

**33.12.2 Transcript of Sacramento, California Public Hearing –
September 11, 2013**

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

In Re:

SHASTA LAKE WATER RESOURCES
INVESTIGATION

Public Hearing

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Reported by Vickey L. Benson, RPR, CSR No. 8076

Golden State Reporting & Video Services (866) 324-4727

Page: 1

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Wednesday, September 11, 2013, commencing at the hour of 1:11 p.m., at the Cal Expo Quality Inn & Suites, 1413 Howe Avenue, Sacramento, California, before me, Vickey L. Benson, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, empowered to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant to Section 2093(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, the following proceedings were had:

--oOo--

MS. DENNING: All right. Welcome everybody. Last night, I said, "I'll make this quick to make sure we conserve time for all the people that we had. We had about 150 people at the Redding hearing. But tonight -- or this afternoon, I guess I can wax on for a long time. But instead of boring you, I'll be brief.

You know, this hearing is really about what you think and feel about the project. It's not about hearing from us; it's about us hearing from you.

Just as some background again, the Congress authorized studying raising the Shasta Dam in 1980 and in 2004 legislation. We're evaluating three dam heights and multiple reservoir alternatives.

The purpose of this project is to increase the fish survival and also to improve water supply reliability throughout large portions of the state of

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 California.

2 We released the draft feasibility report that
3 documented the -- sort of the physical, environmental,
4 economic and financial feasibility of the project back
5 in February of 2012, and we released the preliminary
6 draft environmental impact statement at that time, too.

7 And hopefully, that will help with the review
8 of the public draft that we released a couple of months
9 ago. And that's what we're here commenting on today is
10 that public draft EIS.

11 The final EIS and feasibility report is
12 scheduled to be completed by the end of next year, so
13 just over a year from now.

14 Ultimately, the decision to be made and
15 document in the record of decision will be a
16 recommendation from the Secretary of the Interior of
17 the Congress as to whether or not to raise Shasta Dam,
18 how high and how to operate it.

19 That recommendation is our responsibility as
20 Congress gave us the direction to study this project.
21 If the secretary is recommending no action report,
22 there would be a concluding -- no action alternative,
23 we would issue a concluding report at that time.

24 The secretary may recommend an action
25 alternative. That alternative at this point must be

1 the alternative with the highest net economic benefits.

2 We can identify other alternatives.

3 We may be able to justify another alternative
4 based in part on what we hear as we review the --
5 listen to your comments. But it still has to have a
6 positive economic benefit.

7 Congress would make the ultimate decision
8 after reviewing the information that we provide through
9 the secretary as well as their constituents, you and
10 other members of the public.

11 The information gathered during this comment
12 period is critical for reclamation to develop a good
13 project, for the secretary and Congress to understand
14 the impacts and benefits and your perspectives on those
15 impacts and benefit.

16 I encourage you to be candid, to be
17 respectful of my team in carrying out their role, and
18 to be mindful of the time while making your comments.
19 And I just wanted to thank you for being here today.

20 And, Pete, I think we have one commenter.

21 MR. LUCERO: So, I'm the hearing officer. My
22 name is Pete Lucero. And we will be opening the
23 hearing now. We are currently in session. I will be
24 repeating some of what Michelle said, but I wanted to
25 go through this particular information.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 Welcome to this public hearing on the Draft
2 Environmental Impact Statement for the Shasta Lake
3 Water Resources Investigation. This hearing is being
4 held in accordance with requirements of the National
5 Environmental Policy Act.

6 This is the second of three public hearings.
7 We had one last night in Redding. This one, of course,
8 is our second, and we have a third tomorrow in
9 Los Banos.

10 I'll be serving as the hearing officer. I've
11 got with me Katrina Chow, who is the program manager,
12 project manager for this project and, of course,
13 Michelle Denning, who is the chief planner for the
14 region.

15 We're accepting oral or written comments on
16 the DEIS. To provide oral comments, you should have
17 completed a speaker's card, which is this small piece
18 on the bottom of this larger paper you received. Fill
19 out your name, provide it to the front desk, and
20 they'll bring it up to here so we can call you in order
21 of which you signed up.

22 And if you want to make a written comment, of
23 course there's several ways to do that. One is the top
24 of this card. You can fill this out here or at home.
25 This is self-addressed here. Just mail it in to us.

1 Otherwise, you can e-mail your comments, fax your
2 comments in. All the instructions for that is on this
3 piece of paper.

4 You've got till September 30th to provide
5 comments for the DEIS, so I would encourage you to make
6 those comments as soon as possible.

7 So, I'd like to explain what happens next
8 after this conclusion of this hearing segment of the
9 process. All the comments will be reviewed and will be
10 considered. A final Environmental Impact Statement
11 will be prepared, which will include all comments
12 received and responses to those comments.

13 The final EIS and final feasibility report
14 will be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget
15 before, being circulated for a 30-day public review
16 period after which the Secretary of the Interior will
17 issue a record of decision for, one, a determination of
18 consistency with the National Environmental Policy Act
19 and, two, a recommendation to Congress to approve a
20 preferred alternative or a no action alternative.

21 The hearing will proceed in this manner.
22 Speakers will be called to the microphone in the order
23 which they signed up. And today I have a speaker,
24 Mr. MacNeil.

25 Mr. MacNeil, being that we have an hour and

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 44 minutes left in the day, you have an hour and 43
2 minutes to make your comment, unless someone else
3 chooses that they would like to come up and make their
4 comment.

