

1 DOWNEY BRAND LLP  
2 KEVIN M. O'BRIEN (Bar No. 122713)  
3 DAVID R.E. ALADJEM (Bar No. 152203)  
4 MEREDITH E. NIKKEL (Bar No. 254818)  
5 621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor  
6 Sacramento, CA 95814-4731  
7 Telephone: 916.444.1000  
8 Facsimile: 916.444.2100  
9 daladjem@downeybrand.com  
10 mnikkel@downeybrand.com

11 Attorneys for Protestants  
12 NORTH DELTA WATER AGENCY, BRANNAN-  
13 ANDRUS LEVEE MAINTENANCE DISTRICT,  
14 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 999,  
15 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2060,  
16 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2068,  
17 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 407,  
18 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 317,  
19 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 551,  
20 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 105,  
21 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 563,  
22 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2067, and  
23 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2098,

24 BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCE CONTROL BOARD

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

**TESTIMONY OF GILBERT COSIO, JR.**

1                   **BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2           1.       My name is Gilbert Cosio, Jr. I am a registered civil engineer in California (No.  
3 36308). I specialize in the areas of hydrology, hydraulics, levee rehabilitation and maintenance,  
4 irrigation, drainage, project management, and related areas. I joined MBK Engineers (MBK) in  
5 1984 and have been a Principal since 1990. MBK specializes in water rights, water supply, flood  
6 control and water resource planning. MBK provides these services for cities, counties, state  
7 agencies, federal agencies, irrigation districts, flood control agencies, individual landowners, and  
8 other entities. Exhibit DGCG-2 is a true and correct copy of my professional resume.

9           2.       I have been providing expertise in this area for over 32 years throughout the  
10 Central Valley. During that time, I have developed a broad range of knowledge in the field of  
11 levee rehabilitation and maintenance. In the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta (Delta), I am  
12 currently the district engineer for 33 reclamation districts. I have also, in the past, been district  
13 engineer for an additional 13 reclamation districts. Exhibit DFCG-3 is a list of reclamation  
14 districts for which I have served as district engineer. Exhibit DFCG-4 is a map highlighting the  
15 locations of my experience as district engineer for Delta reclamation districts.

16           3.       As district engineer, I am responsible for all aspects of levee rehabilitation and  
17 maintenance, and drainage of district lands. Duties relative to levee rehabilitation include, but are  
18 not limited to, surveys and cost estimates, coordination of geotechnical exploration and  
19 development of design parameters, compilation of plans and specifications, construction  
20 inspection and contract administration, environmental documentation and regulatory approval.  
21 Levee maintenance responsibilities include, but are not limited to, levee inspections, monitoring  
22 of problem areas, development of encroachment standards, development of maintenance plans,  
23 periodic levee surveys, coordinating floodfighting and levee repairs, and environmental  
24 documentation and regulatory approval.

25                   **OVERVIEW OF TESTIMONY**

26           4.       In preparation for this testimony, I have reviewed and relied on three main  
27 documents; the Water Fix Conceptual Engineering Report Final Draft, July 2015 (Exhibit DWR  
28 212), the Water Fix 401 permit application package to the Corps of Engineers (Public Notice

1 SPK-2008-00861), and relevant portions of the 2015 WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS (Exhibit SWRCB  
2 3) Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities (Appendix 3C), Alternative 4A  
3 maps, and portions of several chapters covering issues addressed in testimony). I have also  
4 reviewed the written testimonies of DWR witnesses John Bednarski (Exhibit DWR-57) and  
5 Parviz Nader-Tehrani (Exhibit DWR-66).

6 5. My testimony will focus on the effects of the California Water Fix (WaterFix)  
7 project's design and operation, and impacts of that construction on the ability of reclamation  
8 districts to perform their duties related to maintaining levee integrity (routine operation and  
9 maintenance), as well as the function of the system of drainage and irrigation ditches and canals  
10 on individual Delta islands.

11 6. Ground motion impacts anticipated to affect the stability and operation of levees  
12 and drainage systems throughout the WaterFix vicinity include intense and prolonged ground  
13 vibrations from extensive pile driving combined with a significant increase in daily volumes of  
14 heavy construction trucks. Several obstructions will also encroach into multiple waterways,  
15 narrowing the channels, reducing the flood flow capacities throughout Project area and altering  
16 the flow velocity and direction at all flow levels.

### 17 **OVERVIEW OF DELTA ENGINEERING PRACTICES**

18 7. Dealing with Delta levees and drainage issues tends to be more complicated than  
19 other regions of the Central Valley due to the unique soil types, shallow groundwater, and varying  
20 materials used to construct levees. Due to the unique characteristics of the area, engineering  
21 structures in the Delta can only be understood from years of experience of construction in the  
22 Delta. The unique circumstances complicating engineering, design and construction in the Delta  
23 are the result of a number of factors such as organic levee and foundation materials, lands  
24 subsided below the adjacent waterways and water table, uncompacted levee materials such as  
25 loose sands, inconsistency of levee materials, and seepage from adjacent waterways.

