

33.11.102 William Kaeding

9/19/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Raising the Dam proposition

KAED



SLWRI, BOR MPR <sha-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>

Raising the Dam proposition

1 message

William Kaeding <willsm23@sbcglobal.net> Sun, Sep 15, 2013 at 11:20 AM
From: "BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov" <BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov>

Hello my name is William Kaeding. I'm a Sailor in the United States Navy currently stationed in Mississippi. I'm from Red Bluff and I'm against the raising of the Dam. Hurting those people and their tribes is wrong to do just for some fish and "more power supply." Please don't hurt those people and their lives.

Thank you,

William Kaeding

Response to Comments from William Kaeding

KAED-1: 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 1.1.1, "Project Purpose and Objectives," of the Final EIS, the Project purpose is to improve operational flexibility of the Delta watershed 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 Section 14.3.4, "Mitigation Measures," for "CP1," "CP2," "CP3," "CP4," and "CP5," are identified as significant and unavoidable, with no feasible mitigation identified.

33.11.103 Mary Grace Kaljian

KALJ

From: Mary Grace <mgkaljian@aol.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 23, 2013 at 4:36 PM
Subject: EIS for Shasta Lake
To: kchow@usbr.gov

Dear Katrina,

KALJ-1

We talked briefly at the workshop in Los Banos, CA. After the meeting I was talking to Chris White from the Central California Irrigation District and we were both wondering why one of your proposals won't have been to increase the wall the maximum height that it was designed for originally. - 200 feet. With the dire need for more water in California, and the regret for the lack of foresight for California's water needs when it was originally built...why wouldn't you proposal the optimal plan of 200 feet or somewhere closer to 200 feet. We are talking about meeting needs for the next 100 years! I think that eventually the Delta issues will be negotiated and you could supply the water for most of California's needs for a long, long time.

I just felt that I had to write you this comment. I would shoot for the moon!

sincerely,
Mary Grace Kaljian
209-675-5380 cell

Response to Comments from Mary Grace Kaljian

KALJ-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, "Range of Alternatives – General."

33.11.104 Enid and Arthur Kendall

July 9, 2013
To Katrina Chow and committee
Please do not raise
KEND-1
the Shasta Dam.
Put it to the ballot for people's vote
Sincerely
Enid Kendall
and
Arthur Kendall

Response to Comments from Enid and Arthur Kendall

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

33.11.105 Barbara Kern

KERN

 **PUBLIC COMMENT CARD**

Name: BARBARA KERN Organization: _____

Address: 4238 LA MESA AVE SHASTA LAKE, CA 96019

Email: thekerns2653@sbcglobal.net

Written Comment: PLEASE STOP WASTING OUR WATER. STOP SENDING KERN-1

OUR FRESH WATER DOWN THE DELTA PUT A DAM ~~THE~~ THERE.
WE DON'T NEED THE DAM RAISED AS IT WILL HURT
OUR TOURISM & MOST THE TIME WE CAN'T FILL
THE DAM AS WE DON'T HAVE THAT MUCH RAIN OR KERN-2
SNOW. ALSO NO ONE HAS ADDRESSED IF IS WILL KERN-3
be diverted away from Redding. ~~Many~~ Many Tourist
business will fold as they are already just barely hanging
on & cannot afford to relocate. KERN-4
(Please excuse my penmanship I ~~am~~ have a serious eye
problem.)

Tear here →

Response to Comments from Barbara Kern

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

KERN-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-3, "Effects to Tourism at Shasta Lake," and Master Comment Response WSR-1, "Water Supply Demands, Supplies, and Project Benefits."

KERN-3: Thank you for your comment on the DEIS for the SLWRI, we appreciate your time in responding to the document. There is no plan to reroute Interstate 5 away from Redding. Interstate 5 was a consideration in determining the maximum feasible dam raise would be for this investigation. As stated in the DEIS Appendices Plan Formulation Appendix any raise larger than 18.5 feet would require modifications to the Pit River Bridge which carries both the railroad and Interstate 5 which would be cost prohibitive. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

KERN-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-3, "Effects to Tourism at Shasta Lake."

