

33.12 Comments from Public Hearings and Responses

This section contains transcripts of the DEIS public hearings held in September 2013 (as described in Chapter 32, “Final EIS”), as listed in Table 33.12-1. Individuals provided independent comments during the hearings or as representatives of elected officials or local agencies. As noted previously, each comment was assigned an abbreviation for the individual or the elected official or agency they represented (example: COSL). The comments were then assigned a number, in sequential order (note that some individuals may have provided more than one comment). The numbers were then combined with the abbreviations for the individual (example: COSL-3).

Responses to the comments follow the transcripts, and are also numbered, corresponding to the numbering assigned in the transcripts. The transcripts and associated responses are presented alphabetically by city, and responses are presented in the same order in which the comment was provided.

Table 33.12-1. Individuals Providing Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement During Public Hearings

Abbreviation	Name	Comments Provided on Behalf of
<i>Public Hearing, Redding, California September 10, 2013</i>		
BROW	Brown, Curtis	Self
BURG	Burgin, Greg	Self
CASS2	Cassano, Eric	Self
CWIN	Stokely, Tom	California Water Impact Network and California Environmental Water Caucus
DAVI	Davison, Matt	Self
DMART2	Martinez, David	Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member
FARR	Farr, Larry	Mayor of the City of Shasta Lake
FOTR3	Evans, Steve	Friends of the River
FRAN	France, Jeanne	Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member
GARD	Gardener, Nick	Self
HARR	Harral, Jerry	Self
HOLT	Holt, Buford	Self
HOOP	Franklin, Robert	Hoopa Valley Tribe (senior hydrologist)
HORK	Horkey, Sue	Self

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
 Environmental Impact Statement

Table 33.12-1. Individuals Providing Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement During Public Hearings (contd.)

Abbreviation	Name	Comments Provided on Behalf of
<i>Public Hearing, Redding, California September 10, 2013 (contd.)</i>		
JOPL1	Joplin, Catherine	Self
KRAV	Kravitz, Kenwa	Winnemem Wintu Cultural Museum
LEAV	Leavitt, Colleen	Self
LEIG	Leigh, Craig	Self
MALO	Malone, Linda	Self
MARE	Marek, Ed	Self
MCNEI	McNeil, Walt	Self
MUND	Mundt, David	Self
PRES	Preston, Michael	Self
RIDE	Rider, Rex	Self
SCHAP	Schappell, Bill	District 4
SCR2	Jones, Harold	Sugarloaf Cottages Resort
SEEL2	Seely, Geenie	Self
SISK	Sisk, Caleen	Chief of Winnemem Wintu Tribe
SLBOA2	Doyle, Matt	Shasta Lake Business Owners Association
SMR2	Harkradr, Anna	Read by Michael Tichera from Shasta Marina Resort
WADE	Wade, Russ	Self
WATK	Watkins, Greg	Councilman of the City of Shasta
WILL2	Williams, Peggy	Self
<i>Public Hearing, Sacramento, California September 11, 2013</i>		
FOTR4	Evans, Steve	Friends of the River
MACNEIL	MacNeil, Steve	Self
<i>Public Hearing, Los Banos, California September 12, 2013</i>		
No Comments		

**33.12.1 Transcript of Redding, California Public Hearing – September
10, 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.)
_____)

HOLIDAY INN
1900 HILLTOP DRIVE
REDDING, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013
6:18 P.M.

Reported By: Allen W. Rose, CSR 13753

1	APPEARANCES
2	ELECTED OFFICIALS:
3	Brenda Haynes, Congressman Doug LaMalfa's Office
4	Mr. Les Baugh, Shasta County Supervisor
5	Mr. Bill Schappell, Shasta County Supervisor
6	Mr. Larry Farr, Mayor of Shasta Lake
7	Mr. Greg Watkins, City Council Shasta Lake
8	Ms. Pam Morgan, City Council Shasta Lake
9	Ms. Caleen Sisk, Chief Winnemem Wintu Tribe
10	Mr. Greg Burgin Vice Chair Winnemem Wintu Tribe
11	
12	
13	STAFF:
14	Ms. Michelle Denning, Regional Planning Officer
15	Mr. Brian Person, Manager of the Northern California Area Office, Manager at Shasta Dam
16	Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager
17	Mr. Pete Lucero, Public Affairs Officer, Mid-Pacific Region
18	
19	Mr. Louise Moore, Public Affairs Specialist
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

		INDEX	
			PAGE
1			
2			
3	1	Comments by Supervisor Bill Schappell	9
4	2	Comments by Mayor Larry Farr	11
5	3	Comments by Councilman Greg Watkins	14
6	4	Comments by Chief Caleen Sisk	17
7	5	Comments by Rex Rider	19
8	6	Comments by Steve Evans	21
9	7	Comments by Craig Leigh	24
10	8	Comments by Robert Franklin	25
11	9	Comments by David Martinez	27
12	10	Comments by Eric Cassano	29
13	11	Comments by Greg Burgin, Junior 11	
14	12	Comments by Catherine Joplin	34
15	13	Comments by Sue Horkey	39
16	14	Comments by Michael Tichera	41
17	15	Comments by Harold Jones	45
18	16	Comments by Matthew Doyle	47
19	17	Comments by Nick Gardener	49
20	18	Comments by Jerry Harral	50
21	19	Comments by Dave Mundt	51
22	20	Comments by Geenie Seely	53
23	21	Comments by Walt McNeill	56
24	22	Comments by Colleen Leavitt	58
25	23	Comments by Matt Davison	60

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1		INDEX	
2	24	Comments by Buford Holt	62
3	25	Comments by Ed Marek	65
4	26	Comments by Russ Wade	67
5	27	Comments by Kenwa Kravitz	68
6	28	Comments by Linda Malone	71
7	29	Comments by Michael Preston	72
8	30	Comments by Peggy Williams	75
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013, REDDING, CALIFORNIA
2	6:18 P.M.
3	--oOo--
4	MR. LUCERO: Thank you Michelle. You may hear a
5	repeat of some of the stuff that Michelle just said. I
6	apologize for that. We're going to go on the record now,
7	and this hearing is now in session.
8	Hello and welcome to this public hearing on the
9	Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Shasta Lake
10	Water Resources Investigation. This hearing is being held
11	in accordance with the requirements of the National
12	Environment Policy Act. Tonight, we are holding the first
13	of three public hearings. Additional hearings will be
14	held in Sacramento on Wednesday, September 11th, and Los
15	Banos on Thursday, September 12th.
16	Again, my name the Pete Lucero. I am the
17	regional public affairs officer and the hearing officer
18	for this hearing. At the table with me is, of course,
19	Ms. Denning. We have Mr. Person who is the area manager
20	for the Northern California area office, and Katrina Chow
21	who is our project manager for this project. Also with us
22	today is Allen Rose who will be taking the notes and
23	recording every word that's being said at this hearing
24	today, so mind yourself.
25	Today we're accepting oral and written comments

1 on the Draft Environment Impact Statement. To provide
2 oral comments, you should have completed one of these
3 cards and turned it in to Mary in the back. This bottom
4 piece of this card is what you would turn in to make a
5 comment tonight orally. The top of this card can be used
6 for written comments. I'd also advise you that even
7 though tonight is a night where you can present written
8 comments, we have other ways to present those comments as
9 well through email, fax, or by letter, and that
10 information is on the comment card.

11 So I want to take a moment just to explain what
12 happens next. After the conclusion of the hearing segment
13 of the process, all the comments will be reviewed and will
14 be considered. A final Environmental Impact Statement
15 will be prepared, which will include all comments received
16 and the responses to those comments. The final EIS and
17 final feasibility report will be reviewed by the Office of
18 Management and Budget before being circulated for a 30-day
19 public review period. After which, the Secretary of
20 Interior will issue a recommended decision for one: A
21 determination of consistency with the National
22 Environmental Policy Act; and two, a recommendation to
23 Congress to approve the preferred alternative or no
24 action.

25 The hearing will proceed in this manner:

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 Speakers will be called to the microphone in the order
2 they showed up -- or signed up, excuse me. If I call your
3 name and you aren't present, you'll moved to the end of
4 the speakers list. Since we have about 30 people signed
5 up to comment, about an hour and a half in this hearing,
6 we're going to give everyone about three minutes to make
7 their comments. If you have extensive comments, please
8 summarize them orally and submit the rest in writing.
9 When it's your turn, please clearly state your name and
10 affiliation, and spell your first and last names. You
11 will see there's a microphone in front for you to do that.

12 Please speak clearly so your comments can be
13 captured accurately. Time will be kept, and you'll be
14 alerted when your three minutes are up. If you look at
15 the board over there, we have a timer. You'll see the
16 green, yellow, and eventually the red light come on. When
17 the red light comes on, unfortunately your time is you up.

18 Before we begin taking public comment, I'd like
19 to acknowledge any elected officials in the room. And I
20 have a list here:

21 Brenda Haynes from Congressman Doug LaMalfas'
22 office is here. Thank you, Brenda, for showing up.

23 From the County of Shasta, we have Les Baugh.
24 Thank you, Les. And we have Supervisor Bill Schappell.
25 Thank you, Bill.

1 From the City of Shasta Lake, we have Mayor Larry
2 Farr. Thank you, Mayor, for coming.
3 City Council of Shasta Lake, we have Greg
4 Watkins. Greg, thank you very much for showing up.
5 And the Tribal Chief of the Winnemem Wintu,
6 Caleen Sisk. Thank you very much.
7 If I've missed anyone who's an elected official
8 please raise your hand to be acknowledged. Yes, sir?
9 MR. BURGIN: Vice Chair of the Winnemem Wintu
10 Tribe in Northern California here representing my people.
11 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, and your name,
12 sir?
13 MR. BURGIN: Greg Burgin, Junior.
14 MR. WATKINS: May I also introduce Pam Morgan,
15 City Council, City of Shasta Lake.
16 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, appreciate
17 that, Pam.
18 So for the remainder of hearing, we'll start
19 taking public comment, and I'm going to begin with
20 federal, state, and local elected officials. And first
21 up -- well, standby.
22 We will proceed in the order of speakers as I
23 mentioned before, and if you wish to provide comments and
24 have not submitted a speaker card, please, again, go see
25 Mary in the back. With that we're ready to start, and

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 what I'll do is invite the elected officials up first, and
2 then after that I will invite two to three people to get
3 in queue to make their public comment for the rest of the
4 meeting.

5 So first you up will be Mr. Schappell.

6 MR. SCHAPPELL: Good evening, everybody. My name
7 is Bill Schappell. I represent District 4.

8 I Am going to be kind of brief. I was an

SCHAP-1

9 owner/operator of a resort on Shasta Lake for 25 years, so
10 obviously my concern is in that area. My area of concern
11 is what is going to happen with the businesses on Shasta
12 Lake, and what is going to happen to the community itself
13 of Lakehead.

SCHAP-2

14 For myself, I don't -- I see it as being dismal,
15 okay. I think that there's a lot of things that need to
16 be addressed. The EIS is one of them, but from an

SCHAP-3

17 economic standpoint the mitigation of the business loss
18 needs to be addressed, and the mitigation of how we're
19 going to reform this lake as it gets higher on the ramps.
20 Currently, Shasta Lake has inadequate ramps when the lake
21 goes down past, say, 100 feet, 75, 100 feet. But if we're
22 going to talk about high pull downs, you're going to have
23 ramps that are going to run down about 200 feet. We have

SCHAP-4

24 inadequate traffic and roads and everything to get in
25 there.

SCHAP-5

SCHAP-6

SCHAP-7

SCHAP-8

1 The economic losses also to Shasta County because
2 of the interruption of the businesses and how they are
3 going to be located. I am worried about Lakehead as a
4 community as a whole. I don't see that people are going
5 to build bridges going across Doney Creek and Charlie
6 Creek. Those expenses of cutting roads into those houses
7 that are going to be there, I think, are going to be
8 absorbed. It's going to be cheaper to buy the properties
9 out on the other side.

10 They have four sites that they considered in
11 this. Two of them are sites in Shasta. The other two I'd
12 like to see some flowcharts from the Bureau of
13 Reclamation. I have not been able to get them yet on
14 expenses, how the water storage would be. In other words,
15 the performance of the raising the dam, of any dam, base
16 it on the yield factor, how many years we're going to have
17 that yield factor, and what the costs are going to be.
18 I'd like to see those figures that are being presented
19 with Sites and also Shasta.

20 I'm going to bring up an old one, and I don't
21 even know the possibility of it. Auburn got stopped years
22 ago in the '80s, and Auburn was an excellent location. I
23 am not sure exactly what happened. One of the things I
24 did hear was it was on an earthquake fault, but almost
25 everything we've got in California is on an earthquake

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

SCHAP-8
CONTD

1 fault. So I'd like to see a readdress of that and the
2 yield of that. And if it's a possibility from an
3 engineering standpoint, go back and address the Auburn
4 site.

SCHAP-9

5 I think that the revenues lost to Shasta County
6 and also Lakehead area, all those need to be mitigated
7 factors, and it's not currently for the businesses, okay.
8 They need to be mitigated factors for the people that have
9 those businesses, that operated them for years, that put
10 their heart, backbones, sweat, and tears into these
11 businesses. It's not easy up there, okay. And for them
12 to have to walk away is going to be an economic loss and
13 emotional loss for everybody.

SCHAP-10

14 So what I am asking for the bureau tonight is
15 that let's consider the four sites that we have that you
16 guys considered originally, possibly Auburn dam, with the
17 yield factors of the water we're going to get for the
18 money we're spending. And also what we're going to be
19 able to achieve. How many years are we going to get that
20 water? How many years are we going to get in the 18.5
21 feet. Is the going to be 5 out of 10, 3 out of 10? The
22 benefits, so that percentage of benefit --

SCHAP-11

23 Thank you very much. I'm done.
24 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, Supervisor
25 Schappell. Next up is Mayor Farr.

1 MR. FARR: Since you put this back in this
2 position, I assume you want it left in that position, so I
3 shall leave it that position.

4 My name is Larry Farr, F-A-R-R, and I have the
5 honor of currently serving as the Mayor of the City of
6 Shasta Lake.

7 The City of Shasta Lake thanks the Bureau of
8 Reclamation for opportunity provide oral comments to draft
9 EIS for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. We
10 will also be providing more detailed questions and
11 comments in a letter in the next few weeks.

12 The City of Shasta Lake is located immediately
13 south and east of the Shasta Dam complex and is literally
14 and figuratively the gateway to the dam. Shasta Dam
15 Boulevard, also known as SR 151, is the main access
16 roadway from Interstate Highway 5 to the dam and serves as
17 a main thoroughfare through downtown Shasta Lake. The
18 north-south access to the facility is Lake Boulevard. The
19 roadways intersect at the western edge of the city and
20 form a loop to the dam complex and the Centimudi boat ramp
21 and back.