5 So with that, we'll go ahead and call our
6 first speaker. Mr. MacNeil?

7 MR. MACNEIL: Sure. Being --

8 MR LUCERO: If you don't mind, sir, would you
9 please state your full name and your affiliation.

10 MR. MACNEIL: Sure.

11 MR. LUCERO: And also spell your name for the
12 court reporter.

13 MR. MACNEIL: My name is Steve MacNeil.

14 That's M-a-c-N-e-i-l. And I'm a landowner in Lakehead,
MACNEIL-1 California, have a home right on the shoreline.

16 One of my concerns, and many of my
17 neighbors', is that raising this dam is going to cause
18 a lot of future problems for us. Obviously, we would
19 lose our property.

20 The discussion of reimbursement, we're very
MACNEIL-2 concerned about. From all we've heard thus far, you
21 know, it's some kind of flat line, across-the-board
22 dollar amount per square foot of land, okay, which
23 is -- I understand that perhaps that the Fed's idea
24 that this is how they would do it to consume the land
25

MACNEIL-2
CONTD

1 and reimburse us for the years of heritage of our
2 property.

MACNEIL-3

3 One of my concerns also is with a lot of the
4 local business owners, that raising the dam from the
5 minimum to the maximum heights are going to wipe out
6 their locations. They've talked about either
7 reimbursing them for their losses or perhaps moving
8 marinas up.

MACNEIL-4

9 Water recreation has been part of our family
10 since I was born, and my dad since he was born, and we
11 believe it's a great family value getting out together
12 and enjoying nature and being able to share that with
13 others and bringing other people into that environment.
14 It makes for a good solid family household as opposed
15 to sending your kids off somewhere for a summer like
16 that.

MACNEIL-5

17 That's just a couple of my concerns. Another
18 one is the future for the landowners and the business
19 owners. How are they going to be reimbursed for the
20 next ten or twenty years of operation?

MACNEIL-6

21 The lake levels as it has been now -- which
22 to the best of my understanding, it's only been full 20
23 percent of the time since the dam's inception. Okay?
24 Managing the water, I understand it's important for all
25 of the state.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	↑	Now, raising it 18 feet, it would have to be
2		full to make use of those gains. All right? Twenty
3		percent of the time doesn't seem much of a
MACNEIL-6		justification, if it's only full 20 percent of the time
CONTD		after this project, especially with the costs. The dam
5		isn't quite paid for yet, to my understanding, from
6		when they built it. It's a long-time process. I
7		understand that. It's a very expensive project.
9		Okay. I also believe that there are better
10		alternatives. I'm sure you folks are probably looking
MACNEIL-7		into them. There are lots of little hills and valleys
12		all the way down the valley where water storage can be
13		done on a smaller basis but on a much greater scale
14		than I think we do it now.
15		I just think this is being looked at because
16		it's a simple approach perhaps for feasibility to
MACNEIL-8		increase water for the gross population, which we have
17		a lot of it in this state.
19		Personally -- my interest is personal. Maybe
20		it's selfish. But I think there are a lot of people
MACNEIL-9		that are going to be affected by this up in the
21		Northern California area, that it will never recover.
22		Those would -- the management, the
23		recreational areas of the lake and the forest areas,
MACNEIL-10		the campsites that will be, you know, gone, I've heard
25		

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 that we have these concerns, you know, as public and as
2 a group, as a neighborhood, as a county, as a city, as
3 a state, and that it's important, and it matters.

MACNEIL-15
CONTD
4 And I think all of these need to be made sure
5 and put into a perspective that they look at and
6 realize it's not just water. There's more to it.
7 There are a lot of people and a lot of families that
8 are going to be affected and for many future
9 generations.

10 My dad has property on the water as well. If
MACNEIL-16
11 he wanted to leave it to me, well, that's not possible
12 anymore if it's raised. These fellows with marinas and
13 cabins right on the lakefront have people year after
MACNEIL-17
14 year come back and enjoy the area. Unavailable
15 anymore, let alone their income for next year and the
16 year after.

17 It's hard. Especially for a little town like
18 Lakehead will probably go away. You know, with a
19 little bit of income for folks that own a little store,
MACNEIL-18
20 they rely on the 500 people a year that come there to
21 spend a little for their survival, their way of life.
22 It may be simple. But what it provides, you know, to
23 the families that come there is immeasurable.

24 I just want to make sure that they understand
MACNEIL-19
25 that there are a lot of people who want to present that

MACNEIL-19
CONTD

1 to them and make sure that this isn't purely an
2 economical status, because there's more to it than
3 that.

4 Thank you. I don't have much more to say.

5 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. MacNeil. Is
6 there anyone else in the room who would like to speak
7 today? Yes, sir. Will you state your name, spell your
8 name and your affiliation?

FOTR4-1

9 MR. EVANS: Steve Evans, S-t-e-v-e,
10 E-v-a-n-s, representing Friends of the River here in
11 Sacramento. I spoke last night, so I didn't sign up.
12 But since there's plenty of time, I wanted to mention a
13 few things that I ran out of time last night in the
14 Redding area meeting.

FOTR4-2

15 First of all, involves the bureau's
16 environmental analysis in the draft EIS and the
17 presentation of the information from that analysis to
18 the public.