26 8. Many of the levees in the WaterFix project area were constructed to U. S. Army  
27 Corps of Engineer (USACE) standards as part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project,  
28 and have not been improved since then. In accordance with assurances that the State gave to the

1 federal government, the repair and maintenance of these project levees must be to USACE  
2 standards.

3 **CONDITIONS IN NORTH DELTA**

4 9. The levees of the North Delta in particular are predominately constructed of loose  
5 sand. The material used to build existing levees was dredged from the local channels and placed  
6 on the original natural levees of the Sacramento River floodway. These natural levees were  
7 formed as the heaviest material of the sediment load carried downstream during floods dropped  
8 out of the floodwater depositing along the original stream bank. As a result, the foundation  
9 supporting the loose sand levee material is porous, consisting of material that can be even more  
10 porous than the loose sand levees. In addition to the obvious propensity of these materials to  
11 seep, the levee and foundation are also susceptible to consolidation and instability when  
12 experiencing changes in water levels within the levee section.

13 10. Another condition that must be considered when designing and constructing  
14 structures near Delta levees is that they also contain a myriad of other materials such as silts,  
15 clays and organics. These materials appear as differing strata in the levee section. The existence  
16 of these varying materials in a predominately sandy levee can create unexpected problems miles  
17 away that must also be considered when constructing facilities on and around levees in the North  
18 Delta.

19 11. The levee and foundation materials in the North Delta make it very difficult, if not  
20 impossible, to predict how they will react under loading because sometimes the complexities  
21 associated with these levees defy standard engineering logic and practice, which are designed for  
22 simpler situations. In the absence of extensive local knowledge, levee design and construction  
23 based on generally acceptable engineering practices can lead to levee failure.

24 12. During my many years working on Delta levees, I have encountered numerous  
25 instances of this phenomenon. These levee impacts include, but are not limited to, separation of  
26 differing soil strata, densification of materials, instability due to dewatering, movement of  
27 material during loading, deep underground seepage sources, internal cracking, differential  
28 settlement, instability caused by changes in water surface levels, impacts due to channel flow

1 velocity and direction, and changes in levee equilibrium. I will describe in more detail how levee  
2 stability has been compromised when local projects have failed to properly account for some of  
3 the unique and unpredictable characteristics of Delta levees.

4 **IMPACTS TO RECLAMATION DISTRICTS, LEVEES, AND CHANNELS**

5 13. As previously stated, the predominant fill material in the upper portion of the  
6 North Delta levees consists of sand and silts dredged from the river channels. The levee  
7 foundation typically consists of sands, silts and gravels. However, since most of the Delta was  
8 originally swamp and overflow land, these levees also contain a considerable amount of organic  
9 clays and peats.

10 14. In Mr. Bednarski's testimony, he characterizes the levees of the North Delta as "in  
11 place and stable for decades." However, because levees are comprised of natural materials that  
12 always have water against them, they are constantly subjected to changing forces affecting their  
13 stability.

14 15. When surrounding conditions are not changing, the levees are not necessarily  
15 stable, but have reached a state of equilibrium with the forces placed upon them. Any change in  
16 the forces acting on the levee will cause the levee to be out of equilibrium, and likely result in  
17 levee damage or channel migration that could undermine the levee stability.

18 16. The degree to which these levees are affected by changing conditions depends on  
19 the duration and severity of these external forces. Therefore, Delta levees as they exist today are  
20 better characterized as being in equilibrium with the forces currently acting upon them; but could  
21 change in an instant if the current condition of the levees is subjected to the intense and prolonged  
22 disturbances described in WaterFix documents that I have reviewed.

23 18. According to the Alt. 4A RDEIR/SDEIS maps that I reviewed, the physical  
24 impacts to levees and farmlands on several Delta islands will be significant. Based on the  
25 description of construction activities I have read, implementation of the WaterFix project will  
26 substantially interfere with and hinder the ability of reclamation districts to perform routine  
27 inspection and maintenance of levees and drainage systems during the entire 14-year construction  
28 period.

1           19.     Construction of three new intakes will impact flood control and farming operations  
2 on three reclamation districts (RD 744 south of Scribner Road, RD 813 Erhardt Club, and RD  
3 551 Pearson District). Based on my review of maps for Alt. 4A, it appears that Intake #2 will  
4 take up approximately one-third of the acreage in RD 744. RD 813 is where Intake #5 will be  
5 located, with Intake #3 also adjacent to its northern border and a tunnel shaft installed at its  
6 southern boundary. A portion of Intake #5 will also cross over into RD 551 at Randall Island  
7 Road, as well as a barge loading facility built on 200 feet of its Sacramento River project levee  
8 (about 1,400 feet north of Twin Cities Road), and the Intermediate Forebay constructed across  
9 from the Snodgrass Slough levee at the southeast end of the island.