22 The City of Shasta Lake exists largely because of
23 the construction of the dam. It's predecessor
24 organizations, the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District
25 and the Summit City Public Utility District, were created

FARR-1

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

	1	to gain access to potable water deliveries and power
	2	generated by the dam.
	3	The city shares a symbiotic relationship with the
FARR-1	4	dam because of these connections. The city's raw water
CONTD	5	supply is drawn through face of the dam outside of the
	6	left and front with intakes at 950- and 750-foot levels.
	7	The water is pumped to the city's water treatment plant
	8	above the dam to the east, and in turn, the city supplies
	9	treated water to the Bureau of Reclamation at the Shasta
	10	Dam complex. Because of its proximity to the dam, the
	11	configuration of the existing roadways and
FARR-2	12	interrelationship of water and power services, and city is
	13	extremely concerned about the overall impact this massive
	14	construction project will have on the city and its
	15	citizens.
	16	By nearly every measure currently in place in the
FARR-3	17	state of California, the City of Shasta Lake is considered
	18	a disadvantaged community. The median income of the city
	19	is less than 65 percent of the threshold of the
	20	designation of a disadvantaged community. The City of
	21	Shasta Lake has serious concerns regarding the
FARR-4	22	socioeconomic impacts of the project, particularly with
	23	respect to the impact of tourism and recreational use
	24	activities. The project proposed will shut down the dam
FARR-5	25	to tourism for the duration of the project. Additionally,

FARR-5
CONTD

1 Centimudi boat ramp will be impacted and will need to be
2 reconstructed to accommodate the additional impound.

FARR-6

3 Currently, thousands of visitors annually visit
4 the dam to take -- excuse me, contribute to tourism and
5 utilize the boat ramp and docking facilities at Centimudi
6 and Digger Bay. So sanctioning of the tourism and

7 closures of the boat ramp will result in lost revenue to
8 the local stores, service stations, and supermarkets. The
9 majority of this economic disruption will be borne by the
10 City of Shasta Lake.

FARR-7

11 It is our belief that the City of Shasta Lake
12 will bear a disproportionate share of the negative impacts
13 associated with reduced air quality, increased traffic
14 flow, and degradation of streets and roadways.

15 Consequently, the city will be reaching out to the bureau
16 at an appropriate time in the future to discuss possible
17 mitigation measures to offset these disproportionate
18 impacts.

19 Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide
20 oral comments.

21 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

22 Greg Watkins, please.

23 MR. WATKINS: Thank you. Greg Watkins, G-R-E-G,
24 W-A-T-K-I-N-S, and I am a councilman of the City of
25 Shasta.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

WATK-1

1 At the last meeting we heard quite about the 29
2 homes that would be inundated, and we had one business
3 owner who stood up and said, "You're going to just buy me
4 out from my business." And the bureau said the only thing
5 we can do is buy the property from you. And I think that
6 the bureau needs to really address the people that
7 currently have private residences and private businesses.

WATK-2

8 And since the bureau has no ability other than paying
9 money, you need to say in the -- in the NEPA document,
10 that we are asking Congress to come up with a special act
11 that says we will -- to the best of our ability, we will
12 find Forest Service land or government land that will make
13 those homes and those businesses whole at an elevation 18
14 feet higher. And it will take an act of Congress, and you
15 just need to right up front say we will do everything we
16 can to repay all the private businesses in tourism around
17 the lake.

WATK-3

18 The second thing I noticed at the meeting last
19 week, or the last time you had the meeting, probably nine
20 to one people were against raising the dam. And that kind
21 of surprised me. But at the same time, I would contend
22 that most of the people in the Redding area, once the dam
23 was raised 18 feet, they'd never know the water level was
24 18 feet higher or not.

WATK-4

But I think what we should be asking for, the

WATK-4 CONTD	1	people here should be looking at the tourism. We should
	2	be asking the bureau that 600,000 acre-feet that you're
	3	going to impound with this additional level, how is it
WATK-5	4	going to be managed? Right now there's a lot of talk,
	5	Well, we're going to increase the cold water pool; we're
	6	going to make more salmon come up the river. What we
	7	ought to be asking as local citizens, let's take that
WATK-6	8	600,000 acre-feet and keep it for recreation until after
	9	Labor Day. Then it will benefit our area, and then you
	10	can send the water down.
	11	There's a lot of talk about the cold water pool,
	12	and there's a lot of debate whether there is any
	13	scientific basis behind that. We do know that a federal
WATK-7	14	judge mandated it, but we don't know if it's sound
	15	science. And I think that we should not be cowtailing to
	16	the fish and to cold water assuming they can make it to
	17	Red Bluff or wherever it is. We ought to be looking at
WATK-8	18	recreation on Shasta Lake, and we ought to be seeing what
	19	we can do to improve it.
	20	And one of the other things we're looking at is
	21	100,000 cubic yards of rock is going to have to come
	22	through the City of Shasta Lake. That's a lot of rock on
	23	those main highways there, and I think the bureau should
	24	be looking at an offsite source, maybe on the lake that
	25	could be barged to the dam. There's no reason that all

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1
WATK-9 that rock and all that aggregate has to be hauled by
CONTD trucks through the City of Shasta Lake.

3 So we'd like the bureau to look at the ways that
4 they can minimize the impact during construction and at
WATK-10 5 the same time increase the benefit to tourism with the
6 additional water that you would store. Thank you.

7 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Watkins.
8 Chief Sisk.

9 MS. SISK: I am Chief Sisk of the Winnemem Wintu
10 Tribe. My name is Caleen, C-A-L-E-E-N, last name is
11 S-I-S-K, Sisk.

12 The comments for us starts back in 1941, 1937,
13 when Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
14 and later the Bureau of Land Management somehow, through
15 an act of Congress, got all of our land away from us and
16 never gave nothing back through this special act.

17 Promised to moved or cemeteries to a land to be held in
SISK-1 18 trust for us forever for free, and somehow that land ended
19 up with the Bureau of Land Management who says they don't
20 hold land for Indian people and they don't hold
21 cemeteries.

22 So we're still dealing with the effects of the
23 beginnings of Shasta Dam and Shasta Lake project. And we
24 now find that we are unrecognized, and you tell us we're
SISK-2 25 unrecognized. And somehow, I feel like you're responsible

1 for us being unrecognized because your never carried out
2 the act of Congress. | The land was never set up for --
3 like land to live on was never given. No arm was provided
4 to reestablish our villages, our places, or homes. The
5 cemetery that was moved did not end up in trust for
6
7 SISK-3 Indians. It's in government trust, but it's not for us.
8 So every time we bury somebody there, we are going against
9 the policies of the Bureau of Land Management because they
10 don't allow burials.
11
12 SISK-4 So there's a lot of confusion and a lot of chaos
13 that's happening because of this lake, and now I am
14 wondering, 18 and a half feet higher, there are more
15 burials that will have to be moved. So do we trust you?
16 Where will you put them? Will there be another place
17 that's given and not really given?
18
19 SISK-5 There are many things of justice that have to
20 happen to the Winnemem Wintu people. There were 26
21 cemeteries that were moved, and now they are in BLM's land
22 holdings. And we're kind of wondering, where is the BIA
23 this time. They were sitting with you guys in 1937,
24 1938. They actually helped pass the law, 1941. | And now
25 the BIA has, like, dropped the ball because now they say
we are unrecognized.

24 SISK-7 The other concern that I have is the fish. You
25 say that the raise in Shasta Dam is for fish restoration.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 Yet in the plan, there is no plans for fish passage to get
2 the fish passed the Shasta Dam. All you're talking about
3 is more cold water down the Sacramento. That has already
SISK-7
CONTD proven to fail fish. They need access to the high
5 mountain waters, and to get by them, this plan needs to
6 address that. If it's really for fish, then because
7 there's already a biological opinion in the mandate to get
8 the fish above this dam, you're going to raise it higher
9 with no plans to get them around. And the same for the
SISK-8 water that's coming down the McCloud. The dam there,
11 there's no plans for fish passage past that dam.
12 The other issues that I have are the dikes. You
SISK-9 know, where we live now is above the dam, but if you raise
14 the dam, then there will be dikes placed around different
15 parts of the lake.
16 The tribal water rights have never been
17 adjudicated, and it's time that we kind of sit down and do
SISK-10 that because there needs to be a benefit coming back to
19 the tribe for the lands that were taken, because at this
20 point in time they have been stolen.
21 MR. LUCERO: Excuse me, Chief Sisk, your time is
22 up. You can submit those --
23 MS. SISK: Thank you.
24 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much. Are there any
25 other elected officials that would like to speak?

1 Now, I am going to start calling the public, and
2 we would ask that the first three stand in queue. Our
3 first speaker is Rex Rider. Following Rex will be Steve
4 Evans, and following Steve will be Craig Fowler Leigh.
5 Please remember to speak clearly, state your
6 name, and spell your name. Thank you very much.
7 MR. RIDER: My name is Rex, R-E-X, Rider,
8 R-I-D-E-R.
9 We have a cabin up on Shasta Lake, Camel Creek,
10 Lot Number 5. My dad bought this cabin in 1963, so we've
RIDE-1 11 been up there for 50 years. Our cabin happens to be one
12 of the lower cabins closer to the water. And even if it
13 comes six and a half feet, 18 and a half probably puts it
14 about deck level. So we would be inundated with water.
15 It doesn't sound like much compared to some of
16 the other people, but think of it as a family compound,
17 someplace your family goes every summer. And you can't
18 believe how fun it's up there. We've listened to Merle
19 Haggard put us to sleep at night up there. We have had my
RIDE-2 20 dad pulled out in a helicopter. We have had a trolley roll
21 down the hill. We sit on the deck -- on the dock, excuse
22 me. We play Rummikub. We enjoy each other's company.
23 It's a family bonding event.
24 Now, I'm 62, and my kids have enjoyed and learned
25 from us as I learned from my dad. And now their kids, my

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

RIDE-2
CONTD

1 nephews and nieces and their kids, are enjoying it. And
2 we have another generation. You know, my granddaughter,
Lydia. I got a niece coming. I have more family that
4 wants to come up and do the same things we did. And you
5 just can't beat it. You're up on Shasta Lake. You've got
6 your cabin. You're on the dock. It's unbelievable.

RIDE-3

7 We're not going to have a lot of say in this
8 because basically Southern California needs water, and
9 it's generated in Northern California. What we expect
10 from the BLM would be if -- if our compound, our cabin, is
inundated with water, what we'd like is to have a cabin
12 moved up to an elevation that's appropriate so we can
13 enjoy it, or we expect to be bought out. And, you know,
14 we expect you guys to be generous. I don't think we need
15 to be run over on this thing. This is family history to
16 us, and we expect the best out of you people.

17 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

18 Mr. Evans.

19 MR. EVANS: My name is Steve Evans, S-T-E-V-E

20 E-V-A-N-S. I'm representing Friends of the River, which
21 is a statewide river conservation group based out of
FOTR3-1 Sacramento.

23 I have spent the last 30 years working to protect
24 the natural resources of the Sacramento River and its
25 tributaries. I want to put this project in a historical

FOTR3-2

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

Page: 21

FOTR3-2
CONTD

1 context in that, as mentioned by Reclamation, the study of
2 this dam raise was first authorized in 1980. The study
3 itself was shelved by Reclamation when the voters of
4 California wisely rejected the Peripheral Canal in 1982.
5 It's been revived, and of course, I don't think
6 there's any coincidence that we're now looking at a Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement and the project is moving
8 forward when the same governor, Governor Jerry Brown, is
9 proposing construction of massive twin tunnels under the
10 delta to send more water south. In fact, the bureau's own
11 numbers in the EIS show that every drop of water from the
12 dam raise, even the water that would benefit salmon, will
13 be sold water contractors. 77 percent of that water is
14 sold to water contractors south of the delta. So there's
15 a direct tie between this project and what we're doing and
16 what we're proposing to do down in the delta.
17 Of course, much of the benefit according to the
18 bureau for this project is to improve conditions for
19 salmon. But the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in its own
20 draft coordination report, which is an appendix on the
21 bureau's website to this project, says that the benefits
22 to salmon are negligible. 90 percent of the time, there
23 would be no benefit to salmon. So this project is really
24 about water and selling that water to water contractors.
This is a big issue because the dam raise will

FOTR3-3

FOTR3-4

FOTR3-5

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 harm two beautiful rivers that are eligible for federal
2 protection as wild and scenic rivers: the McCloud and the
3 Upper Sacramento River. It will violate state law that
4 protects the McCloud in its free-flowing state, and it's a
5 wild trout fishery. It will flood Native American
6 cultural sites used by the Winnemem Wintu today. It's as
7 if we were flooding churches in this town so we could
8 store water for water contracts in LA. It will flood
9 thousands of acres of national forest land that provides
10 important habitat for dozens of sensitive, threatened,
11 endangered species. It provides recreational
12 opportunities for thousands of Californians.
13 It will require the removal or relocation of
14 dozens of roads, resorts, marinas, houses, power lines,
15 you name it, with huge impacts to the local economy. It
16 will also modify flows to the Sacramento River downstream,
17 and these are flows needed to maintain the healthy
18 riparian habitat of that river and many threatened,
19 endanger species that depend on that habitat. And the
20 bureau is promising that the impact of that flow
21 modification will be mitigated through the adoption of
22 adaptive management plan. That doesn't exist today, so I
23 really can't tell if, you know, that mitigation will
24 occur.

I'll close up: I think the bureau needs to look

FOTR3-5
CONTD

FOTR3-6

FOTR3-7

FOTR3-8

FOTR3-9

FOTR3-10

FOTR3-11

FOTR3-12

FOTR3-12
CONTD

1 at an alternative that truly benefits salmon by restoring
2 spawning and rearing habitat, by improving fish passage
3 and restoring fish passage upstream of Shasta Dam, by
4 increasing minimum flows in the river, and by screening
5 unscreened diversions. Thank you.

6 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

7 Next up is Craig Leigh, and on deck will be
8 Robert Franklin and Jeanne France and David Martinez. If
9 you wouldn't mind coming up and standing behind the
10 speaker, that would be great. Thank you very much.

11 MR. LEIGH: My name is Craig Leigh, L-E-I-G-H,
12 62-year resident of Redding on the Sacramento.

LEIG-1

13 That giant white truck you see out front see out,
14 it's United States Weather Bureau. There's something none
15 of you're are thinking about. We have gone from 45 inches
16 annually in rain to 23. You build that dam higher, and
17 you think drought years, well, the next year it will fill
18 up. According to NASA, the Weather Bureau, National
19 Geologic Society, California is going to go less and get
20 fewer and fewer inches of rain.