19 There's a good example right back here in the
20 room where you have a poster that notes how many acre
21 feet of total additional volume is provided by each
22 proposed raise of the dam: Six feet, twelve feet,
23 eighteen and a half feet.

24 Those are misleading numbers at best, because
25 we know that if you raise the dam, Shasta Reservoir

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1
FOTR4-2
CONTD

will not fill every year. It won't fill most years.
So the total additional volume for each version of the
dam raise is really misleading.

7
FOTR4-3

3
4 What we should be presenting to the public at
5 every opportunity is the estimated firm yield, which is
6 the amount of average water that the reservoir
7 enlargement could provide.

8 And based on my review of the EIS, that's no
9 more than 133,000 acre feet depending on the -- at the
10 maximum reservoir enlargement. That's considerably
11 less water to meet all the needs that you're saying
12 that this project will meet.

13 Another problem with the analysis is that
14 some of your analytical tools are, at best, crude. And
15 I don't even want to get into detail, but you're using
16 a model to determine impacts on flows called CalSet 2
17 (phonetic.) And the inadequacies of that model are
18 well known.

19
FOTR4-4

20 For one thing, it at best provides average
21 flows on a monthly basis, which is too crude to really
22 identify the impacts of the flow changes that enlarging
23 the reservoir upstream will have on the downstream
24 flows.

25 And I've been researching materials and
studies on flow impacts on the Sacramento River

1 riparian and aquatic ecosystems. And it seems pretty
FOTR44 clear the scientific consensus is the CalSet 2 flow
CONTD model is -- just cannot really estimate the impacts on
2 that. So that's a major problem.
3
4 I also wanted to bring up the issue of
5 climate change. One of the things that you hear
6 repeated often is that with global warming and climate
7 change, we'll be -- California will receive less
8 precipitation as snow and more precipitation as rain.
9
10 And that may be true, although that's based
FOTR45 on models. And models are models. They're not
11 actually accurate predictions of future events.
12
13 But the other part of that assessment is that
14 overall, the climate will be dryer. That means that we
15 actually won't be receiving likely more rain. And
16 therefore, it increases the -- or makes it clear that
17 the cost effectiveness of building more storage will be
18 reduced.
19
20 In other words, we're proposing to build a
21 lot of very expensive projects -- well, not a lot, but
FOTR46 some very expensive projects for what could be very
22 little additional water.
23
24 This project is now, Christ, pretty close to
25 over a billion dollars. It likely will be more than
that. And at a maximum firm yield of 133,000 acre

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

FOTR4-6
CONTD

feet, that's really, really expensive water.

FOTR4-7

2 And as Tom Stokely from the Water Impact
3 Network brought up last night, even if we accept the
4 bureau's estimates of the number of salmon young that
5 will -- the survival that will be increased from the
6 dam raise by providing cold water, the actual returns
7 of those salmon young as adults are so infinitesimal,
8 are so little that we're talking about thousands and
9 thousands and thousands of dollars for the return of
10 one adult salmon.

FOTR4-8

11 So I think a lot of the reasoning behind this
12 project needs to be reexamined. And we'll be

FOTR4-9

submitting detailed comments by the deadline. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Evans. Are there
16 any other ones who would like to speak?

17 Hearing no, we will go into recess and
18 reconvene if someone decides they would like to speak.
19 Thank you.

20
21 --o0o--
22
23
24
25

1	
2	
3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	
5	
6	
7	I certify that the foregoing proceedings
8	in the within-entitled cause were reported at the time
9	and place therein named; that said proceedings were
10	reported by me, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter and
11	a disinterested person, and were thereafter transcribed
12	into typewriting.
13	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
14	attorney for either or any of the parties to said cause
15	of action, nor in any way interested in the outcome of
16	the cause named in said cause of action.
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
18	hand this _____ day of _____, 2013.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	_____ VICKEY L. BENSON Certified Realtime Reporter
24	CSR NO. 8076 State of California
25	

Responses to Comments from Steve Evans on Behalf of Friends of the River

FOTR4-1: Comment noted.

FOTR4-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, "Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir."

FOTR4-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

FOTR4-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-4, “Best Available Information,” and Master Comment Response DSFISH-2, “Other Fisheries Models and Tools.”

FOTR4-5: As describes in the Climate Change modeling appendix, the central tendency projection for the watershed above Shasta Reservoir is for slightly increased precipitation during the 21st century. To account for the uncertainty in future precipitation, the EIS used a wide range of both wetter and drier climates to evaluate the sensitivity of enlarged Shasta to climate changes. With regard to the effects of climate change on net economic benefits from both urban and agricultural economic activities, an enlarged Shasta results in positive net economic benefits compared to the existing reservoir and these benefits tend to be larger under drier climates (see figures 3-142 through 3-145 in the Climate Change Modeling appendix). However, it is important to remember the sensitivity analysis does not address the “cost effectiveness” of an enlarged Shasta. That assessment requires more detailed analyses and methods not used in the Climate Change Modeling appendix. Please refer to Master Comment Response CC-1, “Climate Change Uncertainty and Related Evaluations,” and Master Comment Response GEN-4, “Best Available Information.”

FOTR4-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” and Master Comment Response COST/BEN-3, “Increased Water Supply Reliability under Action Alternatives.”

FOTR4-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FOTR4-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FOTR4-9: Comment noted.

Responses to Comments from Steve MacNeil on Behalf of Self

MACNEIL-1: Comment noted.