10           20.     RD 1002 will have to deal with construction related impacts such as pile driving as  
11 well as increased seepage of levees and farmlands associated with having the new Intermediate  
12 Forebay and barge loading facility located on their Snodgrass Slough levee, plus five large muck  
13 storage areas placed throughout the district.

14           21.     RD 150 and RD 999 will also experience erosion from changes in flow velocities,  
15 seepage from altered surface water elevations, flow velocity and direction, and intense ground  
16 shaking from pile driving associated with construction of three intakes across from their project  
17 levees on the Sacramento River.

18           22.     Several islands throughout the Delta will also have to deal with impacts to levees  
19 and operations associated with construction of approximately a dozen shaft locations placed about  
20 every three miles of the twin tunnel alignment. Reclamation Districts 38, 756, 2023, 2028, 2040,  
21 and 2110 all will also have one or more shafts constructed on their islands.

22           23.     According to the Recreation Chapter 15 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, there will be a total  
23 of eight barge loading facilities located throughout the Delta. All of these require construction of  
24 cofferdams and will encroach into the waterways for the entire 14-year construction period. Any  
25 loss of flood flow capacity from the narrowing of channels designed to carry flood flows can  
26 result in increased surface water elevations. These barge loading facilities will also alter the flow  
27 velocity and direction during all levels of flow which will lead to levee erosion.

28           24.     In addition to RD 551 and RD 1002, reclamation districts 756, 2023, 2028, 2040,

1 and Kings Island will have barge facilities built on their levees, plus another at Clifton Court that  
2 is across from the Kings Island levee. The distance that each of these facilities encroaches into  
3 the waterway impacts flows varies by location. The barge facility on Pearson District (RD 551)  
4 will occupy about 200 feet of their Sacramento River project levee, and extend approximately 130  
5 feet into the river, leaving less than 100 feet for navigation and flood flows in that location.  
6 About 185 feet of a Glanville Tract (RD 1002) levee on Snodgrass Slough will be occupied by a  
7 barge facility that will extend approximately 135 feet into the channel, leaving about 50 feet for  
8 navigation and flood flows. Bouldin Island (RD 756) will have about 980 feet of its Little Potato  
9 Slough levee occupied by barge facility extending approximately 210 feet into the channel, which  
10 allows nearly 700 feet for passage of boats and flood flows. Venice Island (RD 2023) will have a  
11 barge facility occupy about 928 feet of its San Joaquin River levee on a wide bend on the south  
12 side of the island where the channel is more than 2,000 feet wide. Bacon Island (RD 2028) will  
13 have about 665 feet of its levee on Connection Slough extend approximately 250 feet into the  
14 channel, leaving about 150 feet for passage of boats and flood flows due to a small remnant island  
15 located in the middle of the channel.

### 16 **RISKS TO DELTA LEVEE STABILITY**

17 25. Recently, two DWR flood protection programs, the Non-Urban Levees Evaluation  
18 (NULE) and the Flood System Repair Project (FSRP) have identified 106 sites in the North Delta  
19 that levees are in need of improvement or repair. The recommended repairs are either to control  
20 seepage or to repair erosion. The sites have been described as “serious” or “critical” in the FSRP.  
21 Thirty-five (35) of these sites are along the main stem of the Sacramento River in the region  
22 where WaterFix intakes are proposed to be constructed.

23 26. Levees typically breach due to levee problems associated with stability, seepage,  
24 erosion, and overtopping. Levees in the Delta are particularly susceptible to breaches caused by  
25 water overtopping the levee and eroding the landside slope to the point of failure; from water  
26 seeping through the levee foundation, which is much more difficult to identify; and piping  
27 problems created by industrious burrowing animals, such as beavers and squirrels, building dens  
28 and mazes inside levees. Preventing overtopping is the easiest to recognize, prepare for, and

1 repair. If there are uncertainties regarding base flood elevations when designing a project, or  
2 concern about wave action during flood water surface elevations, additional levee height,  
3 commonly known as freeboard, can be added prior to project construction to account for these  
4 uncertainties. Preventing water from seeping through the levee, by contrast, is harder to prevent  
5 or account for in design.

6 27. In my experience, forces placed on the levees by a project such as WaterFix will  
7 increase the likelihood of levee failure under all four scenarios (stability, seepage, erosion, and  
8 overtopping), including undetectable erosion and piping damage to levees that may not be  
9 apparent until the levee is on the brink of, or is experiencing, a failure.