21 You can see the difference if you live in
22 Redding. We used to have seven or eight snowfalls. We
23 used to have thunderstorms in the summer. You better
24 think about. I don't know how you're going to fill this
25 dam, but you better think about that.

LEIG-1
CONTD

1 Rainfall: That's what fills lakes and fills
2 dams. We're going to look pretty stupid. And I tell
3 everybody, what is Shasta Dam, what is it, the fourth
4 largest dam in the world? And we don't get rain. Think
5 about it. There's nothing you can do about it. And I am
6 not for or against a dam, but I've seen what's happening
7 and I've talked to experts. Every day we review snow-
8 impact reports. Rainfall is a big deal. So anyway, thank
9 you guys.

10 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Leigh. Mr. Franklin.

11 MR. FRANKLIN: My name is Robert Franklin,
12 R-O-B-E-R-T, F-R-A-N-K-L-I-N. I am senior hydrologist for
13 the Hoopa Valley Tribe.

HOOP-1

14 I get out this way quite often, find myself in
15 San Diego, Klamath Falls, all over the place. The reason
16 why is the tribe I work for are fishing people. They
17 have, thankfully, a federal recognition of their fishing
18 right, fully vested property right to fish. Along with
19 others in the Trinity-Klamath Basin, we enjoy a priority
20 in-basin water call. And it's about that that I wish to
21 speak.

HOOP-2

22 The modelling that's used, the planning model for
23 figuring out what to do here in your EIS, is intended to
24 develop an accurate picture for various parties with very
25 different ideas as to what's important so that we all

HOOP-2
CONTD

1 might possibly have a platform to argue about. And the
2 hydrologic model CalSim-II, as it presently is run, fails
3 to appropriately address, accurately address, the in-basin
4 priority Trinity River needs.

5 Specifically, it's insufficient in its treatment
6 of carryover storage needs for the basin, and it fails to
7 contemplate releases from Trinity Dam to the Lower Klamath
8 River, such as is going on today to try and avoid fish
9 kills in the Lower Klamath River, including kills of
10 Trinity River fish. And also CalSim-II fails to dial in a
11 50,000 acre-foot annual priority entitlement to Humboldt
12 County and other downstream users.

13 What you wind up with, I think, is an impression
14 given to folks waiting for their water to come from the
15 raise of the dam, and a goodly portion of that water is
16 not available for viewing accurately. Thank you.

17 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

18 Ms. France. Eric Cassano, can you please come up
19 as well.

20 MS. FRANCE: Jeanne France, J-E-A-N-N-E,
21 F-R-A-N-C-E, Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member and voting
22 Shasta County resident.

FRAN-1

23 I'll be brief. I oppose the raising of Shasta
24 Dam. The taxpayers cannot afford the monetary cost. The

FRAN-2

fish cannot tolerate the lack of free-flowing water.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

FRAN-2
CONTD 2 Biologists cannot say that they know how to restore the
3 salmon. Books cannot provide this knowledge. There's no
FRAN-3 4 efficient way to get the salmon above the dam. Trucking
5 them around the dam is foolish.
FRAN-4 6 The Winnemem cannot and will not tolerate the
7 continuing genocide of our people. We as a people must
FRAN-5 8 stop the engineers that work with water whose mantra is
9 any drop that makes it to the ocean is a wasted drop. And
10 the state water contracts will never, ever be fulfilled.
FRAN-6 11 They are written seven times over the available water.
12 The dam raise doesn't even come close to providing that
13 water. Thank you.
14 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. France.
15 Mr. Martinez. And Mr. Burgin, can you please
16 step up.
17 MR. MARTINEZ: I am David Martinez, D-A-V-I-D,
18 M-A-R-T-I-N-E-Z. I am Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member,
19 Shasta County resident and voter.
20 I thoroughly oppose this dam raise seeing as how
DMART2-1 21 my family and my relatives have been directly affected
22 from this dam since 1973. We were promised many things:
23 like lands, infrastructure, like ways, and we have
24 received nothing.
25 I am a descendent of the Silverthorn Family. We
ran Silverthorn Ferry on the Pit River Arm. That land

DMART2-1
CONTD

1 above the waterline was supposed to go to me and the rest
2 of my descendants and family. Today, none of us own a
3 square inch. And that was a promise from you guys, not
4 you guys directly but your bureau. So I have no faith
5 that you will do anybody right or there will be any
6 justification or proper redress or compensation for any of
7 the losses to any of the people that are out their
8 businesses, landowners, resort operators, concessionaires,
DMART2-2 leaseholders, that will be affected by this dam raise.

10 I feel they are going to get what we got. Here's
11 our promise. Oh, no, we got it. Who are you? That's who
12 we are today: Who are you? We're the people that got
13 almost totally destroyed by this dam raise. Are you going
14 to treat the people that are there now the same way you
15 treated us?

DMART2-3

16 And this is the lynch pin for those twin
17 tunnels. Studies already show that the water that will
18 come from this dam will go down south. It's the only way
19 you can do it. You can't take water above the delta and
20 say "Oh, we still have the same amount of flow going
21 through the delta." You have to have that extra water up
22 above this dam for those twin tunnels to work. Right now
23 you take the water below the delta, at the end of the
24 delta, and ship it south. You're going to take it above
25 it and still have the same flow? I don't think so.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	There's a lot of inconsistencies in the reports.
DMART2-4	There's a lot of inconsistencies in the cost and
3	benefits. What is the cost to the Winnemem Wintu people
4	and other native peoples that surround this lake when we
5	lose our sacred sites, our churches, our homelands. They
DMART2-5	have already been taken from us, but we still use those
7	areas. Sometimes we've got to do it without permission,
8	but, you know, we were here a lot longer before the rest
9	of you guys showed up. So we do use those sites.
10	What would you be paying us to lose that? What
11	would you be saying if we were taking those kinds of
DMART2-6	things from you. If we said we're taking your church,
13	we're taking your home, we're taking everything you have
14	had in your family for 10,000 years, so that somebody down
15	south can grow a damn water valley down there in the
DMART2-7	desert, or so the oil companies can frack and destroy the
17	aquifers around here. That's where the water is going,
18	folks. Thank you very much.
19	MR. LUCERO: Thank you Mr. Martinez.
20	Eric Cassano, Greg Burgin, Catherine Joplin,
21	please stand up.
22	MR CASSANO: My name is Eric Cassano. It's
23	E-R-I-C, C-A-S-S-A-N-O.
24	I'm with a website called ShastaLake.com, and I
CASS2-1	25 am against the plan to raise Shasta Dam a hundred percent.

CASS2-2

1 I believe that the 3M quarry project is directly linked at
2 the hip with this particular project. Now, Bureau of
3 Reclamation people claim it's too small of a project to
4 merit a 3M quarry. Well, my understand is any project
5 over a 100,000 square yards, the bureau has a policy to
6 have five times the amount of aggregate supply for that
7 project. It's a policy: five times. Now, take five times
8 the bridges, the camp grounds, the marinas. I think the
9 3M quarry and the timing, just like the Peripheral Canal,
10 I believe it's all linked.

CASS2-3

11 So that kind of leads into my next point. Let me
12 just say it: The Shasta Lake Water Resource Investigation
13 name, I think this whole process could be started over
14 solely for the fact that it's very cryptic. It's an
15 attempt to deceive the public with regards to what it
16 actually meant. It should have been called Shasta Dam and
17 Shasta Lake Enlargement Project, or Shasta Dam and
18 Reservoir Enlargement Project. That would be more
19 appropriate, and that would be more helpful to the
20 public.

CASS2-4

21 I have been trying to get a document that is
22 referred to in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
23 and it has to do with the aggregate. It's in the
24 engineering summary appendix. It states more details
25 regarding potential local salmon gravel aggregate sources

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

CASS2-4
CONTD

1 are contained in the reclamation Shasta Dam enlargement
2 sand and gravel -- excuse me, sand and aggregate sources
3 2007D. Now, I talked to Katrina Chow, it was in July
4 sometime, and she said she'd have it to me in a reasonable
5 amount of time. I haven't seen it yet. I've been
6 contacting Louis Moore, tried to contact Katrina Chow
7 again and left messages. They are not making these
8 documents available. They are very pertinent to the
9 environment impact. How can we review this if the
10 supporting documents are not being made available? I
11 think that needs to be -- at the very least, can you
12 please get it to me before the comment period is over.
13 That would be kind of nice.

CASS2-5

14 Also they have a map in there showing these
15 potential quarry/borrow sites where they'll be getting
16 this material. And they show little dots, little colored
17 dots. Here's private and here's public. How about
18 telling me what those companies are. The public ones,
19 that's a little bit more ambiguous, but which is the name
20 of this quarry, what's the name of this quarry, and why
21 wasn't 3M quarry at least listed as a potential project,
22 or quarry, since according to Katrina, she said that they
23 have been speaking to 3M officials regarding that quarry
24 as an aggregate source. So that should be a potential
25 aggregate supply as well.

CASS2-6

CASS2-7

1 I think they are just basically trying to keep it
2 too undulated because they are piecemealing the
3 environmental review. And also, I think that they need to
4 at the very least address -- I am just going to stop.
5 Thank you very much.

6 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your time, sir.

7 Mr. Burgin.

8 MR. BURGIN: I'm Greg Burgin, G-R-E-G,
9 B-U-R-G-I-N, Jr. I am direct descendant of the Wilkes
10 family, which is the Wilkes expedition done to the Turtle
11 Bay area.

BURG-1

12 For those that don't know the Wintu history, I
13 encourage you to pick up a book and read it. If you
14 understand any of our people around this area, you will
15 know we have no lands. We have no say. Our words carry
16 no weight with the government. We have no home. The
17 water that was ours is being used against us to flood us
18 out. None of our people own any land along the river or
19 around the lake. We own it as a tribe.

20 There are many Wintu people up in this area.
21 Shasta Lake has the highest amount of native children in
22 the area enrolled in its schools there. What kind of
23 message are we sending to our children that in 2013 the
24 Indians still have no voice. He's still in the way of
25 profit-making, in the way of corporation greed. When will

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

BURG-1
CONTD

1 it stop. When will our lands stop being decimated. When
2 will our grave sites stop being decimated, our
3 grandmothers, our grandfathers. It's no different than
4 digging up a grave at some other cemetery and pulling the
shoes right off their feet. We've got to dig up pestles.
6 We have people in colleges labeled as specimens until this
7 day.

BURG-2

8 This is 2013, and us Indians are still specimens
9 and experimented on. This county goes all over the word
10 protecting other people all around, but we can't even take
11 care of the people that this land was stolen from. The
12 people are all against the dam, all the Indian people. I
13 know a lot of the leaders in these areas. I am related to
14 a lot of people around here, multiple tribes. Nobody here
15 is for raising this dam. But yet we feel that even though
16 we bring all the facts, the dates, the people that were
17 supposed to have broken promises, we still have no voice,
18 no stance, no land.

BURG-3

19 How much is enough? I mean really. One day I
20 pray that our elders will still be around to see some land
21 come into ownership of the rightful stewards of this
22 land. We don't want all of California. We want just
23 places where our families grew up, the villages, our
24 sacred spots where we hold ceremony. It's not like we're
25 asking for the whole world. We're asking for what's

1 fair. And one day when you go up to talk to the man
2 above, you'll be questioned on how you treated your
BURG-3
CONTD 3 brothers and sisters in this life. I can go there now,
4 and I'm okay with what I've done and what I've tried to
5 do.

6 I think there needs to be some kind of
7 ratification for the people of this area. They want to
8 say we're not recognized, well why is all of our stuff in
9 the Smithsonian, Shasta colleges, UC Berkeley, UC Davis,
BURG-4 10 but we're not a recognized tribe? It doesn't make any
11 sense to me. You want to talk about genocide? The
12 greatest genocide that's ever happened in the world has
13 happened to the Indian people in this county. And still,
14 2013, the Indian person is still in the way. That's all I
15 have to say.

16 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Burgin.
17 Catherine Joplin, Tom Stokely, Curtis Brown, and
18 Sue Horket, please step up.

19 MS. JOPLIN: Catherine Joplin, C-A-T-H-E-R-I-N-E,
20 J-O-P-L-I-N. I am a resident of Lakehead, and I serve on
21 the Lakehead community development association. I had the
JOPL1-1 22 opportunity to serve on the stakeholders committee which
23 worked with BOR in the investigations in preparation for
24 the report.

JOPL1-2 25 I object to the raising of the dam. I feel that

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

JOPL1-2
CONTD

1 it severely impacts our community of Lakehead and Shasta
2 County. I am also very upset about the impact it will

JOPL1-3

3 have on the Wintu Indians. I won't pursue explanations.
4 I think their explanations have been very favorable.

5 I feel that we need to spread our water storage
6 in more areas and not just more storage in Shasta. I feel
7 that Sites Reservoir should have a higher priority because
8 it will capture water from the tributaries below Shasta

JOPL1-4

9 Dam, and most importantly, that it would have three times
10 the water capacity of the water storage in the raising of
11 the dam. If water capacity storage is truly the issue,
12 then forget about raising Shasta Dam and look more closely
13 at the Sites Reservoir in Colusa County. My detailed
14 letter will follow. Thank you.

15 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

16 MR. STOKELY: Thank you. My name is Tom Stokely,

17 T-O-M, S-T-O-K-E-L-Y. I am here representing the
18 California Water Impact Network and the California
19 Environmental Water Caucus, which is a coalition of a
20 number of groups.

CWIN-1

21 The organizations I represent support salmon
22 restoration, but we do not support this project. Why?

CWIN-2

23 Because this project is being justified with almost
24 two-thirds of the cost being billed to the taxpayers on
25 behalf of the salmon. And yet raising Shasta Dam appears

CWIN-3

CWIN-3
CONTD

1 nowhere in over 1,100 recommendations from the National
2 Marine Fishery Service in their Sacramento River Draft
3 Salmon Recovery Plan. It does not appear in any plan by
4 the Department of Fish and Wildlife or any other
5 regulatory agency. It's simply an excuse for this
6 project.

CWIN-4

7 The obvious preferred alternative, CP4, is
8 justified because it will produce 813,000 salmon smolt at
9 a cost of \$654.9 million to the taxpayers. At a return
10 rate of .13 percent, which we will provide you with the
11 background on that, that's approximately 1,057 returning
12 adult salmon to the Sacramento River at a cost of \$618,000
13 per fish. You thought the \$600 toilet seats were
14 expensive, we could do a lot more with \$618,000 per fish
15 than this project.