MACNEIL-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

MACNEIL-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

MACNEIL-4: Comment noted.

MACNEIL-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

MACNEIL-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

MACNEIL-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

MACNEIL-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MACNEIL-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MACNEIL-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-11, “Inundation Zone/Reservoir Buffer.”

MACNEIL-11: A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

MACNEIL-12: Please refer to Master Comment Response RBR-2, “Reduced Public Access Around Shasta Lake.”

MACNEIL-13: Thank you for your comment on the DEIS for the SLWRI, we appreciate your time in responding to the document. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

MACNEIL-14: Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” identifies impacts from inundation of Traditional Cultural Properties and Sacred Land Filings, which include Winnemem Wintu places of traditional, ceremonial, and sacred uses. See “Impact Culture-2” in Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” Section 14.3.4, “Mitigation Measures,” for

“CP1,” “CP2,” “CP3,” “CP4,” and “CP5,” are identified as significant and unavoidable, with no feasible mitigation identified.

Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

MACNEIL-15: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MACNEIL-16: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MACNEIL-17: As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” inundated recreation facilities and associated utilities would be relocated before demolition to the extent practicable. Section 2.3.8 also states that scheduling and sequencing of recreation facility relocation or modification construction activities will strive to minimize or avoid interruption of public access to recreation sites.

MACNEIL-18: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MACNEIL-19: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**33.12.3 Transcript of Los Banos, California Public Hearing –
September 12, 2013**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	
Public Hearing on the Draft)
Environmental Impact Statement)
for the Shasta Lake Water)
Resource Investigation.)
_____)
MERCED COUNTY SPRING FAIRGROUNDS	
GERMINO BUILDING	
403 "F" STREET	
LOS BANOS, CA	
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2013	
6:41 P.M.	
Reported By: Allen W. Rose, CSR 13753	

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	APPEARANCES
2	STAFF:
3	Ms. Michelle Denning, Regional Planning Officer
4	Mr. Brian Person, Manager of the Northern California Area Office, Manager at Shasta Dam
5	Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager
6	Mr. Pete Lucero, Public Affairs Officer, Mid-Pacific Region
7	
8	Mr. Louise Moore, Public Affairs Specialist
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2013, LOS BANOS, CALIFORNIA
2	6:41 P.M.
3	--oOo--
4	MS. DENNING: Good evening, I am Michelle
5	Denning, the Reclamation Regional Planning and Hearing
6	Officer. The hearing is now open.
7	Does anyone wish to make any comments for the
8	record? No one wishes to make a comment, so we'll recess
9	the hearing. Thank you.
10	(Off the record.)
11	MS. DENNING: The hearing is adjourned.
12	(Hearing adjourned at 8:01 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Allen Rose, CSR 13753, hereby certify that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter; that I recorded verbatim in shorthand writing the foregoing proceedings completely and correctly; that I have caused under my direction said shorthand writing to be transcribed into typewriting and the foregoing pages constitute a complete and accurate transcript of said shorthand writing taken at the above-mentioned proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said proceeding nor in any way interested in the outcome of said proceeding.

Dated: September 23, 2013

Allen Rose, CSR 13753

This page left blank intentionally.

33.13 Comments Submitted After the Comment Period and Responses

This section contains copies of comment letters (and any attachments) from comment letters submitted after September 30, 2014, listed in Table 33.13-1. As noted previously, each comment in the comment letters was assigned a number, in sequential order (note that some letters may have more than one comment). The numbers were then combined with an abbreviation for the local agency (example: KAMP-1).

Responses to the comments follow the comment letters, and are also numbered, corresponding to the numbers assigned in the letters. The letters and associated responses are sorted alphabetically by abbreviation and appear in the section in that order.

Table 33.13-1. Individuals Providing Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement After the Comment Period

Abbreviation	Name	Individual
CAPO	Caporale, John	Caporale, John
ESSE	Esselen Tribe of Monterey County	Brennan, John Polomo
HORN	Horne, Adele	Horne, Adele
KAMP	Kampa, Richard	Kampa, Richard
SILVE	Silvers, Dean	Silvers, Dean

33.13.1 John Caporale

CAPO

From: John Caporale <jcaporale@gmail.com>
Date: July 4, 2014 at 1:12:34 PM PDT
To: <kchow@usbr.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Shasta Dam Raise

Katrina Chow - Project Manager

US Bureau of Reclamation

Planning Division,

2800 Cottage Way

Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

Dear Ms. Chow,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposal to raise the height of Shasta Dam by 6.5-18.5 feet.

CAPO-1

Although the USBR draft feasibility study found such an undertaking would be "technically and environmentally feasible," as well as "economically justified," this project could require more than \$1 billion in taxpayer funds and there is significant evidence that runs contrary to your findings.

Furthermore, these large projects rarely meet budget projections often running to massive cost overruns.

CAPO-2

Briefly put: raising Shasta Dam would provide a small benefit at a great cost.

If plans are approved to raise Shasta Dam by 18.5 feet, which USBR found to be the most economical option, statewide water storage capacity would expand by only 1.5%. The creation of 76,000 acre-feet of firm yield would add less than 0.2% of agricultural and urban water use per year in California.

