spawning grounds far outweighs the potential benefits downstream. The project's potential scope needs to be reduced significantly, as well as redesigned to reduce the "significant and unavoidable impact" of that destruction on native fish species. In addition, allowing a project to go forward that states that it is "unknown" if the proposed mitigation steps "are feasible" or even if they work is unacceptable. As written, the proposed plan essentially says that whatever the damages caused by the project are, tough luck. In addition, a \$2 billion price tag seems exorbitant - you could probably buy all of the downstream properties impacted and turn them into wetlands - which is probably what they were before the initial levees were constructed - for less than the projected costs of this project.