CWIN-5

16 Besides that, it's certain that Reclamation will
17 not operate the project to protect the fishery. There's
18 nothing in the document that says that operation of the
19 project, and that cold water pool reserve for salmon, will
20 actually be managed by the California Department of Fish
21 and Wildlife, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the
22 State Water Resources Control Board, the EPA, or any other
23 regulatory agency. It's just clear that this is

CWIN-6

24 justification so that you can get the taxpayers to foot
25 the bill for this project that's not cost effective.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	Even if the contractors are going to be
2	responsible for part of this project, there's a recent
3	inspector generals report that indicates that under
4	current repayment schemes by the Bureau of Reclamation,
5	the Central Valley Project irrigators will never repay
CWIN-7	their share of the cost, and ultimately those cost will be
7	passed onto the Central Valley Project electrical
8	customers such as Redding Electric Utility. If this issue
9	of repayment is not resolved soon, what we're going to see
10	is a huge balloon payment by the power customers and a
11	massive rise in rates, and that's going to apply to
12	Redding as well.
13	There are also other alternatives that should
14	have been looked such as water conservation, recycling,
15	stormwater capture, retiring drainage problem lands in the
16	western San Joaquin Valley. There are whole number of
CWIN-8	other opportunities that could actually produce real word
17	water and would have both water supply reliability and
18	fishery benefits. This project is not going to provide
19	the fishery benefits.
20	In addition, this project will have significant
21	water quality impacts. It's going to inundate old mine
22	tailings, which will mobilize zinc, copper, and other
CWIN-9	toxic minerals which will actually harm the fisheries. We
24	will submit detailed written comments. Thank you.
25	

1 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Stokely.

2 Mr. Brown.

3 MR. BROWN: My name is Curtis Brown, C-U-R-T-I-S,
4 B-R-O-W-N.

5 I moved here in 1952 when I was 16 years old to
6 be with my father. Redding had a population of about
7 10,000, between 8 and 10. They probably have 100,000 or
8 more now. And irregardless of how people think, they have
9 to look at it from a commonsense point of view. You have
10 a population increase. It doesn't make any difference if
11 it's here or Sacramento or San Francisco, Los Angeles.

BROW-1

12 You have to have water to support them. That's the only
13 thing that you cannot substitute. You cannot substitute
14 water. You can build roads. You can build bridges. You
15 can build buildings. You can build homes. You can almost
16 substitute anything else, but water you cannot substitute.

17 So it's just commonsense. Dams are going to have
18 to be increased. That's are all there is to it. There's
19 nothing you can do to stop it, unless you can stop
20 population increase, and you cannot do that. It has to be
21 taken care of from a reasonable point of view.

22 And the people that own the businesses up there
23 around the lake and everything, I agree with them. They
24 should be refinanced for what money it's going to cost
25 them to move up higher on the lake and what have you. And

BROW-2

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

BROW-2
CONTD

1 the federal government should give them property to
2 rebuild their homes. The people that live close to the

BROW-3

3 lake, like that one gentlemen who had a cabin here. He
4 was afraid he was going to get swamped. Move his cabin up
5 higher or even build him a new one up higher.

BROW-4

6 You know, it's only fair because we're going to
7 make plenty of money off of it because it has to be sold
8 down further in the Los Angeles Basin, and I'll explain to
9 you why. They used to get their water out of Colorado
10 River. It came through the Boulder Dam. Well, Arizona,
11 Phoenix, all those cities over in there became so large
12 they had to have that excess water themselves. They
13 couldn't let Los Angeles Basin take it anymore, so they
14 stopped them.

BROW-5

15 It has to come from somewhere, and it's going to
16 come from Shasta Lake here. It's going to come from the
17 other dams that are along the Sierra Nevadas. I worked on
18 the first offshore dam that was built in California down
19 out of Los Banos, and that's what it was for, store water,
20 send it down the Delta-Mendota Canal. And they have pumps
21 down there, pumped it up over the Grapevine down there
22 into Los Angeles Basin. That's been on the books for a
23 lot of years. I started working down there in 1963, and I
24 finished in 1967. They were trying to get the Peripheral
25 Canal at that time through there, and now they are calling

1
BROW-5
CONTD

↑
underground tunnels. But it's got to be done. How else
are they going to get water, and I hope everybody
understands that.

3

4

MR. LUCERO: Thank you Mr. Brown.

5

Ms. Horkey, Mr. Doyle on deck.

6

MS. HORKEY: My name is Sue Horkey, S-U-E,

7

H-O-R-K-E-Y. I am a resident of Lakehead.

8

I will restate my exception in your presentation
from your disks supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation that
you are studying four alternatives for water use and
creating the same stability for fish and for redundant
water supply. For Sites, one of the locations, at the

HORK-1

--

time you stated that Shasta Dam raising is the only

14

presentation that's being made. If you're going to call

15

these alternatives, you need to present all the facts for

16

all the four sites at the same time or it's not truly an

17

alternative. It sounds like there might already be an

18

agenda onboard.

19

Once again, I think we're hiding behind the issue
of fish. I've heard several statements here from people

HORK-2

far more knowledgeable than I regarding the science behind

22

this. The document states that 40 percent of the cold

23

water pool will allocated towards fish stabilization, fish

24

water temperature stabilization. The other 60 percent,

HORK-3

where is that going? It's probably not in our best

↓

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

HORK-3
CONTD
↑
2 interest. I am sure it's going south for subsidized
crops.

3 Another piece of the information supplied in your
4 disk was that the study was done by Spyglass real estate
5 company up in Oregon. They used a 2006 to 2008 database,
6 which is our historical low in this area after the stock
HORK-4 market crashed about 2007. They are further devaluing the
7 properties that they intend to buyout by saying the
8 properties now with our current economic decline are at
9 only 80 percent of the value of 2008, which was already a
10 low. So they are already misleading Congress by creating
11 artificially low valuations for the true costs of this
12 project, and I don't think that's such a good idea.

13 We do have the McCloud River that's supposed to
HORK-5 be in the wild and scenic designation. Do we just throw
14 that out the window?

15 I think Mr. Greg Watkins had -- I appreciate his
16 comments on his saying you can't just buy us out with
17 dollars, pay us straight across the board. We chose this
18 lifestyle. We don't have Los Angeles's economy up here.
HORK-6 You can't just throw dollars to buy us out. We would like
19 to have an act of Congress, if that's what it takes, to
20 relocate us into a like community above the new lake
21 levels if it should go through.

22 And my last question is how does Los Banos public
HORK-7

HORK-7
CONTD

hearing figure in on rain for what's going on up here?

2 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments.

3 I have Anna Harkrader next. Anna Harkrader?

4 MR. TICHERA: I have a statement to read on her
5 behalf.

6 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

7 MR. TICHERA: If you don't mind, I'll just read
8 what she has prepared for me.

9 MR. LUCERO: Would you mind stating your name,
10 sir?

11 MR. TICHERA: Michael Tichera. I am the manger
12 of Shasta Marina Resort.

13 MR. LUCERO: Sir, I'm sorry. Would you mind
14 spelling your last name?

15 MR. TICHERA: T-I-C-H-E-R-A.

16 She is -- her and her husband are the mother- and

17 father-in-law of myself, and they are owners of the marina

18 that I manage. The DEI states that all Shasta Marina's

19 buildings, parking areas, access roads will be affected by

SMR2-1 the new pool elevation of CP3. And that was provided to

21 us to us plate 39, recreation site states -- and it gives

22 the Shasta Marina site is to be abandoned. Very troubled

23 to see the plan for our location is to be abandoned, and

24 Shasta Marina has an "X" on top of the map. What exactly

25 does that mean? And how was this alternative reached

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

SMR2-1 1 without consulting us. And why, when all of the
2 facilities will be affected by raising the dam, we are to
3 be abandoned and others to be relocated.

4 We are a profitable business on the lake and
5 provide employment opportunities that pull up the local
6 economy. We have owned and operated Shasta Marina since
7 June 1st of 1996 and invested in 18 moves and millions of
8 dollars in an effort to build this marina to ensure the
9 future.

SMR2-2 10 The numbers are summed as follows: We've managed
11 to reform a small, run-down marina grossing less than
12 \$600,000 a year to a thriving, state-of-the-art facility
13 with some of the most luxurious rental boats in the
14 country. Today we gross five to six times what our
15 predecessors have done in the past. We host over 600
16 trips a year, 135 moorage spaces. We bring over 12,000 a
17 people a year to the lake, 12 full-time employees, 6 over
18 10 years. Our employees all are home owners, have
19 families, and have always paid -- we have always paid a
20 hundred percent of our full-time employees with health
21 insurance.

22 During the summer, we employ an additional 8 to
23 10 employees. Each year, we invest millions in our local
24 economy and services to supply us to support operations.
25 We offer some of the best customer service you will find

SMR2-2
CONTD

1 anywhere and provide a quality experience on Shasta for
2 the public.

3 Our land items are definitely expendable, and
4 our water-based assets are moveable. We move our marina
5 most years as the water level changes. Consequently, we
6 have put most of our improvements into floating assets and
7 made the necessary functions that can be performed in high
8 or low water conditions.

SMR2-3

9 The shallow conditions of the O'Brien inlet have
10 presented us with challenges during our time here, but we
11 have dealt with them and the area has advantages that make
12 it worth the efforts. We have changed every process
13 within our company. There are three separate anchor
14 systems that enable us to move in the shortest amount of
15 time possible so as not to interrupt our guests time on
16 the lake. It's a quick disconnect and reconnect to move
17 the docks with boats attached.

SMR2-4

18 Before ruling that Shasta Marina be abandoned, we
19 believe there are many options to investigate that would
20 allow us to remain on the O'Brien Inlet. Abandoned
21 campgrounds, private properties could be purchased, roads
22 that could be created on the south side to take us into a
23 deeper water location. All these solutions have been
24 planned and thought about the entire time we've been here
25 as we have already had the challenges of needing to move

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

SMR2-4
CONTD

two to three times a year.

2
SMR2-5

We are a family owned and operated business and have the longevity of our employees. We also have family within our work group. Our people think like us.

4
5

MR. LUCERO: Sir, I have to ask you to wrap up or submit your comments into the record.

6
7
SMR2-6

MR. TICHERA: Thank you. One last: Simply to be dismissed by those that have never even seen our operation is offensive. Thank you.

9
10

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

11

Mr. Jones, Matthew Doyle, and Nick Gardner.

12
13

MR. JONES: Good evening. My name is Harold Jones, H-A-R-O-L-D, J-O-N-E-S.

14
15
SCR2-1

My wife and I are the owners of Sugarloaf Cottages Resort up at Shasta Lake. We're one of the few businesses on the lake that is private. And we've got about two acres of land with about 400 foot of waterfront across. And one of my questions is why aren't we being

16
17

considered to be relocated along with the rest of the businesses that are on permits on Shasta Lake?

18
19
SCR2-2

Our resort is going to go under water. I will be out of business. My family's lifestyle will be gone. My

20
21
SCR2-3

house will be gone. We will have nothing left. How are we going to be compensated? Are we just going to walk away after spending 20 years on the lake and putting our

SCR2-3
CONTD

heart and soul into the business?

2

Another question is: The government comes in and takes my property that we don't want to sell to them.

4

SCR2-4

Then they turn around, they are forcing us to leave, and then they are going to tax me for capital gains. So they are taking my property, and then taxing me for taking my property. That doesn't really seem to be a real fair way of doing things.

9

SCR2-5

The other question I had was the three quarters of the resorts, the land-based resorts, would be taken out with this project. How can you take three quarters of the resorts, the land-based ones, and then say that you're going to increase recreation on the lake. It doesn't make sense.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

SCR2-6

In the EIS, one of the things is that's awfully long document, and a lot of these questions are very difficult when you're looking at the document, you're trying to read the document, we have questions that aren't in the document, but yet we are we are asked to respond in a forum like this. How can we come up with a way of doing this with the document? You don't have the answers or the questions in front of us.

19

20

21

22

23

SCR2-7

And it appears, honestly, that we need our Congressman. Doug LaMalfa and his team is going to have to be there to help us. If we don't get the help from

25

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1
SCR2-7
CONTD

↑ those guys, we're going to be left out to dry. And it's going to a long, tough road for all of us.

3
4
5
6
SCR2-8

3 Lastly, you got to believe Lakehead as a town
4 will die. When you take out 80 percent of the resorts up
5 there, and Lakehead being a vacation town and they don't
6 have the tourists up there during the summertime, the
7 stores, the bars, the places that are not going to be
8 inundated, are going to go out of businesses. That's
9 going to drive values of properties down. That little
10 town is going to die. Thank you.

11 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.
12 Matthew Doyle, Nick Gardner, Jerry Harral.

13 MR. DOYLE: Good afternoon. My name is Matthew
14 Doyle, M-A-T-T, D-O-Y-L-E, president of the Shasta Lake
15 Business Owners Association, also general manager of Lake
16 Shasta Taverns and general manager of Lake Shasta Dinner
17 Cruises.

18
19
SLBOA2-1

18 As the president of the Business Owners
19 Association, we oppose the dam raising. And there's one
20 major issue behind it: Because there's no clarity behind
21 it. As the hierarchy goes, the BOR is the lead agency,
22 but the Forest Service actually manages recreation on the
23 lake. Now, my only concern with that is for the first
24 time -- I've been involved with this since 2004 as far as
25 the original talks. My first Forest Service meeting was
↓

1 two and a half weeks ago, and we were given less than a
SLBOA2-1 week's notice. On that meeting, we noticed that our
CONTD 2 marinas will drop from nine marinas to five. Now, this is
3
4 not the exact of what's going to happen, but this the
5 first time it's been submitted to us.
6
7 This is going to be devastating, and it's not
SLBOA2-2 going to be devastating to the businesses on the lake.
8 This is the going to be devastating to the entire economy
9 within this area. And it's only because there's a lack of
10 clarity. We have two government agencies, but we're not
11 getting good representation. Even though recreation is
SLBOA2-3 listed several dozen times within the feasibility report,
12 it doesn't really mean anything because it's also being
13 forced down our throat by Forest Service. Which means we
14 don't necessarily -- business owners, private business
15 owners, Anna was one of them, Harold was one of them, Bill
SLBOA2-4 Schappell, he kind of made his notice. The issue is we
16 don't have a place at the table.
17
18 Right now, we're being told what is going to
19 happen. And the owners of Shasta Marina, the first time
20 they noticed they were going to be going out of business
SLBOA2-5 is when they saw a black X on Shasta Marina with no
21 relocation. How would that be after 20 years of hard work
22 and sweat to just be pushed out. I'm pretty sure the
23
SLBOA2-6 Winnemem can understand how that is. We're just going to

SLBOA2-6

CONTD

be the same thing.