CAPO-2 CONTD	<p>Dams don't create water – they merely capture rain and snow melt – and the firm yield reliably produced on an annual basis depends on annual rainfall. The dam has only reached full capacity about 12 times since its creation. The hypothetical firm yield of water produced from the 6.5-foot raise ranges from 20,000 to 72,000 acre-feet. The hypothetical firm yield of the 18.5-foot raise is 71,000-146,000 acre-feet. In comparison, if farmers producing low-value alfalfa were to conserve a mere five percent of the water they consume, it would save nearly one million-acre feet of water. Conservation is a much better alternative.</p>
CAPO-3	<p>Another stated objective of raising the dam is to “increase survival of anadromous fish populations in the upper Sacramento River.” Ironically, Shasta Dam prevents Chinook salmon from reaching the cold-water streams where these fish naturally breed. Funds would be better spent building a fish ladder around Shasta Dam.</p> <p>An analysis conducted by Golden Gate Salmon Association and the Natural Resources Defense Council found that the target salmon population put forth by state and federal government is only at 20% of historic populations. Why not invest instead in salmon restoration, an alternative which would provide a better long-term solution without exacerbating the problem it purports to solve?</p>
CAPO-4	<p>Beyond the negative economic and ecological effects of raising Shasta Dam, please also consider the cultural damage a higher dam would inflict.</p> <p>The Winnemem Wintu Tribe, the same people who lost much of their traditional homeland and many historic, cultural and sacred sites when Shasta Dam was built in the 1930's and 40's, would see an additional 39 sacred sites flooded, including Puberty Rock, a major ceremonial initiation site. A crucial aspect of the tribe's ability to practice their culture and religion would be lost.</p>
CAPO-5	<p>Raising Shasta Dam also violates the McCloud River's designation as a federal Wild & Scenic River. So, not only would many Winnemem sacred sites be flooded and a Wild and Scenic River compromised, a variety of small businesses and families would be displaced.</p>
CAPO-6	

CAPO-7	Who would really benefit from raising the dam? A report by the Environmental Working Group shows that California taxpayers subsidize \$416 million a year in water for agriculture that is conveyed to Central Valley farms and that “the largest 10 percent of the farms got 67 percent of the water.” These Central Valley water purveyors, including Westlands Water District, can sell the subsidized water to urban areas in southern California at a profit. The water might also facilitate hydrocarbon fracking in the Monterey Shale region. These are not valid justifications for raising Shasta Dam.
CAPO-8	
CAPO-9	Furthermore, raising Shasta Dam is linked to the controversial proposal by California Governor Jerry Brown to build two large tunnels under the Delta in order to divert large amount of water to corporate agricultural farms to the south, not to the people who are paying for the proposed project. I urge you to carefully consider these high costs and minimal benefits of raising Shasta Dam, and abandon the proposal to raise the height of the dam.

Please remove email addresses before forwarding. Use BCC when sending to several people at once.

Response to Comments from John Caporale

CAPO-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” and Master Comment Response COST/BEN-2, “Comments Related to the SLWRI Feasibility Report.”

CAPO -2: The SLWRI DEIS does not include evaluations related to economic feasibility because it is not required under NEPA. Accordingly, the DEIS does not identify a “most economical” alternative. As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-2, “Comments Related to the SLWRI Feasibility Report,” evaluations related to economic feasibility were included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report.

Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” Master Comment Response COST/BEN-3, “Increased Water Supply Reliability under Action Alternatives,” Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

CAPO -3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam,” Master Comment Response ALTD-2, “Alternative Development – Anadromous Fish Survival,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

CAPO -4: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources,” and Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

CAPO -5: Please refer to Master Comment Response WASR-1, “Eligibility of the McCloud River as a Federal Wild and Scenic River.”

CAPO -6: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses,” and Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

CAPO -7: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

CAPO -8: Please refer to Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

CAPO -9: Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts,” and Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

33.13.2 John Polomo Brennan on Behalf of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County

ESSE

From: John Brennan <jb96094@gmail.com>
Date: November 14, 2013 8:54:47 AM PST
To: <sfry@usbr.gov>, <comments@usbr.gov>, The River Exchange
<mail@riverexchange.org>, <winnememwintutribe@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments on raising Shasta dam from the Esselen Tribal Engineer

Attached please find subject comments.

ESSE-1

The Esselen People stand opposed to this project based on the unmitigatable adverse impacts to Native American Cultural Resources protected under NEPA section 106.

John Polomo Brennan

Choose a life fully lived, walk close to the edges, take risks, follow your bliss. There are no mistakes, only lessons. Remember and apply them.

ESSE-2

Please change my email address to jb96094@gmail.com

John Brennan
3715 Dale Creek Road
Hammond Ranch, CA 96094
530.938.4027 cell 530.859.3499
jb96094@gmail.com

November 15, 2013

Ms. Katrina Chow
Project Manager
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Planning Division
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

Comments from the Esselen Tribal Engineer re the DEIS for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation

Dear Ms. Chow:

- ESSE-3 The current reservoir behind Shasta Dam impinges on sacred Native American Cultural Resources by drowning them and preventing access to them for ceremonial purposes.
- ESSE-4 The proposed project not only continues the above travesty, but will severely impact current accessible Native American Cultural Resources which are protected under NEPA section 106. The proposed mitigation measures cannot in any way compensate for the loss of these sacred sites which are used to this day by our cultural brothers in the Winnimem Wintu Tribe and other California Tribes.
- ESSE-5
- ESSE-6 It may be difficult for non-native people to comprehend the value we place on our cultural resources. Please bear in mind that our Peoples have been in this region for over 6,000 years. Over those millennia we have developed deep personal relationships with the lands which sustained us and which we call home.
- ESSE-7 To flood these sacred lands and to offer the pitifully inadequate mitigations is akin to flooding the Sistine Chapel, or the Dome of the Rock, or the Wailing Wall, and offering free scuba lessons and equipment to Christian Catholics, Muslims and Jews so they can visit their sacred sites.
- ESSE-8 The loss of access to these sites created by the proposed project is not mitigatable. It, in fact, is another subtle form of cultural genocide. The People of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County stand opposed to the losses of Native American Cultural Resources and therefore stand opposed to the proposed project.