10 28. In my experience in the Delta, I have seen many things happen that defy standard  
11 engineering theory and practice that should be considered prior to completing design of the  
12 WaterFix facilities and included as mitigation requirements in permits issued by state and federal  
13 agencies. In my opinion, the WaterFix project has underestimated the scope and severity of  
14 potential impacts to levees and flood flows, and will therefore need to expand the number of  
15 levees that are actively evaluated, monitored, and mitigated for prior to and during construction.  
16 Following are local levee conditions that provide insight into the type of circumstances and  
17 impacts that I anticipate may occur during construction of the WaterFix project:

- 18 • Recently, the City of Stockton built a new water diversion pumping plant on a  
19 levee along the San Joaquin River. In order to build the plant, Stockton had to  
20 build a new levee behind the existing levee. Although standard geotechnical  
21 practice determined the new levee would be quite stable, it did not consider the  
22 issues that would be associated with rapid construction on the soft soils prevalent  
23 in the Delta. As a result, the levee almost failed when the immediate forces of fill  
24 placement pushed the foundation landward 13-feet in less than about two weeks.  
25 In one day alone, it moved 3.5-feet.
- 26 • Several years ago a subdivision was under construction in Contra Costa County.  
27 The developer was required to construct a levee, and that work involved  
28 densification of the foundation. This densification process produced ground  
vibrations similar to pile driving. Approximately 3 miles from the project a sandy  
levee experienced consolidation and the foundation of two structures on the levee  
cracked due to the vibrations. In addition, the project construction area  
experienced an increase in the number of beaver dens, which often occur in areas  
where the beaver can find fractures in a levee that are easier to penetrate,  
compared to levees that are uniformly compacted and more resistant to their  
industrious digging. In my experience, the combined effects of densification and



1 pile driving create opportunities for interior levee cracking, which substantially  
2 increases the likelihood of levee failure.

- 3 • In the North Delta, seepage is a major concern due to the sand and gravel levee  
4 foundation. For years on Grand Island we monitored a particular seepage site that  
5 would be wet during high water and dry up after the water went down. In 2006,  
6 during what has been described as a 10-year flood, the seepage forces caused  
7 water to flow with such intensity that the water was expressed as an artesian flow  
8 shooting about 6-inches in the air landward of the levee toe. After the river  
9 receded, artesian flow did not stop, saturating the soils to the point that the ground  
10 in the area became unfarmable. The only recourse was to acquire an easement  
11 from the landowner and build a large and expensive seepage berm to permanently  
12 control the seepage. What happened to knock this area out of historic equilibrium  
13 is unknown and could not be predicted.
- 14 • Due to the differing soil types in Delta levees, these soil types sometimes separate  
15 due to vibration, or intensified saturation. This separation does not express itself at  
16 the surface until it reaches the point that a sinkhole develops as soil moves to fill  
17 the voids caused by the separation. During 2006 flood, we had one day when  
18 unusual high winds came out of the southeast. The wave fetch from these wind  
19 caused tremendous erosion that had to be repaired by the Corps of Engineers under  
20 the PL84-99. Up until that unusual wind direction changed the equilibrium on the  
21 levee, we had not experienced erosion during the high flows alone. But the change  
22 in forces acting upon the levee changed the equilibrium that maintained the levee  
23 in a particular configuration. When the forces changed, the levee changed as well.
- 24 • Changes in water table levels have caused subsidence and cracking of levees  
25 throughout the Delta. This cracking occurs both on the surface and within the  
26 interior of the levee structure.

27 29. In my professional opinion and experience, I anticipate similar conditions and  
28 circumstances to be exacerbated in the North Delta due to the numerous impacts to levees and  
flows associated with the construction of the Water Fix project.

#### **PILE DRIVING IMPACTS ON LEVEES**

30. According to the pile driving assumptions in Table 3C-2 of the 2015  
RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix 3C, the construction of Water Fix will involve installation of a  
tremendous number of piles at several different construction sites, including the three new intakes  
and sedimentation basins, new Intermediate Forebay, and barge loading facilities in the North  
Delta (9,650 piles in the North Delta, with a total of 8,830,000 strikes). These piles will be driven  
close to the levees and other local structures. The piles will consist of either pole type piles or  
sheet piles. The piles will be driven by impact hammers or vibratory hammers. Both of these pile

1 driving methods produce vibrations that travel a considerable distance that will impact levees and  
2 properties throughout a large area of the North Delta. For instance, the project in Contra Costa  
3 County described above caused levee settlement and damaged a building foundation  
4 approximately three miles from the source of the construction ground vibrations.