SLBOA2-7

2 I honestly feel this is going to happen whether
3 we like it or not. What I am trying to do is take a
4 proactive approach as far as securing the businesses up
5 here on the lake. As it states in Chapter 18, and I'll
6 read straight from the feasibility report. "Affected
7 recreation facilities would be relocated as a part of the
8 construction activities for all action alternatives. This
9 could include relocation of affected portions of
10 facilities within existing use areas, in adjacent
11 undeveloped areas, or at new sites in general vicinity of
12 the lake. This is the important sentence: "Because of
13 the possible consolidation of facilities, the total number
14 of facilities of specific type may be reduce." They are
15 taking apart the businesses on the lake.

16 Now, it makes perfect sense on Excel as far as
17 logic. Okay, you have more area, we can increase
18 recreation, but you're going to decrease the number of
19 marinas. Well, it doesn't work like that. The tourism
20 recreation industry is extremely volatile. If you upset
21 one customer by one statement, they might not come back.

SLBOA2-8

22 We're talking about closing down -- and this goes
23 back to the clarity -- we have no idea how long these
24 marinas, the ones that actually do stay behind us, are
25 going to be out of business. And it was stated during the

SLBOA2-9

SLBOA2-9
CONTD

1 last comment period, a gentlemen I forget his name, stated
2 specifically that current rules and regulation do not
3 compensate for lost business. This is, of course, where
4 we need Congressman Doug LaMalfa to come in to say, "Hey
5 we need to protect businesses up on this lake."

6 MR. LUCERO: Thank you.

7 Nick Gardener, Jerry Harval, Dave Mundt.

8 MR. GARDENER: Hello. I'm Nick Gardener,
9 N-I-C-K, G-A-R-D-E-N-E-R.

GARD-1

10 I wanted to talk to you about the salmon. Before
11 they built Shasta Dam, the high water was in the winter
12 and the low water was in the summer. When they built the
13 dam, they knocked out 85 percent of the spawning grounds
14 and reversed that. Now probably your average flow in
15 spawning time in the winter is 3,200 cubic feet per
16 second. I've been down fishing. I've fished this river
17 since I was in 7th grade, and I am 62 now. I've been
18 fishing and watched the water go down and see fry
19 flocking.

GARD-2

20 If you could include in your environmental report
21 a constant flow of at least 6,500 square feet per second
22 from the first of October through January, that would
23 enhance the salmon reproduction more than anything that's
24 been done to date. Thank you.

25 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	Jerry Harral, Dave Mundt, and Geenie Seely.
2	MR. HARRAL: Hi, my name's Jerry Harral,
3	J-E-R-R-Y, H-A-R-R-A-L.
4	I just want to say my heart goes out to the Wintu
5	tribes and all the other neighboring tribes. I can't
HARR-1	believe what's going on there. I do believe they need to
7	be paid back by the water that goes down through the tubes
8	to those people.
9	Also, Mr. Brown spelled it perfect that we have a
HARR-2	lot more people now. We need to give these people water.
11	Unfortunately, we have to have a dam. We have to have a
12	bigger dam with more water.
13	That's really all I have to say. We need this
HARR-3	dam. That's all there is to it. But my heart goes out,
15	and I hope the people who get this water, who pay for this
16	water, need to pay for the people who are losing their
17	homes and also give the resorts a place to go. Thank you
18	very much.
19	MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Harral.
20	David Mundt, Geenie Seely, and Walt McNeill.
21	MR. MUNDT: Good evening. My name is Dave Mundt,
22	M-U-N-D-T. My affiliation is with Citizens Who Are
MUND-1	Taxpayers. I am a former resident of Lakehead, and that
23	town I will always love the best of any place I have ever
24	lived.
25	

1 I'm opposed to the raising of the dam. I see
2 this as a single-threaded approach to a very complex
MUND-2 3 problem. I am very disappointed that the Bureau of
4 Reclamation has had a laser-like focus on the dam when a
5 holistic approach using multiple resources would be a
6 better use of our money and your money too. A billion
7 dollars, and we all know a billion-dollar budget is going
8 to inflate to, what, a billion and a half, two billion. I
MUND-3 9 have managed almost a million dollar software budget. I
10 know how easy it's for these things to go array, and I'm
11 sure you do too. But we don't need to talk about that.

12 I don't see water storage as the primary issue
13 driving this. I see water shortage as what we need to
MUND-4 14 focus our efforts on. I think multiple channels is what
15 we need to investigate rather than a single thread of
16 raising the dam.

17 A few comments on statistics: Last meeting we
18 had, we talked about the statistics about the drought of
19 1977 when the water level went down 238 feet. And then we
20 also noted that in 1978, it filled up again in one year.
MUND-5 21

22 I would like to say about statistics this: We
23 know that statistics, as any student of statistics from
24 college knows, those were probability factors and not
25 facts. So in 1977 when we had that drought, the bureau
knew that the drought was coming. My parents owned the

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 Antlers Resort in Lakehead, and so the bureau -- I don't
2 know if any of you were employed with the bureau at that
3 time, but the bureau drove to Lakehead down Antlers Road,
4 and because the statistics also predicted that the lake
MUND-6 would fill up in 1978, they gave my parents a check to
CONTD 5 hold us over so that we would be safe and protected,
6 because we knew the lake would fill up.
7
8 And of course that was a story. It did not
9 happen. We lost everything we owned. My family was blown
10 apart. And I say that not to engender sympathy. We're
11 all doing fine now. We're happy, doing great, living back
12 in Redding. But my point is this. There is so much
13 weight on this project based on statistics -- I am a
MUND-7 little bit nervous -- but I don't see contingency also
14 based on those statistics. Thank you so much.
15
16 MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your time. Just a
17 time check here, we have about 15 or 16 more speakers. So
18 if you do the math that's about 45 plus more minutes just
19 so you know where we stand.
20
21 Geenie Seely is next, Walt McNeill, Colleen
22 Leavitt will be after that.
23
24 MS. SEELY: My name is Geenie Seely. I'm a
SEEL2-1 Native American. I am Wiyot from Humboldt County, born on
25 a rancheria.
What I'm hearing here is some naive people trying

1 to have some discourse with federal agencies. My people
2 have had them for 200 years. I am fighting the same
SEEL2-1
CONTD 3 battles my mother and father fought. I've dealt with all
4 kinds of government agencies, so I'm naturally very
5 skeptical.

6 My first question would be, you're getting all of
SEEL2-2 7 these comments coming in. How do we know what they say?
8 Are you just tabulating them: pro, con. We don't. I
9 don't trust the government. I'll be quite frank about it.

10 I am hearing several comments here. A lot of
11 people are talking money, like, okay, the bureau has some
12 money. The government doesn't own much. The money comes
SEEL2-3 13 from us. We're the ones that provide the money to the
14 government. The government owns nothing except a few
15 forts and some post offices, and people are talking about
16 federal land. The people own that land.

17 So I just want to clear up a few things. I've
18 taught Native American studies for many years. I have
19 taught public education for 35 years. I am 83 years old,
20 and I am still working to protect the land, and I'll be
SEEL2-4 21 working until the day I die. I want these things cleared
22 up because people need to know. A few people are
23 questioning, and you have a right to question. But you
24 can't let it stop there. You need to keep the fire under
25 their feet to make sure they are accountable.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 My people come from the reservation. We were
2 terminated. This is the just how the federal government
3 can control you. My people were terminated. Then they
SEEL2-4 were unterminated. Then they were recognized. By whom?
CONTD 4 The Secretary of the Interior. I don't know who he is.
5 He doesn't know who I am. This is how the government
6 works. Now I am again terminated by my own people, so I
7 know all the politics.
8
9 And the thing is, I just want to make sure that
10 everybody here follows up on these thing. I came to the
11 last meeting. I said it was worst meeting I have ever
SEEL2-5 12 been in. It was supposed to be a workshop, couldn't hear
13 anything. It reminded me of a 7th and 8th grade
14 cafeteria. I taught 7th and 8th grade for 35 years, so I
15 know what it's like. So I would just like to, like I
16 said, encourage people to follow up here. Do not accept
17 what the government says as cast in stone.
18
19 I'm on the Shasta County Coordination Committee.
20 You say you're operating under NEPA. My understanding
SEEL2-6 21 under NEPA is that people or agencies that operate under
22 the federal government cannot come into an area and change
23 their culture, their economy, or anything else, or any of
24 these drastic changes, without meeting with the
 governments in that area.
SEEL2-7 Now, we're having these hearings. These are just

SEEL2-7
CONTD

1 common citizens speaking. That's the law. That's the law
2 the government made itself.

3 MR. LUCERO: Excuse me, Ms. Seely. I'm sorry,
4 your time is up.

5 MS. SEELY: All right. Thank you very much.

6 MR. LUCERO: Please submit your comments in
7 writing.

8 Walt McNeill, Colleen Leavitt, and Matthew
9 Davison.

10 MR. MCNEIL: Good evening. My name is Walt
11 McNeil. I'm an attorney here in Shasta County. I am also
12 a resident here in Redding. I'm here as an individual
13 water user. But as an attorney, I have represented
14 probably all of water agencies in this county in the
15 Shasta-Trinity division in respect to negotiations of
16 long-term water contracts under CP EIA. Seven years ago,
17 and I also continued to, represent Bear Creek Community
18 Services which has about 10,000 water users, and I
19 represent private parties. We have a very direct interest
20 in water.

MCNEI-1

21 I am not making these comments on behalf of any
22 particular client, but I wanted to let you know that I
23 have been deeply involved in water issues for the last 10
24 to 20 years. I want to point out just one glaring

MCNEI-2

deficiency in the draft EIS. There are many issues here,

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

MCNEI-2
CONTD

MCNEI-3

MCNEI-4

1 but one I want to point out, and I'll leave the other
2 issues to for other people to cover, and that is the
3 failure of the draft EIS to address the California area of
4 origin water statutes as well as the failure to address
5 the impact of that in regards to acquisition of water
6 rights.

7 I think a little history is helpful. When the
8 dam was built, about that time the State of California
9 passed Water Code Section 10505. It states, "No priority
under this part shall be released nor assignment made for
11 any application that will, in the judgment of the board,
12 deprive the county in which the water covered by the
13 application originates of any such water necessary for the
14 development of the county."

15 At the same time, Water Code Section 11460, prior
16 right to watershed water. Without reading the whole
17 thing, basically it provides the same area of origin right
18 to landowners and to the counties, property owners, water
19 users within the watershed of origin. When I looked at
20 Chapter 6 of the draft EIS, there's no mention of those
21 statutes. It's completely ignored. When I look at the
22 section related to acquisition of water rights, you're
still working on that, and you're saying that it's being
24 pursued.

What I want to emphasize is that for maybe 50

MCNEI-4
CONTD

MCNEI-5

LEAV-1

LEAV-2

1 years, federal government promised water users in Northern
2 California that they would have the first right to water
3 that originates here, and that that right would not be
4 disturbed. What we have come to learn is that the United
5 States and Bureau of Reclamation do not honor that
6 promise. And in fact, when they operate the CVP, they do
7 not honor area of origin rights. Enlarging the dam will
8 only increase the amount of water that's taken from area
9 landowners and taken to another place without giving it to
10 the people here who need it in the first place. Thank
11 you.

12 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

13 Colleen Leavitt, Matthew Davison, Buford Holt.

14 MS. LEAVITT: Colleen Leavitt, C-O-L-L-E-E-N,
15 L-E-A-V-I-T-T.

16 So I'm really impressed with the comments from
17 all the people here tonight, and I hope that you're going
18 to take them seriously. Often, I think we've been through
19 the environmental review processes here in Shasta County
20 that seem like our comments really aren't taken that
21 seriously.

22 I was especially interested in people that made
23 comments on alternatives to the project. I know the
24 Bureau of Reclamation has a long history of building dams,
25 but maybe that's not the best way anymore. People talked

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 about holistic approaches and water conservation. And I
LEAV-2 actually would like considered in the environmental impact
CONTD 2
3 report the possibility that instead of building the dam --
4 if you look at a picture of Shasta Lake, and as anybody
5 who lives here knows, there are multiple jutting-out
LEAV-3 6 areas, and as soon as the water gets low, it's nothing but
7 rock. Why couldn't those be removed. It would change the
8 shoreline somewhat, but it would add capacity for storage
9 of water, and it would not raise the level of the water.
10 I mentioned to one of the guys here with the name
11 tag, and he said, "Oh, what are you going do with all rock
12 we're removing." Well, okay, that's a problem, but I
LEAV-4 13 don't think it's nearly the problem that moving people's
14 businesses, flooding people's homes, flooding Indians'
LEAV-5 15 sacred places. There must be a way to deal with that.
LEAV-6 16 I'd like to see an actual serious consideration. If that
17 won't work, why not.
18 Maybe storage requires raising the dam, but what
LEAV-7 19 about a combination of alternatives. Maybe some removal,
20 you know, excavation of the lake to make it bigger. What
21 about water conservation. I mean, like I say, I know you
LEAV-8 22 have a long history of building dams, but maybe that era
23 is over and we should start thinking about other things.
LEAV-9 24 The other comment -- and I realize that this is a
25 time for us to make comments that should be considered in

LEAV-9
CONTD

1 the environmental impact report, or if we're not happy we
2 need to put out the things possibly for litigation later.
3 So I just have a couple other things. In the cases where
4 the California Environmental Quality Act is stricter, and
5 I know there are areas, is your EIS going to comply with
6 the stricter regulations under the California
7 Environmental Quality Act?

LEAV-10

8 And is there any discussion, or could there be,
9 of some legislative changes that would allow the bureau to
10 operate the dam higher, the existing dam higher? I think
11 it's 20 feet that you keep it from the top. Could you
12 raise it a couple of feet and still manage it? And I
13 understand that it's regulated by legislation, but maybe
14 we could get it changed. Maybe we could get a couple feet

LEAV-11

15 there, maybe we could scoop some stuff out. You know, I
16 just would like to see other alternatives besides raising
17 the dam.

18 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Leavitt.

19 Matthew Davison, Buford Holt, and Ed Marek.

20 MR. DAVISON: My name is Matt Davison, M-A-T-T
21 D-A-V-I-S-O-N. I want to keep my eye on the little
22 charming timer over there mutli-colored graphics.

DAVI-1

23 I appreciate the chance to speak in public about
24 this issue that you have provided. Because many people
25 have presented all these different angles, I am going to

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

DAVI-1
CONTD

focus on just four issues for why I reject the validity of raising Shasta Dam.

3 So point number one I have is the budget process.

4 I do like that you have a timeline in the back, and you
5 had one at the previous presentation here, that showed all
6 steps you're going through very methodically to do this.