Sincerely,

John Brennan, PE
Tribal Engineer
Esselen Tribe of Monterey County

JPB/1s

Cc: Caleen Sisk Franco

Response to Comments from John Polomo Brennan on Behalf of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County

ESSE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

ESSE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response MAILINGLIST-1, “Addition to the Mailing List.”

ESSE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

ESSE-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-11, “Cultural Resources and NEPA,” and Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

ESSE-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-11, “Cultural Resources and NEPA.”

ESSE-6: Thank you for sharing your history. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process.

ESSE-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-11, “Cultural Resources and NEPA.”

ESSE-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

33.13.3 Horne, Adele

From: **Adele Horne** <adelehome@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 31, 2014 at 11:47 AM
Subject: Please don't raise the Shasta dam
To: kchow@usbr.gov

Dear Ms. Chow:

HORN-1

I am writing to urge you to stop plans to raise the Shasta dam, because of the destruction this would cause of natural sites that are sacred to the Winnemem Wintu people. I believe that in this era of grave peril to our shared inheritance, the natural world, one of our best hopes for survival as a society is to learn from the rootedness of indigenous peoples to the land they and their ancestors have inhabited. We need to learn to become careful stewards of the land, to try to rectify the environmental destruction we have caused. If we contribute to the destruction of Winnemem Wintu culture by destroying their access to sacred cultural sites, all of us will have lost a cultural heritage that has the potential to point the way to a more balanced and harmonious relationship with nature. We cannot afford to do this. For the sake of today's children and future generations, please do not raise the Shasta dam.

Sincerely,

Adele Horne

2276 Fair Oak View Terrace

Los Angeles, CA 90039

Response to Comments from Adele Horne

HORN-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, "Potential Effects to Cultural Resources," and Master Comment Response CR-3, "Current Effects to Cultural Resources."

33.13.4 Richard Kampa

KAMP PRS-8.00

COPY

22216 Parrotts Ferry Rd. Sp. 37
Sonoma, CA 95370-9008

May 11, 2014

Senator Dianne Feinstein
331 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Feinstein:

KAMP-1 I am firmly opposed to raising the Shasta Dam!

Sincerely,

Richard R. Kampa

Response to Comments from Richard Kampa

KAMP-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

33.13.5 Dean Silvers

 COPY

PR5-8.00
Dean A. Silvers SILVE
316 Myrtle St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
May 10, 2014

Dear Ms. Chow,

I write to you as someone who has great respect for the Winnemem Wintu, who have lived along the McCloud River for thousands of years. Since 1969, I have been reading about these people and their struggles. The McCloud River is a place that I have hiked along and also appreciated. Therefore, I am strongly **against the raising of the Shasta Dam**, knowing of the destruction that it would cause to the Winnemem's cultural heritage, sacred spots and healing sites. There is also the enormous damage that it would do to the larger habitat. **SILVE-1**

I am sure that you're aware of The "New York Times" article of May 7, 2014 ("Tear Down "Deadbeat" Dams). While many would argue that Shasta is not yet a "deadbeat dam," its construction and continued existence has certainly has been destructive to the historic McCloud River salmon runs and to the Winnemem Wintu culture. **SILVE-2**

Therefore, it would seem that the least that could be done to help both the salmon and the Winnemem Wintu would be to STOP the raising of the Shasta dam, install fish ladders, and then bring back the genetic descendants of McCloud River salmon (from the Rakaia River of New Zealand's South Island, where they were transported in the early 1900s). **SILVE-3**

Thank you,



Dean A. Silvers

Response to Comments from Dean Silvers

SILVE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, "Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise," Master Comment Response CR-1, "Potential Effects to Cultural Resources," and Master Comment Response EI-1, "Intent of NEPA Process is to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts."

SILVE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources,” and Master Comment Response DSFISH-6, “Historic Dam Effects on Fisheries.”

SILVE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam,” and Master Comment Response CR-8, “Native American Connection to Salmon.”

33.14 References

- Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). 2013. Your Questions Answered. Available at: <http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/AboutBDCP/YourQuestionsAnswered.aspx>. Accessed January 27, 2014.
- California Air Resources Board (ARB), 2012. Cap-and-Trade Regulation Instructional Guidance, Chapter 1: How does the Cap-and-Trade Program work? September. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/guidance/chapter1.pdf>. Accessed January 2013.
- California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service. 2010. CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program, End of Stage 1 Report. Sacramento, California. April.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 1998. Technical Noise Supplement. October. Available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/Technical%20Noise%20Supplement.pdf> . Accessed February 10, 2014.
- _____. 2009 (November). Technical Noise Supplement. Available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/tens_complete.pdf. Accessed March 2014.
- _____. 2011a. California Airport Land Use Handbook. October. Available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents/alucp/AirportLandUsePlanningHandbook.pdf> . Accessed February 2014.
- _____. 2011b. Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. May. Available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/ca_tnap_may2011.pdf . Accessed February 10, 2014.
- _____. 2013. Technical Noise Supplement. September. Available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TeNS_Sept_2013A.pdf . Accessed February 10, 2014.
- _____. 2014. Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic on California State Highways – 2012. Available at <http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/>. Accessed January 31, 2014.