5 31. Because the levees in the North Delta consist of various sand and gravels which  
6 were either part of the original “natural” levee or dredged from the channels to raise and widen  
7 the natural levee, these loose sands tend to settle and densify when they are vibrated. As a result,  
8 when vibrations occur in the area of the Water Fix construction, the material will densify, causing  
9 the levee to consolidate and lower in elevation (settle and subside). During the densification, the  
10 slopes of the levee could also become unstable and slide on either the waterside or landside of the  
11 levees and potentially lead to a breach.

12 32. Much of the deformation caused by vibration due to pile driving will be on the  
13 interior of the levee and not visible at the surface. Failed levee slopes and lowered levee crowns  
14 can be measured; however, within the levee section itself, deformation may occur that cannot be  
15 seen or measured. Within these loose sands, strata of organics or clay materials exist. These  
16 materials tend to fracture as the sand densifies and consolidates. These fractures would remain as  
17 cracks within the levee section. If these cracks occur during a time of low water, and remain  
18 unseen when the water rises during the winter, a seepage path develops through the cracks. This  
19 seepage path could lead to water running through the levee at a velocity high enough to move  
20 sand and cause damage and failure to the levee. This phenomenon is call piping, or interior  
21 erosion.

22 33. During the non-flood months, typically the spring, summer and fall seasons, the  
23 water table is just above mean sea level along the levees of the Sacramento River. In the winter  
24 months, the issues related to vibrations of the levees will change because during flood periods, the  
25 water surface elevations in the Delta increase substantially, often by about 20 feet. The vibrations  
26 of saturated levees will cause pore pressures of the saturated area to increase as the sand attempts  
27 to densify, which eventually leads to liquefaction. The increase of the water table in the loose-  
28 sand levee, and the resulting liquefaction, could cause a fracturing, or failure, of the levee during

1 work caused by pile driving vibrations, similar to failure caused by seismic vibrations from an  
2 earthquake. During construction these problems will be very difficult, if not impossible, to  
3 identify, which will be an even bigger problem if reclamation districts are unable to access  
4 portions of their levees to conduct inspections and perform routine maintenance due to conflicts  
5 with construction equipment and activities

6 34. In addition to the damage experienced by the levees, any structures on or near the  
7 levees will likely also experience damage. There are many homes, packing sheds, wineries and  
8 other farm and domestic structures on, or near, the levees in the North Delta.

9 35. To mitigate against seepage damage, the Water Fix design includes a slurry wall  
10 through the center of the levee. This wall can also act as a “crack stopper” which may alleviate  
11 some of the ground shaking issues noted, above. However, the pile driving vibrations will travel  
12 a considerable distance and I fully anticipate that the fracturing will occur well outside the area  
13 the Water Fix project has proposed installing cut off/slurry walls. As mentioned previously, I  
14 have seen sand densification and resulting levee and building foundation damage occur up to  
15 three miles from the source of the construction vibration.

16 36. In my professional opinion, the Water Fix pile construction will damage the levees  
17 and structures in the North Delta. Unfortunately, the extent and severity of this impact on Delta  
18 levees is unknown because the intensity, duration, and cumulative impacts associated with  
19 simultaneous pile driving at multiple construction sites has not been analyzed by the Project  
20 Proponents. Because much of this damage will occur within the interior of the levee, as a  
21 precautionary measure, monitoring devices that can detect levee movement and instability will  
22 need to be installed. The only measure that would probably be sufficient to prevent levee failures  
23 from intense ground shaking would be installing slurry walls on all Delta levees within 2-3 miles  
24 from locations where WaterFix construction sites involve pile-driving.

### 25 **IMPACTS OF FLOODWAY OBSTRUCTIONS**

26 37. The construction of the Water Fix project will create encroachments into several  
27 water channels that will obstruct and limit the existing capacity of floodways of the North Delta.  
28 Three construction sites that are located close together in a four mile stretch of the Sacramento

1 River are the intake structures and a barge loading facility that will include cofferdams jutting out  
2 into waterway. The cumulative impacts to entire flood control system in the Delta will be  
3 significant, due to the combined effects of twelve cofferdams installed during construction of the  
4 three north Delta diversion (NDD) intakes, eight barge loading facilities, and a new operable gate.  
5 Each of these facilities could, during its construction, or while it is in place, cause levee damage  
6 individually, but their combined effects will significantly increase the probability of damage and  
7 levee failure.

8 38. As mentioned previously, the eight cofferdams installed for the construction of  
9 barge loading facilities will narrow channels, constrict flood flows, and alter flow direction and  
10 velocity for all flow levels in the Sacramento River near Twin Cities Road, Snodgrass Slough  
11 near Walnut Grove, Potato Slough, Connection Slough in the Delta north of the San Joaquin  
12 River.