7 I know there are bigger forces pushing this forward than
8 anyone in this room, but I wish I could see on a timeline
9 like that in the future the budgeting of the process at

DAVI-2

each step. Because I know as you get into a process like
11 this, the more you invest in, the more it becomes urgent
12 you go ahead and do it. It develops its own momentum. So
13 I would just like transparency in terms of knowing that
14 the more money that goes into this, the more you're going
15 to just do it. It's like gambling fever: You've got to
16 because you are already in the pot

17 So the second point -- that's one level at which
18 I reject that part of the process, that it should have
19 transparency in terms of how much money is being invested
20 at each step.

DAVI-3

21 The second point I want to make is the fish
22 habitat argument, that it improves the fish habitat. We
23 have a gentleman from the fisheries that was here, a very
24 nice gentleman. And I looked at his charts and
25 everything, and I said, "All this seems to only point to

DAVI-3
CONTD

1 fish going downstream." And he was very kind and said
2 "Yes, you are correct. This has nothing to do with
3 improving fish habit for fish coming upstream because they
4 can't get upstream." And so that's the reason I reject
5 the argument that this improves the fish habitat for
6 raising the dam.

DAVI-4

7 The third one is the theory of recreation
8 increase, like some sort of mysterious atomic theory that
9 more water acreage -- ah, the green dot has appeared. The
10 more acreage there is, that there will be this sort of
11 magnetic attraction that there will be more recreation on
12 the lake. Actually, a lot of people aren't slamming into
13 each other on the lake now. So that's more affected by
14 the economy. The economy is the main reason you don't see
15 more people recreating. It has nothing to do with
16 acreage. So I reject that argument for raising the dam.

DAVI-5

17 And the fourth argument is water release. I
18 heard an argument that they need to release -- the amount
19 of water that they are releasing changes. In drought
20 condition, they would be able to retain more water. I
21 didn't see that they contended how much is released to
22 generate electrical power. So I'd like more clarity in
23 terms of how much of that water release we get anyway
24 because of electrical power.

DAVI-6

Finally, I just want to say before I run out of

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

DAVI-6
CONTD

1 time here on the yellow dot. As an American who's not a
tribal member, I think it's far past the time where we
recognize the Winnemem Wintu as Americans. They lived
4 here before us, and I think they should be recognized.

5 Thank you very much.

6 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Davison.

7 Buford Holt, Ed Marek, and R. Wade.

8 MR. HOLT: My name is Buford Holt, B-U-F-O-R-D
9 H-O-L-T.

HOLT4-1

10 I just wanted to comment on one of the things
11 that's missing from this document, not of all the document
12 per se. It's difficult. It's a good document put
together by competent people. I don't have a problem with
14 what's there so much as the ending has problems. And
15 we've had some excellent comments from my predecessors up
16 here at the mic.

HOLT4-2

17 What my concern is is that it's been 10 years,
18 probably, since the context was given for which all this
19 stuff is happening. Several of the comments addressed
that, "Gee, you haven't looked at the alternatives."
21 Well, they did, ten years ago. The CalFED EIS and the CVP
22 IA implementation EIS, but who remember that 10 years
23 later? And you have to remember, those documents were
24 themselves a couple of feet thick. There's a lot of
25 material there, and then there are lots and lots of

HOLT4-2
CONTD

environmental reports from the CalFED stuff. There were whole bookshelves full of CalFED documents.

3

HOLT4-3

And so what's happened is we've lost sight of that context or it's been forgotten. And what I think would be helpful in a document like this is to have an appendix that summarizes some of the broader picture.

5

6

7

HOLT4-4

Like right now California faces at least three major budget-busting problems: Water supply, which people are mentioning because we are already tapping -- virtually everything that can be economically captured is being captured with small exceptions. We've got the problem of

9

10

11

HOLT4-5

water delivery, the trans-delta sort of thing. And we've

13

HOLT4-6

got flood control issues, which no one has even mentioned here. That's a whole separate sort of thing. But we're

14

15

HOLT4-7

talking about things where the budgets are tens of billions of dollars. And in today's environment, those things are kind of difficult to do. But we don't have,

17

18

HOLT4-8

for the public, that kind of perspective, putting them in tradeoffs that we'd have to take. And I think it would be very useful to have a brief summary of that.

20

21

HOLT4-9

Nor is there a mention of the fact that global oil production has peaked. In 1970 we went from being domestically self-reliant to importing oil with borrowed money. In about 2006, the global oil production peaked. And what that means is the era of relatively cheap oil is

22

24

25

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

HOLT4-9
CONTD

1 gone. You can look at the numbers, but it's clear that
2 this is no longer the world in which Colonel Drake drilled
3 70 feet through unconsolidated sediments, buried under
4 bedrock he found oil 250 years ago. Now, we have floating
5 platforms dynamically positioned in the ocean dropping
6 miles of pipe. It's far more expensive to get oil now.
7 The finances to pull this stuff off are going to be
8 questionable. So thank you.

9 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Holt.
10 Ed Marek, R. Wade, Joy Wade.

11 MR. MAREK: Yes, my name is Ed Marek. I live
12 here Oak Run.

13 MR. LUCERO: Sir, can you spell your last name,
14 please?

15 MR. MAREK: M-A-R-E-K. I'd just like to address
16 both the audience and ladies and gentlemen here. I think
17 that what hasn't been discussed, from my perspective, what
18 we're really discussing is planning for disaster. And
19 maybe this occurred to you that sometimes when you plan
20 for disaster, you can plan a disaster. I'd like everyone
21 to take a look at the environmental impact report. And it
22 is in there rather buried, but find the climate change
23 modelling appendix part one, page 17, some of the more
24 moderate facts for North California. "Snowpack decreases
25 is projected to be more substantial over the portions of

MARE-1

MARE-1
CONTD

1 the basin where baseline cool weather temperatures are
2 generally closer to freezing thresholds and more sensitive
3 to projected warming. Such areas include much of the
4 northern Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountains of the
Sacramento River Basin." That's us, Northern California.

6 Then page 25-2, mean April 1st snow water
7 equivalent, that's the snowpack existing in this
8 watershed. Declined by the 2020s, 53.4 percent; by the
9 2050s, 75.9 percent; and by the 2070s 88.6 percent decline
10 in our snowpack.

MARE-2

11 Now, the dam does nothing whatsoever to
12 ameliorate the damage done by climate change, the slow
13 disaster we're facing. What it does do, and what it is an
14 attempt to do, is to reduce the effects for Central and
Southern California. What would be disaster for us would
16 be survivable for Central and Southern California because
17 it will allow you to collect the water, the precipitation
18 that does not fall as snow but falls as rain, and continue
19 to ship it south by increasing storage capacity in
20 Northern California.

MARE-3

21 And the point I want to make about this is that
22 for us, this is not going to be a disaster that is
survivable. Northern California is dependent on the
24 forest resources not only for the timber economy but for
25 tourism and the greater forest ecology. If those forests

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 cannot survive, as they cannot do as to soil moisture
2 declines with declining snowpack, then we will not have
MARE-3 3 the same Northern California we have now, however high the
CONTD 4 lake is.
5 So anyway I just said, concluded, you're asking
6 the wrong question in your study. And I understand you're
7 constrained. You can only discuss the water storage
MARE-4 8 options specifically in Lake Shasta. But nothing you are
9 going to do here is going to benefit us to live in this
10 future. And it's only going to extend the ability of
11 Central and Southern California by several decades. And
12 maybe even the salmon, it's entirely possible you can keep
MARE-5 13 the water colder by using the dam. But it's really not
14 solving the problem.
15 So just to conclude by saying: Instead of
MARE-6 16 planning for this disaster, maybe we should start planning
17 to avoid this disaster. I hope you at all take that
18 comment to heart.
19 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, sir.
20 R. Wade, Joy Wade, and Gill Goss.
21 MR. WADE: Thank you for your patience. R-U-S-S
22 W-A-D-E, Russ Wade.
23 This is project doesn't make any sense to me.
WADE-1 24 You're essentially just doing a railroad job on people's
25 houses and our tourist business. The other thing is do we

WADE-2

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

Page: 67

1 have the rainfall to support the project. Recent history
2 says no. One year out of six we get enough water. That's
WADE-2 17 percent of the time; 83 percent of the time we don't
CONTD 4 have enough water. Would any -- I am a small business
5 guy. Would I ever put up any money to come out ahead 17
6 percent of the time? This is project makes no sense at
7 all because the water is not available. And you are --
8 just like to Wintu got the railroad job, all those people
WADE-3 that spent years and years developing their recreation
9 businesses, believe me, it will all go in the toilet.
10
WADE-4 And it's to ship water south. The Lower San
11
12 Joaquin, they've pumped out aquifers. Water is the new
13 gold, and the smartest thing that we could do would be
14 quit flushing all our water into rivers. We've got
15 graywater systems that we should be using to replenish
16 aquifers. Fresno is constantly drilling wells just to
WADE-5 take care of their half a million people. If they
17
18 collected the graywater and injected it, they could
19 replenish aquifers. So it's a plumbing design problem, as
20 far as I am concerned. And we should look to graywater
21 instead of spending billions of dollars and railroading
22 the people in Northern California. Thank you for your
23 time.
24 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Wade.
25 MR. WADE: Joy Wade will not be speaking.

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, sir.
2 Gil Goss, Kenwa Kravitz, and Linda Malone.
3 MR. GOSS: My comments were already entered. Gil
4 Goss.
5 MR. LUCERO: Mr. Goss, thank you very much.
6 Kenwa Kravitz, Linda Malone, and Michael
7 Preston.
8 MS. KRAVITZ: Hello. My name is Kenwa Kravitz,
9 K-E-N-W-A, K-R-A-V-I-T-Z. I am the curator and director
10 of Winnemem Wintu Cultural Museum in the City of Shasta
KRAV-1 11 Lake. I am also Winnemem Wintu.
12 MR. LUCERO: Excuse me. Ms. Kravitz, can I have
13 you speak closer to the mic?
14 MS. KRAVITZ: Yes. I apologize. This is very
15 sensitive to me.
16 In 1941 the Congress passed an act called the
KRAV-2 17 Acquisition of Indian Land for the Central Valley
18 Project. That has never been answered for in regards to
19 my people. I truly oppose the raising of the dam.
KRAV-3 20 I currently have in my possession a document
21 called a CDIB, Certified Degree of Indian Blood, that
22 states I am a descendent and have Wintu blood in me,
KRAV-4 23 meaning Indian blood of the land that was taken. This
24 government agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs gave it to
25 me. It's an official document. I would like to see some

1 accountability before anything more is done in any way
2 shape or form. Who holds the government of the United
3 States of America accountable for what they have done to
4 my people? Where is the accountability?
5 I don't -- I will just honestly say that I do not
6 trust the United States government because of these
7 things. All the way back to 1851, the Ash Creek Treaty
8 was never ratified. It promised my people 35 square miles
9 of the river basin right here. All this side of the
10 Sacramento River all the way, basically, out to Mount
11 Lassen up to the Pit River all the way to the Sacramento
12 River down to Cottonwood.
13 Lots of us people here live in that area. Does
14 anybody know about that? No, because it was held in
15 secrecy for a really long time. There's a continued
16 breaking of trust, breaking of treaties, in regard to my
17 people. And not only my people, but all the people across
18 this land. That was given to us. It might not seem like
19 much to you, but to me this is where my people come from.
20 Lots of people don't understand that, but to say this is
21 where I come from. That's huge. And if you cover that
22 dam, you're going to cover that land.
23 Right at McCloud River, my ancestors lived
24 there. There are burial sites there. I have deeds of
25 trust that were given to ancestors. Kitty McKenzie up in

KRAV-4
CONTD

KRAV-5

KRAV-6

KRAV-7

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	↑	Lamoine which will affected. The McKenzies down the
KRAV-7		McCloud River. Over in Trinity Center, the lake over
CONTD		
3		there covering that area. This is personal. It's not --
4		when is enough enough? Who will hold the United States
KRAV-8		Government accountable for what they have done to me, my
6		people, and my children. Thank you.
7		MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.
8		Linda Malone, Michael Preston, and our last
9		speaker is Peggy Williams.
10		MS. MALONE: Hello and thank you for hearing my
11		words.
12		I take off where she left off. We have a sad
MALO-1		history, and whenever we're asked to talk about it, it
14		hurts. It hurts really bad. We had this removal once
15		before. In 1938, my parents were moved. And if you know
16		McCloud River, it's one of the most pristine rivers in the
MALO-2		world. It's the coldest river in the United States. And
18		when you raise the dam, you're going to go up two miles,
19		into that, and that river is lost.
20		Also what is sad is that you have recreation
MALO-3		here, and you make a lot of taxes off the water and the
22		lake and the recreation and the boats, the houseboats.
23		And my brother drowned in the lake in 1995. You had a
MALO-4		17-year-old who just drowned last week. You still haven't
25	↓	found him. I know, personally know, two other people that

MALO-4
CONTD

1 are in the lake. Jack Potter, Senior, and Mr. Hale, I
2 believe. He was like 35 years old. He's still not found.
3 My brother was not found after 15 months, then he came up.
4 So your feasibility and your investigation, to me the
5 edges of your lake is too steep.
6 It is a very deep lake. It's so deep you can't
7 find people with those little bitty cameras that go ten
8 feet because I saw that when we hunted for my brother. So
9 it's -- every year, people drown in that lake. So we need
10 the water, but then we need the people to live, and then
11 you need it for your recreation also. But when they built
12 Shasta Dam, it's so steep, that whole hillside. Where
13 they put Shasta Dam, that's one of the hardest spots in
14 Northern California that they chose.
15 But we try to get along. We've got a long time,
16 but we still have to deal with issues. Every year, two or
17 three times a year, and every time we come and tell you,
18 like years from now, it's a whole different group. And
19 the law changes on us. And then the BIA steps in and says
20 you have to do this now, and it takes us a long time.
21 But when you raise the lake again, we're going to
22 lose more land. I can't believe Lakehead might disappear.
23 I shopped there. But it just seems to go on and on, and
24 we have lost enough land. For the second time, it really
25 hurts. Thank you for hearing me.