California Department of Water Resources. 2009. California Water Plan Update, Bulletin 160-09. Sacramento, California.

_____. 2012. Climate Action Plan. Phase 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan.

_____. 2014. The California Water Plan, Update 2013, Bulletin 160-09. Sacramento, California. October.

California Energy Commission (CEC), 2013 (April). Renewables Portfolio Standard Eligibility, Seventh Edition, Commission Guidebook. CEC-300-2013-005-ED7-CMF-REV. April. Available at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2013publications/CEC-300-2013-005/CEC-300-2013-005-ED7-CMF-REV.pdf>.

California Environmental Protection Agency. 2013 (August). Indicators of Climate Change in California. Available at <http://oehha.ca.gov/multimedia/epic/pdf/climatechangeindicatorsreport2013.pdf>.

California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board. 2013. Compliance Offset Protocol U.S. Forest Offset Projects

California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (Sections 15220 to 15229).

California Natural Resources Agency. 2013. Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Your Questions Answered.

Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Section 3406 (d)(2).

City of Ceres, 2010. Mitchell Ranch Center Draft Environmental Impact Report. SCH No. 2007092011. May. Available at <http://staffrep.ci.ceres.ca.us/planning/Mitchell%20Ranch%20DEIR/Draft%20EIR/> . Accessed February 2014.

Cole, J., Y. Prairie, N. Caraco, W. McDowell, L. Tranvik, R. Striegl, C. Duarte, P. Kortelainen, J. Downing, J. Middelburg, and J. Melack, (Cole et al.), 2007. Plumbing the Global Carbon Cycle: Integrating Inland Waters into the Terrestrial Carbon Budget. Ecosystems 2007.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1981 (March). "NEPA's Forty Most Asked Questions." Available: <<http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/40p3.htm>>. Accessed March 15, 2014.

- _____. 2010. Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases. February 18. Available at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ceq/20100218-nepa-consideration-effects-ghg-draft-guidance.pdf>.
- Deemer B.R., J.A. Harrison, S.M. Henderson, and M.T. Glavin. 2012. Water level drawdown affects methane and nitrous oxide production in a small eutrophic reservoir: Lacamas Lake, Washington. Poster at the Society for Freshwater Science Annual Meeting, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Eastern District of California. 2010. Consolidated Delta Smelt Cases, 717 F.Supp.2d 1021.
- _____. 2010. Consolidated Salmonid Cases, 713 F.Supp.2d 1116.
- Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN), 1997. Effects of Aviation Noise on Awakenings from Sleep. June. Available at
http://www.fican.org/pdf/Effects_AviationNoise_Sleep.pdf. Accessed February 10, 2014.
- Fremier, A.K. 2003. Floodplain Age Modeling Techniques to Analyze Channel Migration and Vegetation Patch Dynamics along the Sacramento River, California. Master's thesis. University of California, Davis, Davis, California.
- Fremier, A.K. and T.S. Talley. 2009. Scaling Riparian Conservation with River Hydrology: Lessons from Blue Elderberry Along Four California Rivers. *Wetlands* 29:150–162.
- Internal Revenue Service. 2013. (IRS) Publication 544
- James, Krumland, Jennings, Eckert. 2007. Carbon Sequestration in California Forests; Two Case Studies in Managed Watersheds.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2004 (October). Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan. Southwest Region. Long Beach, California.
- _____. 2009. Revised Biological Opinion on the Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan (NMFS 2009).

- _____. 2009. Draft Recovery Plan for the evolutionarily Significant Units of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring Run Chinook Salmon and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead. Sacramento Protected Resources Division. Sacramento, California.
- _____. 2014. Recovery Plan for the Evolutionarily Significant Units of Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon and the Distinct Population Segment of Central Valley Steelhead. West Coast Region, Sacramento, California. July 2014.
- Shasta County, 2011. Environmental Initial Study – General Plan Amendment 09-002, Zone Amendment 09-013, Use Permit 09-018, and Reclamation Plan 09-001. Prepared for the Moody Flats Quarry Project. April 12. Available at http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index/drm_index/planning_index/eirs/moodyflatshome.aspx. Accessed February 2014.
- _____. 2012. Notice of Preparation – Moody Flats Quarry Project. January. Available at http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/index/drm_index/plannint_index/eirs/moodyflatshome.aspx. Accessed February 2014.
- Soumis, N., E. Duchemin, Rene C. Canuel, and M. Lucotte (Soumis et al.), 2004. Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Reservoirs of the Western United States. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, Vol. 18 GB3022.
- Stillwater Sciences. 2007. Linkages Report.
- _____. 2008. Sacramento River Ecological Flows Study" (TNC et al. 2008).
- The Nature Conservancy, Stillwater Sciences and ESSA Technologies. 2008. Sacramento River Ecological Flows Study: Final Report. Prepared for CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program. Sacramento, CA. 72pp.
- The River Exchange. 2010 (June). Upper Sacramento River Watershed Assessment and Management Strategy. Prepared for the River Exchange by North State Resources, Inc. Redding, California.
- Tremblay, A, J. Therrien, B. Hamlin, E. Wichmann, and L. LeDrew, (Tremblay et al.), 2005. GHG Emissions from Boreal Reservoirs and Natural Aquatic Ecosystems. *Environmental Science*: 209-232.