13 39. In the reach of the Sacramento River, adjacent to the proposed intakes, any  
14 increase in the surface elevation of water will have secondary effects. First, increased water flows  
15 during flood events will change the frequency of the levee overtopping and failure. According to  
16 the USACE report, "Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California Special Study: Hydrology", issued  
17 in February 1992 (Exhibit DFCG-5)<sup>1</sup>, the flood levels in this area of the Sacramento River offer  
18 very little margin for error. The report indicates that the difference from a 50-year and 100-year  
19 flood at the Sacramento River at Snodgrass Slough (approximate location of intake number five)  
20 is only 0.5 feet. (Exhibit DFCG-5, Table 6.) Additionally, the difference between the flood  
21 elevation between the 100 and 200-year flood is approximately, 0.3 feet. (Exhibit DFCG-5, Chart  
22 6.) In other words, any change in flood elevations will change the flood frequency. This means  
23 that, if the WaterFix project increased water stage 0.1 feet, as suggested by Dr. Nader-Tehrani's  
24 testimony, then what would have been a 200 year flood would have the effects of a 300-year  
25 flood. Thus, the obstruction of flows in the Sacramento River by the WaterFix project will  
26 increase the probability of flooding in the areas adjacent to the proposed new intakes and barge  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Exhibit DFCG-5 is a true and correct copy of the document.

1 facilities.

2 40. Based on my professional experience, obstructions of any kind in Delta channels  
3 can raise the water surface elevations, and also cause secondary impacts due to the changes in  
4 flow velocities, and flow directions, causing problems upstream, downstream and across the  
5 channel from the obstruction. Impacts caused by changes in flow velocity and direction will  
6 occur at every level of flow. None of these hydraulic impacts on flood flow capacity and levee  
7 stability has been analyzed by the Water Fix project.

8 41. It is important to note that damages resulting from these obstructions would also  
9 have an adverse effect on landowners adjacent to levees that overtop. According to Mr.  
10 Bednarski's testimony, the WaterFix project itself has been designed to withstand a 200-year  
11 flood event. But, the actual level of protection for WaterFix structures (including the intakes) is  
12 less than 100-year flood protection because that is what the surrounding levees currently provide.  
13 I believe that it is not realistic for DWR to believe that it would be able to operate the intake  
14 structures if all of the lands immediately surrounding those structures were inundated. Using  
15 standard flood probabilities, there is a significant chance that the lands immediately adjacent to  
16 the WaterFix intake compound could be inundated within thirty years of construction, because the  
17 cumulative probability of a 100-year flood in that time exceeds 26%.

18 42. Although the Water Fix petition documents explain that the construction of the  
19 intakes will be limited to the levee slope, they do not acknowledge that the cofferdam and  
20 permanent intake structure will protrude approximately 100 feet water-ward of the levee crown.  
21 Based on the approximate width of these channels, that is almost 20 percent of the entire channel  
22 width. Based on the cross sectional area of the flow under the 200-year flood, we estimate that  
23 this obstruction constitutes approximately 9 percent of the flowage area. This blockage would  
24 result in an increase of flood flow water surface elevations of approximately 0.1 feet. Since the  
25 increase in water surface leads to a very small increase in cross sectional area, the velocity of the  
26 flow will increase. Since flow is the product of velocity and area, if the area is reduced, then the  
27 velocity increases proportionally.

28 43. Other Water Fix construction sites that will obstruct even larger portions of other

1 Delta channels and alter the flow of water are several barge facilities. The size and magnitude of  
2 obstruction of these features is described in the Recreation Chapter 15 of the 2015 WaterFix  
3 RDEIR/SDEIS, but not well detailed the Water Fix petition project description, even though they  
4 will cumulatively add to the impacts of flow changes.

5 44. The introduction of obstructions in the channel also changes the velocity of the  
6 flow and the direction of the flow. When calculating floodwater surface elevation increases, a  
7 one-dimensional model is typically used, but is limited because it disregards these changes in  
8 velocities and directions of flow. Therefore, in order to adequately analyze the impacts of the  
9 proposed WaterFix obstructions, a two-dimensional model should have been used by DWR for  
10 the change in diversion petition. Even with a two-dimensional model, it is very difficult to  
11 calculate the impacts due to these changes in flow, velocity, and direction. In addition, these  
12 obstruction produce impacts at all flow levels, adding complexity to the analysis.

13 45. As I noted earlier in my testimony, any change in the forces acting on a Delta  
14 levee will cause the levee to be out of equilibrium, and likely result in levee damage or channel  
15 migration that could undermine the levee stability. We have seen this occur after Corps of  
16 Engineers bank protection projects on the Sacramento.

17 46. In addition, a stockpile of reusable tunnel material will be placed along Snodgrass  
18 Slough on a property commonly known as Zacharias Island. Although this property is not  
19 flooded during normal tidal cycles, the levees are inadequate to keep the property from flooding  
20 during most floods. Therefore, during times of high water, this property becomes part of the  
21 Snodgrass Slough floodway. The stockpiling of the RTM will essentially reduce the capacity of  
22 the slough to carry water and affect the forces in a manner similar to the Sacramento River  
23 obstructions.