MALO-5

MALO-6

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Malone.
2 Michael Preston, Peggy Williams. And if you
3 still want to speak, please give your name to Mary,
4 otherwise we have two more speakers left.
5 MR. PRESTON: Michael Preston, M-I-C-H-A-E-L,
6 P-R-E-S-T-O-N. (Speaking in Native language). My name is
7 Michael Preston, up on McCloud River representing the
8 Winnemem Wintu Tribe and also a member of Shasta County
9 public and youth. And I want to speak to you actually on
10 that ground right there.
11 And basically, I wanted to address the
12 environmental justice issue that the dam has created in
13 the first place from 1941 in accordance to the Winnemem
14 Wintu Tribe and the loss of sacred sites. This is
15 documented in the Central Valley Indian Land Acquisition
PRES-1 16 project. Before we move forward with the Central Valley
17 Project, I feel like we should be addressing these issues
18 with that Central Valley Indian Acquisition Project
19 stating it would provide, you know, just -- I'm sorry,
20 looking for correct word -- provide like land to live on,
21 which was 4,000 -- over 4,000 acres of Indian allotment
22 lands, which were allotted not only to the Winnemem Wintu
23 Tribe but also surrounding Wintu tribes and different
24 Wintus that reside along the rivers.
25 Before move forward with that, written in the

1 law, I feel like that should be once again revisited. And
PRES-1 also infrastructural support was also promised through
CONTD that. So in that not being ratified or being swept under
4 the rug and not being addressed, is an environmental
5 justice issue.

6 This issue with dams happens all over the world.
7 We've displaced a billion people around the world. This
8 just so happens to be in Shasta County. And the main
9 reason why these dams are being put in place is
PRES-2 economically it forces control of the water and, I think,
11 at the expense of the local people. So we are
12 representing the local people, tribes first and foremost,
13 and then the public which is also going to be -- the
14 general public overall, which is going to be at an
15 economic loss as well as stated by many of the people
16 here.

17 And so I wanted to addresses that as well just
18 from the economic means -- that just based on -- like
PRES-3 19 Brazil, for instances, and different countries. Go into
20 these different countries and basically subdue the
21 economics there and the infrastructural promises, and then
22 basically getting these governments into debt and subduing
23 them to World Bank, for instance.

PRES-4 I see this as the same issues, just in the local
25 area with the Bureau of Land Management and federal

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1 government coming in and coming into the local economy.
2 And the promise of jobs, the promise of salmon returns,
PRES-4 the promise of these different things will benefit the
CONTD - area. However, in the long run it's not what is
5 actually going to benefit the economy or the people in the
6 long-run.
7 So based off of the water allocation going down
8 to the south, that's what it's all about. It's all about
9 the agricultural interests that are in the Central Valley
PRES-5 paying a pretty price and paying for this water that will
11 be up there, as well as Southern California. It's not
12 really for the people, per se. It is, only about for --
13 the vast majority, though, for which the water is used, 70
14 percent of the water is used for agricultural means.
15 Also fracking is a big deal which is coming up on
16 the chopping blocks in Southern California, which has used
PRES-6 millions and millions of gallons water to extract oil and
18 natural resources. And so that's what I feel is the main
19 reason for the dam raise, and the main reason for the
20 water allocation down to Southern California. Thank you.
21 MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much for your
22 comments.
23 Ms. Peggy Williams, you have the honor of being
24 the last speaker tonight.
25 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Peggy

1 Williams, W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S. I am a member of the board of
2 directors for the Lakehead Community Development
WILL2-1 3 Association, which does a tremendous job for the
4 community.
5 I want to just touch on a few points, and one of
WILL2-2 6 them, a couple people remember, is terrorism. When the
7 dam was built in the '30s, '40s, we had no terrorism, but
8 we had no jobs. This is not going to help with the job
WILL2-3 9 situation. It will employ people. But you're going to
10 put all the water for California in one big basket up
WILL2-4 11 here, and then are we going to wait for some crazy
12 terrorist to come and fly into the dam when it's high and
13 flood all the way to Sacramento. That's what will happen.
14 I've often wondered that about the I-5 bridge,
WILL2-5 15 what it would do for travel, the way people would have to
16 go around. It would cause a major problem. And I find
WILL2-6 17 that with the dam. I was told six feet they can do with
18 the existing structure, six feet up.
19 And I also -- as a few of you know, I have lived
20 in my home on the lake for 30 years. I recognize at least
WILL2-7 21 a half a dozen owners or managers of resorts that I deal
22 with and have for years: 20 years, 18 years. And this is
23 not a 24 hours and you're off or 8 hours and you're off
24 the rest of the week. This is 24/7, 365 days a year.
25 These people work. They work hard. And it's not only for

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	them, their employees, it's for all the tourists, tens of
2	thousands of tourists that come. And we're not seeing
3	them now because of the economy: no jobs, gasoline, this
4	kind of thing.
5	I think the water storage problem would be best
6	served by carrying the water down the state and not
7	putting it all in one place and having little spots.
8	And also, the American Indians: As far as I am
9	concerned, I am an American Indian now. You're taking my
10	home of 30 years. Three daughters I raised in that house.
11	You know, they can't believe it that I am going to have to
12	leave there. I said they are going to carry every
13	toothpick out of my house then.
14	So not only the businesses, the employees go, no
15	tourists. I just think everybody loses with the extreme
16	amount that they want to raise the lake. I just think
17	everybody will lose.
18	And I met two farmers. And these two farmers, I
19	said, "Bob, what are you not rice ranching this year?" He
20	says, "Nope, neither is Larry." I said, "Why not?" He
21	goes, "We can get more money for the water than we can get
22	for the rice." So if we supply 90 percent of the produce
23	to the United States and our farmers are selling water,
24	who's going to grow the produce? Who is going to feed the
25	people? What will happen?

WILL2-7
CONTD

WILL2-8

WILL2-9

WILL2-10

WILL2-11

WILL2-12

WILL2-13

1 But you guys are going to relocate me like you
2 relocated the Indians? Never going to happen. We're
3 going to get the same shaft they got, and I truly believe
4 that, but I appreciate you being here and listening. And
5 I appreciate all the people that I have seen here tonight
6 that I have known for decades. I know they worked 24/7,
7 365 days a year for their employees, for our community,
8 taxes, and for tens of thousands of tourists.

9 MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Williams, appreciate
10 your comments.

11 We have called the last speaker. Does anybody
12 else want to make a comment?

13 Then in that case, on behalf of Reclamation, I'd
14 like to thank everyone for taking the time to attend and
15 participate in this hearing. Please remember, if you
16 still plan to provide written comments, you have until
17 September 30th midnight.

18 This concludes our hearing on the Draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement For the Shasta Lake Water
20 Resources Investigation. Thank you and good night.

21 (Meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.)
22
23
24
25

RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

1	CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER
2	
3	I, Allen Rose, CSR 13753, hereby certify that I
4	am a Certified Shorthand Reporter; that I recorded
5	verbatim in shorthand writing the foregoing proceedings
6	completely and correctly; that I have caused under my
7	direction said shorthand writing to be transcribed into
8	typewriting and the foregoing pages constitute a complete
9	and accurate transcript of said shorthand writing taken at
10	the above-mentioned proceedings.
11	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12	attorney for any of the parties to said proceeding nor in
13	any way interested in the outcome of said proceeding.
14	
15	Dated: September 22, 2013
16	
17	_____
18	Allen Rose, CSR 13753
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

Page: 79

Responses to Comments from Curtis Brown, Provided on Behalf of Self

BROW-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, "Comment Included as Part of the Record."

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

BROW-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-3, “Relocation of Privately Owned Cabins on USFS Lands.”

BROW-4: Neither Reclamation nor DWR in operating the CVP and SWP realize any profit as they are public agencies.

Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-1, “Water Supply Demands, Supplies, and Project Benefits.”

BROW-5: Water released from Shasta Reservoir does flow into the Sacramento River where it is delivered to CVP contractors in the Sacramento Valley and also pumped from the South Delta for CVP contractors south of the Delta. It is reasonable to assume that if the BDCP were to be implemented, some water released from Shasta Dam would be conveyed through the Delta conveyance facilities to contractors south of the Delta. As described in Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” the BDCP is considered for the purposes of evaluating potential cumulative impacts of the SLWRI. Further speculation on implementation of the BDCP or similar programs is not required by NEPA.

Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

Responses to Comments from Greg Burgin on Behalf of Self

BURG-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition,” and Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

BURG-2: 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.

BURG-3: 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.

BURG-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from Eric Cassano on Behalf of Self

CASS2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

CASS2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ENG-2, “Borrow Materials.”

CASS2-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

CASS2-4: The requested document has been mailed to Mr. Cassano. Text regarding sand and borrow sources within the Final EIS have been revised to provide clarification on the identified borrow sources for the construction of the dikes required for the various action alternatives. In the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that have been identified as potential sources for borrow material.

CASS2-5: As described in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix, Chapter 3, “Design Considerations for Dam and Appurtenances of Dam Enlargements,” multiple borrow sources are available to meet project needs. Material availability would vary with market demand and production restrictions, but it is expected that sufficient materials will be available when needed for construction. The sites that have been identified are included in the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites.” Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that have been identified as potential sources for borrow material. The construction contractor will make the final decision on where the aggregate sources for construction will be supplied from. Any commercial source would need to meet all applicable local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements.

CASS2-6: In the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that has been identified as potential sources for borrow material. For further clarification refer to Master Comment Response ENG-2, “Borrow Materials.”

CASS2-7: NEPA regulations, 40 CFR 1502.4, states "proposals or parts of proposal which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement." The DEIS evaluates the entire SLWRI in a single impact statement and therefore meets NEPA regulations.

Responses to Comments from Tom Stokely on Behalf of California Water Impact Network and California Environmental Water Caucus

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

CWIN-2: This comment appears to be related to allocation of costs to project beneficiaries, which is outside the scope of the DEIS. 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(b)). As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-5, “Potential Project Financing,” an updated cost allocation were included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report. This comment was included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

CWIN-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”

CWIN-4: This comment appears to be related to allocation of costs to project beneficiaries, which is outside the scope of the DEIS. 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(b)). As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-5, “Potential Project Financing,” an updated cost allocation was included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report. This comment was included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

CWIN-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”

CWIN-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

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

CWIN-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” Master Comment Response ALTD-2, “Alternative Development – Anadromous Fish Survival,” Master Comment Response ALTS-1, “Alternative Selection.”

CWIN-9: The EIS, Chapter 7, “Water Quality,” includes a discussion of heavy metals and the associated impacts. Mitigation measures have been developed to ensure that the one known site (Bully Hill area) will be

addressed. In addition Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” of the EIS includes a comprehensive list of environmental commitments, including preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to ensure compliance with relevant water quality requirements.

Responses to Comments from Matt Davison on Behalf of Self

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

DAVI-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of EIS.”

DAVI-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

DAVI-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-9, “Relationship Between Recreation and Shasta Lake Water Levels.”

DAVI-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

DAVI-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from David Martinez on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member

DMART2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

DMART2-2: Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for SLWRI and provided to decision makers. 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.

DMART2-3: Water released from Shasta Reservoir does flow into the Sacramento River where it is delivered to CVP contractors in the Sacramento Valley and also pumped from the South Delta for CVP contractors south of the Delta. It is reasonable to assume that if the BDCP were to be implemented, some water released from Shasta Dam would be conveyed through the Delta conveyance facilities to contractors south of the Delta. As described in Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” the BDCP is considered for the purposes of evaluating potential cumulative impacts of the SLWRI. Further speculation on implementation of the BDCP or similar programs is not

required by NEPA. Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

DMART2-4: It is unclear which reports the commenter is referencing. If the commenter is referencing reports related to the BDCP in comparison to reports related to the SLWRI, please see Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.” If the commenter is referencing reports related only to the SLWRI, please see Master Comment Response GEN-2, “Unsubstantiated Information.”

DMART2-5: Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6, “Areas of Controversy,” of the DEIS acknowledges that Native American concerns and cultural resources remain an area of controversy. The U.S. Congress will use this Final EIS, the related Final Feasibility Report, and supporting information, as well as any additional information they believe appropriate, to determine the public interest in the project, and the form scope of project authorization (if any). As this Final EIS chapter includes public and agency comments received on the DEIS, and responses to each of these comments, these decision makers will have a full characterization of the public interests.

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.”

DMART2-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

DMART2-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

Responses to Comments from Larry Farr on Behalf of Mayor of the City of Shasta Lake

FARR-1: Comment noted.

FARR-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

FARR-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response EJ-1, “Potential Effects to Disadvantaged Communities.”

FARR-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-3, “Effects to Tourism at Shasta Lake,” Master Comment Response RBR-1, “Access Across Shasta Dam,” and Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

FARR-5: As stated in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Chapter 4, “Design Consideration for Reservoir Area Infrastructure Modifications and/or Relocations,” Sections, “Recreation Facilities,” and “Public Boat Ramps,” that the public boat ramps that are affected by the action alternatives will be modified in place to allow for access. If for any reason the boat ramps cannot be modified in place the capacity will be relocated as to maintain recreation distribution around the lake.

The associated costs for modifications to the public boat ramps are accounted for in the overall cost estimates and can be found in detail in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix, Attachments 2 through 4, for the different action alternatives.

FARR-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

FARR-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response EJ-1, “Potential Effects to Disadvantaged Communities.”

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

FOTR3-1: Comment noted.

FOTR3-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

FOTR3-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-4, “Non-monetary Benefits of Action Alternatives,” and Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

FOTR3-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-5, “Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report,” and Master Comment Response WSR-1, “Water Supply Demands, Supplies, and Project Benefits.”

FOTR3-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response WASR-1, “Eligibility of the McCloud River as a Federal Wild and Scenic River,” Master Comment Response WASR-6, “Protections of the Lower McCloud River as Identified in the California Public Resources Code, Section 5093.542,” and Master Comment Response WASR-8, “Effects

to the Eligibility of Rivers for Inclusion in the Federal Wild and Scenic River System.”

FOTR3-6: Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6, “Areas of Controversy,” of the DEIS acknowledges that Native American concerns and cultural resources remain an area of controversy. The U.S. Congress will use this Final EIS, the related Final Feasibility Report, and supporting information, as well as any additional information they believe appropriate, to determine the public interest in the project, and the form scope of project authorization (if any). As this Final EIS chapter includes public and agency comments received on the DEIS, and responses to each of these comments, these decision makers will have a full characterization of the public interests.

As stated in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.1.2, “Purpose and Need/Project Objectives,” of the DEIS, the Project purpose is to improve operational flexibility of the Delta watershed system of the existing Shasta Dam and Reservoir to meet specified primary and secondary project objectives including increasing survival of anadromous fish populations in the Sacramento River and increasing water supply and water supply reliability for agricultural, M&I, and environmental purposes, to help meet current and future water demands (primary objectives); and to conserve, restore and enhance ecosystem resources in the Shasta Lake area and the upper Sacramento River, reduce flood damage downstream, develop additional hydropower generation capabilities at Shasta Dam, maintain and increase recreation opportunities at Shasta Lake and maintain or improve water quality conditions downstream (secondary objectives). The DEIS examines the full range of impacts on the human environment of five action alternatives and a no action alternative.

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.”

FOTR3-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FOTR3-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FOTR3-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity,” Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake,” and Master Comment Response TRANS-1, “Potential Construction-Related Effects to Roadways and Traffic Congestion.”