- Tu, I.M. 2000. Vegetation patterns and processes of natural regeneration in periodically flooded riparian forests in the Central Valley of California. Dissertation, University of California, Davis.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. 2011. Departmental Manual Chapter 112 DM 33 effective June 1, 2011.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Central Valley Project Improvement Act 3406(b)(2) flows.
- _____. 1983 (September). Enlarged Shasta Lake Investigation, Preliminary Findings Report.
- _____. 1999. Shasta Dam and Reservoir Enlargement, Appraisal Assessment of the Potential for Enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir.
- _____. 2003a. Strategic Agency and Public Involvement Plan.
- _____. 2003b (March). Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation, Mission Statement Milestone Report. Mid-Pacific Region. Sacramento, California.
- _____. 2004. SLWRI Initial Alternatives Information Report.
- _____. 2006. SLWRI Environmental Scoping Report.
- _____. 2007. Plan Formulation Report.
- _____. 2007. Reclamation Manual, Directives and Standards FAC; 09-01, 09-02, 09-03. Denver Colorado, October, 2007.
- _____. 2008. Biological Assessment on the Continued Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP (Reclamation 2008).
- _____. 2011. Technical Memorandum No. SHA-86-68110-CD-2011-1. LS-DYNA Dynamic Analyses for Shasta Dam Raise Studies – Central Valley.
- _____. 2012. Reclamation's NEPA Handbook. Denver, Colorado. February.
- _____. 2013. Central Valley Project Improvement Act. 2013. Public Law 102-575, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 2013 (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, January 2014).

- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Biological Opinion on the Coordinated Operations of the Central Valley Project.
- _____. 2007. Draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report.
- _____. 2008. Revised Biological Opinion on the Coordinated Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project in California. (USFWS 2008).
- U.S. Water Resources Council. 1983. Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies. Washington, D.C. March.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Hydropower Association (UNESCO and IAH), 2010. GHG Measurement Guidelines for Freshwater Reservoirs.
- Vaghti, M.G., and S.E. Greco. 2007. Riparian Vegetation of the Great Valley. Pages 425–455 in M. G. Barbour, T. Keeler-Wolf, and A. A. Schoenherr (eds.), Terrestrial Vegetation of California. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.

33.15 Acronyms and Abbreviations

2008 Long-Term Operation BA	Reclamation 2008 Biological Assessment on the Continued Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP
2008 USFWS BO	USFWS 2008 Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on the Proposed Coordinated Operations of the CVP and SWP
2009 NFMS BO	NMFS 2009 Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion on the Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP
ABA	Architectural Barriers Act
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
ARB	Air Resources Board
ARFP	Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
BDCP	Bay Delta Conservation Plan
BIA	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
BMP	best management practice
BO	Biological Opinion
Cal/EMA	California Emergency Management Agency
CALFED	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Cal Fire	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CMS	comprehensive mitigation strategy
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
COA	Coordinated Operations Agreement
COS	carry-over storage

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement

CP	Comprehensive Plan
CRMP	coordinated resource management plan
CVHJV	Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CWA	Federal Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DEC	Design, Estimating, and Construction
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FAC	Reclamation Manual, Directives and Standards, Project Planning and Facility Operations, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation
FHA	
FICAN	Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise
GCM	global climate models
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographic information system
IAH	International Hydropower Association
IL4	Incremental Level 4
IMPLAN	IMpact analysis for PLANning
IOS	Interactive Object-oriented Salmon
IRA	Inventoried Roadless Area
L _{dn}	day-night noise level
L _{eq}	equivalent noise level
L _x	statistical descriptor
L2	Level 2
LEDPA	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan
M&I	municipal and industrial

MAF	million acre-feet
MCR	Master Comment Response
MT CO ₂ e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions
MW	megawatt
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
mph	miles per hour
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
NAVD	North American Vertical Datum
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOA	Notice of Availability
NODOS	North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage
NRA	National Recreation Area
NRI	National Rivers Inventory
OBAN	Oncorhynchus Bayesian Analysis model
OFA	Office of Federal Acknowledgment
OHV	Off-Highway Vehicle
ORV	outstandingly remarkable value
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OVS	Office of Valuation Service
P&G	Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies
RBPP	Red Bluff Pumping Plant
Reclamation	U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
RES	Renewable Electricity Standard
ROD	Record of Decision
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
RPS	Renewables Portfolio Standard
RWSP	Refuge Water Supply Program
SacEFT	Sacramento River Ecological Flows Tool
SCSO	Shasta County Sheriff's Office
SEL	single-event (impulsive) noise level
SLWRI	Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
SRTTG	Sacramento River Temperature Task Group
SRWQM	Sacramento River Water Quality Model

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement

State	State of California
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
STNF	Shasta-Trinity National Forest
SWAP	Statewide Agricultural Production
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TCD	temperature control device
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Uniform Act	Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United State Code
USFS	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
Western	Western Area Power Administration
WQMT	Water Operations Management Team
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