24 47. Floodway obstruction caused by the Water Fix project will result in erosion  
25 damage to the levees in the North Delta. We have seen these impacts occur when structures such  
26 as boat docks, pump plants, and bank protection projects have narrowed Delta channels and  
27 changed velocity and direction of flows.

28

1                    **DEWATERING AND SEEPAGE IMPACTS**

2                    48.        Levee stability in the North Delta is significantly compromised when exposed to  
3 seepage resulting from changes in the surface water elevations, while seepage in the interior of  
4 the island is heavily influenced by changing elevations of the groundwater table. Local flood  
5 control facilities (levees, and drainage ditches/canals) and irrigation canals have reached a state of  
6 equilibrium with the current water table elevations. See page through, and under, the levees of  
7 the North Delta, and within the nearby farming areas has been well documented. Attached as  
8 Exhibit DFCG-7 is a true and correct copy of Plate 10, excerpted from DWR Bulletin 125,  
9 “Sacramento Valley Seepage Investigation” (August 1967) (Exhibit DFCG-6)<sup>2</sup>.

10                49.        The Water Fix RDEIR/SDEIS states that dewatering pumps will be placed up to  
11 300-foot depth and as close as 50-foot spacing around the intake facilities, Intermediate Forebay,  
12 and other facilities. To lower the water table in order to facilitate construction, the plans indicate  
13 that slurry or sheet pile cut off walls will be installed through the levee fronting the intake  
14 facilities. .

15                50.        However, as described in DWR Bulletin 125, the current seepage condition in this  
16 area is expansive and emanates from a very porous soil condition and shallow groundwater table  
17 that underlies the entire North Delta. Therefore, the cut off walls may not perform as designed,  
18 since seepage will originate from upstream, downstream, and landward of the cut off walls, and  
19 continually provide seepage water to the construction area without regard for a cut off wall. As a  
20 result, there will be an extremely large amount of water generated by the dewatering wells since  
21 they will be pulling water directly from the river. The Water Fix documents do not adequately  
22 address the volume of water removed on a daily basis by the dewatering pumps or the specific  
23 Delta channels that it would be discharged.

24                51.        It appears the WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS proposes to discharge an unknown volume  
25 of water from dewatering into existing irrigation and drainage ditches, which would inundate  
26 them. This would not only interfere and hinder the ability of reclamation districts to perform their  
27

28                    \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>2</sup> Exhibit DFCG-6 is a true and correct copy of the document.

1 drainage flood control responsibilities, but would also contaminate and obstruct water supplies for  
2 farming operations in the area.

3 52. In addition to lowering the water table in the construction area, these wells will  
4 also lower the water table in the levee, levee foundation and underneath surrounding properties.  
5 The WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS indicates groundwater will be lowered within a 2600-foot radius of  
6 the intake construction areas. My experience in the Delta has shown that lowering the water  
7 table, and thus disturbing the equilibrium, results in subsidence of the levee that leads to cracks  
8 that create seepage paths through the levee. This subsidence is similar to subsidence caused by  
9 over drafting of groundwater. Attached as Exhibits DFCG-8 through DFCG-10, are photos of  
10 levee cracking caused by tree roots searching for water while water surface levels were lowered  
11 during the recent drought. Exhibit DFCG-11 shows this effect on the cross-section of a levee. In  
12 addition to levee damage, structures built on the levee will likely experience damage due to the  
13 lowering of the water table as well. Also, a home near the levee in this area suffered foundation  
14 damage.

15 53. Operation of the Water Fix project will pull water from the Sacramento River, thus  
16 lowering the water surface for a distance downstream of the intakes. Levees are typically  
17 designed to hold back high water, so low water scenarios are generally not of concern. However,  
18 levee design requires support on the waterside of the levee. The water itself supplies this support.  
19 Although water weighs less than levee soil material, it still provides a buttressing force for the  
20 waterside slope.

21 54. Lowering of the low tide water surface levels as described in Mr. Nader-Tehrani's  
22 testimony affects the levee in two ways. First, it reduces the buttressing force of the water, thus  
23 making the waterside slope less stable. Secondly, the lower surface elevation exposes the lower  
24 levee slope to wind wave and boat wake forces, which represent significant forces acting on the  
25 waterside of levees.

26 55. Once these conditions change, the forces also change and knock the levees out of  
27 equilibrium. While it is not possible to predict exactly how the levee will respond, I am confident  
28 that a less stable levee will result when historic water surfaces are lowered; specifically, the



1 waterside slope becomes less stable and it fails, or slips to a point that it would need to be  
2 repaired. Significant slippage could lead to levee failure.