FOTR3-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-3, “Botanical Resources Effects Related to Flow Regimes.”

FOTR3-11: NEPA requires full disclosure of the potential effects of Federal actions and accompanying alternatives and possible mitigation. The mitigation measure Bot-7 in Chapter 12, “Botanical Resources and Wetlands,” Section 12.3.5, “Mitigation Measures,” describes a range of performance measures to mitigate identified impacts on riparian and wetland communities.

Mitigation Measure Bot-7 identifies specific actions (modification of dam operations and funding restoration actions) that will be included in the final plan to avoid and compensate for impacts on riparian and wetland communities such that a no-net-loss performance standard is met. Mitigation Measure Bot-7 also identifies the minimum measures that will be implemented to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts. Details about off-site mitigation opportunities in the primary study area are not yet available. Potential mitigation lands containing comparable wetland and special-status species habitat comparable to those that would be affected by the action alternatives have been identified and specific details about how these lands may be used for mitigation will be discussed in detail in future documents and be subject to review by regulatory agencies and the public. The DEIS follows standard NEPA procedures in disclosing impacts on biological resources and providing mitigation measures that Reclamation will be required to implement following future Congressional authorization, that commits Reclamation to the measures. The intent of this document is to identify measures that are flexible and adaptable so they can be implemented effectively by Reclamation to respond to direct and indirect impacts on riparian and wetland habitats resulting from the project. The mitigation measure clearly states that a mitigation and adaptive management plan will be implemented and will include implementation funding mechanisms and criteria. On pages ES-32 and ES-33 of the Executive Summary, the DEIS identifies implementation of a comprehensive revegetation plan and a comprehensive mitigation strategy to minimize potential effects on biological resources as environmental commitments. Therefore, the document properly identifies the probability of implementation of mitigation as required under NEPA and commits Reclamation to implementing this mitigation.

As stated under Mitigation Measure Bot-7, Chapter 12, “Botanical Resources and Wetlands,” Section 12.3.5, “Mitigation Measures,” feasible measures in this context are those that are not in conflict with applicable laws, agreements, and regulations, or with the purpose of the project. Also as stated in Section 12.3.5, appropriate restoration actions are those that do any of the following: 1) enhance connectivity of river side channels (e.g., by modifying the elevation of secondary channels, remnant oxbows, or meander scars); 2) expand the river meander zone at selected locations (e.g., by assisting in funding projects that meet this objective); 3) increase floodplain connectivity (e.g., by assisting in funding projects that meet this objective); 4) control and remove nonnative, invasive plant species from riparian areas to shift dominance to native species; 5) create riparian and wetland communities (e.g., through plantings); and 6) increase shaded riverine aquatic habitat (e.g., through plantings). Because the plan would be developed in coordination with USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, and the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, each of these entities would have the opportunity to provide input on the appropriateness and feasibility of restoration actions.

FOTR3-12: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-2, “Alternative Development – Anadromous Fish Survival,” and Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

Responses to Comments from Jeanne France on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member

FRAN-1: Please refer to response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

FRAN-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FRAN-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

FRAN-4: Thank you for providing your position relative to the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for the SLWRI and provided to decision makers. 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.

FRAN-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FRAN-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

Responses to Comments from Nick Gardener on Behalf of Self

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

GARD-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-4, “Maintaining Sacramento River Flows to Meet Fish Needs and Regulatory Requirements.”

Responses to Comments from Jerry Harral on Behalf of Self

HARR-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

HARR-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HARR-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

Responses to Comments from Buford Holt on Behalf of Self

HOLT4-1: Comment noted.

HOLT4-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General.”

HOLT4-3: The Final Feasibility Report was published with the Final EIS as an attachment. The Final Feasibility Report includes additional contextual information.

HOLT4-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-7: Comment noted.

HOLT4-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

Responses to Comments from Robert Franklin on Behalf of Hoopa Valley Tribe (senior hydrologist)

HOOP-1: Comment noted.

HOOP-2: CalSim-II is the best available tool to represent CVP/SWP operations. Operations modeling was performed using the CalSim-II simulation model, the best available tool for predicting CVP/SWP system-wide water operations. Details on the CalSim-II model and the assumptions included in all simulations can be found in the Modeling Appendix, Chapter 2, “CalSim-II.” Also see Master Comment Response GEN-7, “Rules and Regulations for Water Operations under SLWRI Action Alternatives.”

Responses to Comments from Sue Horkey on Behalf of Self

HORK-1: The SLWRI is intended to evaluate alternatives that meet various legislative and planning directives as stated in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” and Chapter 2, “Alternatives.” Sites Reservoir is being evaluated under a separate study and is not considered an alternative to SLWRI as it would not provide the benefits to meet the SLWRI purpose and need and primary objectives. Please refer to Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response ALTS-1 “Alternative Selection.”

HORK-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HORK-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HORK-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

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

HORK-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HORK-7: Comment noted.

Responses to Comments from Catherine Joplin on Behalf of Self

JOPL1-1: Comment noted.

JOPL1-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

JOPL1-3: Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for SLWRI and provide to the decision-makers. 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.

JOPL1-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

Responses to Comments from Kenwa Kravitz on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Cultural Museum

KRAV-1: Comment noted.

KRAV-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

KRAV-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

KRAV-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

KRAV-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

KRAV-6: Comment noted.

KRAV-7: Thank you for sharing your history. 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.

KRAV-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from Colleen Leavitt on Behalf of Self

LEAV-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

LEAV-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

LEAV-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

LEAV-4: Comment noted.

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

LEAV-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

LEAV-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

LEAV-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

LEAV-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response CEQA-1, “CEQA Compliance.”

LEAV-10: The current reservoir is operated at levels sufficient to provide flood surcharge storage space to avoid overtopping during large flood events.

LEAV-11: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” and Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General.”

Responses to Comments from Craig Leigh on Behalf of Self

LEIG-1: As described in the Climate Change Modeling appendix, a wide range of drier climates than the historic climate were used to evaluate the sensitivity of enlarged Shasta to potential climate changes. Please refer to Master Comment Response CC-1, “Climate Change Uncertainty and Related Evaluations,” and Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

Responses to Comments from Linda Malone on Behalf of Self

MALO-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

MALO-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MALO-3: 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.

MALO-4: Comment noted.

MALO-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

MALO-6: Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. 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.

Responses to Comments from Ed Marek on Behalf of Self

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

MARE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

MARE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MARE-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

MARE-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MARE-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

Responses to Comments from Walt McNeil on Behalf of Self

MCNEI-1: Comment noted.

MCNEI-2: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-4: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-5: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

Responses to Comments from David Mundt on Behalf of Self

MUND-1: Comment noted.

MUND-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” 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.”

MUND-3: 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.

MUND-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response ALTS-1, “Alternative Selection,”

MUND-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-4, “Historic Operations vs. Simulated Operations Used for Alternatives Evaluations.”

MUND-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-4, “Historic Operations vs. Simulated Operations Used for Alternatives Evaluations.”

MUND-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-4, “Historic Operations vs. Simulated Operations Used for Alternatives Evaluations,” and Master Comment Response GEN-4, “Best Available Information.”

Responses to Comments from Michael Preston on Behalf of Self

PRES-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

PRES-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts,” Master Comment Response EI-4, “Socioeconomic and Associated Indirect Environmental Effects,” Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

PRES-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

PRES-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.”

PRES-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

PRES-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

Responses to Comments from Rex Rider on Behalf of Self

RIDE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-8, “Inundation Zone/Reservoir Buffer.”

RIDE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

RIDE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-3, “Relocation of Privately Owned Cabins on USFS Lands.”

Responses to Comments from Bill Schappell on Behalf of District 4

SCHAP-1: Comment noted.

SCHAP-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SCHAP-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-9, “Relationship Between Recreation and Shasta Lake Water Levels.”

SCHAP-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

SCHAP-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SCHAP-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response RBR-2, “Reduced Public Access Around Shasta Lake.”

SCHAP-7: The estimated costs and non-monetized benefits presented in the DEIS were determined by comparison of the with-project condition to the No-Action Alternative (future conditions, 2030 baseline), consistent with the Federal planning process identified in the U.S. Water Resources Council’s 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies (P&G).

For a summary of costs, please see the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Attachment 1, “Cost Estimates for Comprehensive Plans,” which estimates costs for the Comprehensive Plans. For a summary of the overall potential benefits, including increased water supply reliability, of all comprehensive plans, please see the Table 2-24, in Section 2.5, “Summary of Potential Benefits of Action Alternatives,” of Chapter 2, “Alternatives.” The quantified benefits were based on modeling efforts that are described in several parts of the DEIS: Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Chapter 11, “Fisheries and Aquatic Resources,” Chapter 23, “Power and Energy,” and the Modeling Appendix.

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

SCHAP-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

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

SCHAP-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

SCHAP-11: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

Responses to Comments from Harold Jones on Behalf of Sugarloaf Cottages Resort

SCR2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-5, “Relocation of Private Recreation Facilities onto Federal Lands.”

SCR2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-5, “Relocation of Private Recreation Facilities onto Federal Lands.”

SCR2-3: Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. A response to this type of comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

SCR2-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

SCR2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake,” Master Comment Response REC-5, “Relocation of Private Recreation Facilities onto Federal Lands,” and Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

SCR2-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

SCR2-7: Comment noted.

SCR2-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

Responses to Comments from Geenie Seely on Behalf of Self

SEEL2-1: Comment noted.

SEEL2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

SEEL2-3: Comment noted.

SEEL2-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

SEEL2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

SEEL2-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-8, “Public Outreach and Involvement,” and Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.”

SEEL2-7: Comment noted.

Responses to Comments from Chief Caleen Sisk on Behalf of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe

SISK-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

SISK-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

SISK-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.” **SISK-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-13, “Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Process,” and Master Comment Response CR-15, “National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultations.”

SISK-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

SISK-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

SISK-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

SISK-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

SISK-9: As stated in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Chapter 3, “Design Consideration for Dam and Appurtenances of Dam Enlargements” Sections, “Reservoir Area Dikes,” dikes will be required in the Lakeshore and Bridge Bay area to protect California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) highways and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) from inundation.

SISK-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from Matt Doyle on Behalf of Shasta Lake Business Owners Association

SLBOA2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

SLBOA2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1. “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SLBOA2-3: 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.

SLBOA2-4: 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.

SLBOA2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities.”

SLBOA2-6: 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.

SLBOA2-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake.”

SLBOA2-8: 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.

SLBOA2-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

Responses to Comments from Anna Harkradr on Behalf of Read by Michael Tichera from Shasta Marina Resort

SMR2-1: As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” relocation plans were developed to verify that for each action alternative, the existing recreational capacity could be maintained. Reclamation and USFS will continue to work together to develop and finalize plans for relocation of recreational facilities that is suitable for the National Recreation Area, should an alternative be authorized by Congress. At a minimum the current available capacities would be maintained, inundated and affected facilities would be relocated to the extent practicable. Chapter 2, Alternatives, Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” text has been revised to clarify that the affected marinas would be maintained in the immediate vicinity, but due to unforeseen circumstances preventing this, relocating or consolidating with other marinas would be reconsidered. In the Final EIS Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 39, “Recreation Site Status,” has also been updated to reflect that affected marinas would be relocated in place.

SMR2-2: While we thank you for information regarding the operations of your marina 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.

SMR2-3: While we thank you for information regarding the operations of your marina 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.

SMR2-4: As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” relocation plans were developed to verify that for each action alternative, the existing recreational capacity could be maintained. Reclamation and USFS will continue to work together to develop and finalize plans for relocation of recreational facilities that is suitable for the National Recreation Area, should an alternative be authorized by Congress. At a minimum the current available capacities would be maintained, inundated and affected facilities would be relocated to the extent practicable. Chapter 2, Alternatives, Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” text has been revised to clarify that the affected marinas would be maintained in the immediate vicinity, but due to unforeseen circumstances preventing this, relocating or consolidating with other marinas would be reconsidered. In the Final EIS Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 39, “Recreation Site Status,” has also been updated to reflect that affected marinas would be relocated in place.

SMR2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities.”

SMR2-6: 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.

Responses to Comments from Russ Wade on Behalf of Self

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

WADE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

WADE-3: 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.

WADE-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

WADE-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

Responses to Comments from Greg Watkins on Behalf of Councilman of the City of Shasta

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

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

WATK-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

WATK-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-3, “Effects to Tourism at Shasta Lake.”

WATK-5: A detailed discussion on management of the cold-water pool for anadromous fish is presented in Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.6, “Operations and Maintenance,” for CP4 and CP4A. It is explained that Reclamation would work cooperatively with the SRTTG (Sacramento River Temperature Task Group) to determine the best use of the cold-water pool each year under an adaptive cold water management plan. Reclamation would manage the cold-water pool and operate Shasta Dam each year based on recommendations from the SRTTG. Because adaptive management is predicated on using best available science and new information to make decisions, a monitoring program would be implemented as part of the adaptive management plan. SRTTG members would conduct monitoring, develop monitoring protocols, and set performance standards to determine the success of adaptive management actions.”

WATK-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response ALTS-1, “Alternative Selection,”

WATK-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”

WATK-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities,” and Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake.”

WATK-9: As discussed in Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” potential borrow sources were examined at a preliminary level and would need further sampling and testing to determine suitability and refine quantity estimates. A maximum haul route distance of 20 miles was assumed to evaluate a worst-case scenario of traffic, noise and air quality impacts related to haul of borrow materials. Borrow sites will be refined during the final design and permitting phases of the project.

WATK-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process is to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts,” Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities,” and Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake.”

Responses to Comments from Peggy Williams on Behalf of Self

WILL2-1: Comment noted.

WILL2-2: Increased law enforcement needs of an enlarged Shasta Dam are presented in Chapter 22, “Public Services,” Section 22.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”

WILL2-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-2, “Effects on Short-term and Long-term Employment.”

WILL2-4: Increased law enforcement needs of an enlarged Shasta Dam are presented in Chapter 22, “Public Services,” Section 22.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”

WILL2-5: As described in the DEIS Appendices Engineering Summary Appendix, bridge relocations and modifications are described. The Pit River Bridge will require modifications but will remain in place, and no major traffic disruptions are expected.

WILL2-6: As stated in the DEIS Appendices Plan Formulation Appendix Chapter 3, “Shasta Dam and Reservoir Enlargement Scenarios,” raises of up to 30 feet can be accomplished by raising the existing dam crest. A raise greater than 30 feet would require additional mass be added to the structure.

WILL2-7: 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.

WILL2-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

WILL2-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

WILL2-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

WILL2-11: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

WILL2-12: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

WILL2-13: Comment noted.