### 3 IMPACTS ON LEVEES FROM TRUCK TRAFFIC

4 56. Water Fix construction will involve running loaded trucks well in excess of both  
5 the traffic volume and vehicle weight ever seen in the Delta. The main roadways (County roads  
6 and State highways) used by these construction trucks in, out, and around the Delta are situated  
7 on top of levees.

8 57. The impacts to the levees caused by truck traffic will be similar to the ground  
9 shaking impacts caused by pile driving; therefore the combination of these two construction  
10 activities will intensify the impacts to levees.

11 58. Although superficial repairs to the surface pavement are described in the Water  
12 Fix documents and witness testimony, they are all silent regarding the impacts to the interior and  
13 slopes of the levee, which underlie and support the roads.

14 59. Based on my experience with impacts to levees from truck traffic while levee  
15 improvements are being constructed by reclamation districts, I anticipate that truck traffic  
16 vibrations will cause significant levee damage each year of construction that will remain unseen,  
17 and will not be repaired by simply replacing the road pavement surface. Damages to the interior  
18 of the levee from ground shaking caused by hundreds of heavy trucks parading through the Delta  
19 every day for the 14-year construction period could be disastrous when combined with pile  
20 driving vibrations if they occur during high water and generate liquefaction of the saturated sandy  
21 levee.

22 60. As mentioned previously, cracks from intensive ground vibrations will also  
23 produce a seepage path for water to flow through the levee and cause structural failure due to  
24 piping and movement of levee material. In other words, repair of the roadway surface as  
25 proposed by the WaterFix project mitigations will not actually address the true damage to the  
26 flood control structure underneath. The only solution to prevent water running through the levee  
27 and causing levee failure would be to install a cutoff wall through all of the levees identified as  
28 being used during WaterFix construction. Because the Project Proponents did not even address

1 these impacts in the WaterFix petition or RDEIR/SDEIS, a substantial amount of analysis would  
2 need to be conducted prior to construction in order to determine the number and location of cut  
3 off walls that would be necessary to mitigate for this impact. It is likely that after thorough  
4 geotechnical evaluation of the levees and damage caused by truck traffic, that numerous levees  
5 throughout the Delta will require reconstruction.

#### 6 **INTERFERENCE WITH WATER SUPPLY AND DRAINAGE SYSTEMS**

7 61. Due to the unique characteristics of the Delta, groundwater and surface water are  
8 linked. Therefore, any changes in groundwater elevation, such as that produced by Water Fix  
9 dewatering activities during construction, will impact the function of local domestic water wells,  
10 and irrigation and drainage systems that have been designed with management of subsurface  
11 water elevation as a component.

12 62. The lands of the Delta are commonly differentiated as Delta highlands and Delta  
13 lowlands. Delta highlands are defined as land with an elevation greater than 5-feet above sea  
14 level. Delta lowlands refer to ground below 5-feet above sea level.

15 63. Generally, water table is typically below the root zone in the Delta highlands, so  
16 farmland is traditionally irrigated by placing water above the ground surface. Delta lowlands are  
17 quite different. The water table is shallow and often very close to infringing on the root zone.  
18 Irrigation water can therefore be supplied by allowing ditches around, and through, fields to fill  
19 with water which raises the groundwater table into the root zone. This method is commonly  
20 referred to as sub-irrigation.

21 64. Water Fix proposes to drop subsurface water levels in order to accommodate  
22 construction of it facilities. Water Fix estimates this drawdown of the water table will lower the  
23 subsurface water level around the intakes and Intermediate Forebay by about 10-feet in a radius  
24 of approximately 2,600 feet from the dewatering wells. However, this is merely an estimate,  
25 because there has been no analysis of the extent and severity of impacts on groundwater levels.  
26 Based on my experience, this lowering of the groundwater table will certainly have an impact on  
27 irrigation systems and residential water wells.

28 65. Ground subsidence will also result from lowering the surface and ground water

1 table during dewatering. The magnitude of land and levee subsidence will vary throughout the  
2 dewatering wells' zone of influence. This will result in uneven fields. If the fields relied on  
3 proper sloping for irrigation and drainage, they will be impacted due to this improper grading. In  
4 addition, compaction of the subsided soil will impact crop growth, especially permanent crops  
5 that have reached a state of equilibrium the existing soil compaction characteristics.

6 66. Although Mr. Bednarski's testimony indicates the numerous diversion intakes and  
7 ditches used for irrigation and drainage that would be disrupted and disconnected will be repaired,  
8 the ability to move water through systems that have been carefully designed to operate with the  
9 island's ground elevations may not work as effectively, thus rendering the properties unfarmable.

10 67. For all of the above reasons, the Water Fix project is likely to have an adverse  
11 effect on water supply and flood control in the Delta.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28