33.11.106 Kimberly Anne

10/18/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - NO DAM

KIMA



SLWRI BOR MPR <sha-mp@slwri@usbr.gov?>

NO DAM

1 message

kimberly anne <alisvolat00@yahoo.com> Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 1:22 PM
Reply-To: kimberly anne <alisvolat00@yahoo.com>
To: "BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov" <BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov>

KIMA-1 Is. Katrina,

If you have any pull at all in stopping the damming at Shasta, please do so. The cost way outweighs the benefit, monetarily as well as in resources both physical and sacred to the people of the area.

Thank you.

~KimAnne

Response to Comments from Kimberly Anne

KIMA-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, "Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest," and Master Comment Response CR-1, "Potential Effects to Cultural Resources."

33.11.107 Kathryn Kirkman Campbell



Public Comment Card

During the 90-day public review and comment period for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation (SLWRI) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Reclamation provides several methods for the receipt of written comments. This public comment card is on **KIRK-1** for interested persons to submit written comments, which will be included and addressed in the Final EIS and retained in the SLWRI Record. Please write clearly. You may leave this card at today's meeting or mail at your convenience. Writer **KIRK-2** may also be sent by email to bor-mpr-slwr@usbr.gov or provided in-person at related workshops and/or public hearings. All written comments must be **KIRK-3** postmarked on or before September 30, 2013.

Name: KATHRYN KIRKMAN CAMPBELL Organization: SELF
Address: 543 AURORA PL., REDDING, CA 96001
Email: kato.doctor@m@gmail.com

Comment: I attended the first meeting in Redding on Tuesday, 7/16. I came for information, without preconceived notions. I appreciated the staff's difficulties in dealing with a hostile audience. However, in discussing the hydrology graphs and questioning the benefits in raising Shasta Dam, I was treated with some disdain. I am a professional (MD) with lots of science and experience with graphs. I'm not sure my concerns about the increases in available water by raising the dam were addressed. I am unaware of any effect by raising the dam on my own properties, and can only be affected as an environmental advocate, taxpayer, and utilizer of Shasta Co.'s outdoors. It was hard to ignore a feeling that this meeting was a PR effort only, and the raising of Shasta Dam is a fait accompli. Specially since I've subsequently heard that Senator Diane Feinstein is committed to accomplishing it.

Response to Comments from Kathryn Kirkman Campbell

KIRK-1: Comment noted.

KIRK-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, "Comment Included as Part of the Record."

KIRK-3: Comment noted.

33.11.108 Mardy Kisling

7/23/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Public comment(s) period to raise issues for real property owners RE: raising of Shasta Dam



KISL1

SLWRI, BOR MPR <sha-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>

Public comment(s) period to raise issues for real property owners RE: raising of Shasta Dam

1 message

Mardy Kisling <mfkisling@dishmail.net> Tue, Jul 2, 2013 at 5:53 PM

To: "bor-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov" <bor-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>

^: "sugarloafhomes@gmail.com" <sugarloafhomes@gmail.com>
KISL1-1

At the Lakehead Community Meeting recently, the comments made by Chuck Johnson, BOR/Mid-Pacific Regional Realty Officer, was rude and had signs of being a school bully. He commented that price values the Bureau will be paying to residential owners will not be high to bail out the investments of the owners. If owners over built, that's their problem. I am urging Congress restate clearly that considerations paid to acquire residential properties MUST BE A FAIR VALUE. Fair value should be arrived by various material matters, including comparable sales, actual supportive construction costs, land acquisition costs and other reliable FAIR WAYS to deal with owners the Bureau plans to acquire properties.

Summary: Emphasis on "FAIR VALUE" to be paid in the taking of citizens' properties.

Sincerely, Tom & Mardi Kisling

Sent from my iPad

Response to Comments from Mardy Kisling

KISL1-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, "Effects to Private Residences and Businesses."

33.11.109 Tom and Mardi Kisling

KISL2

September 22, 2013^D

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OFFICIAL FILE COPY SEP 27 2013
to: K Duncan 27 Sep 13
to: K Chow

Katrina Chow, Project Manager, Reclamation, Planning Division
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

RE: Public Comment(s) Period, ending September 30, 2013, to raise issues regarding property owners on the proposed raising of Shasta Dam

WILLING BUYER VS. UNWILLING SELLER

KISL2-1 The taking (eminent domain) is not as simple as government paying a "Fair Market Value". Simply, this verbiage is "a buyer's point of view". Congress should REWORD the existing law governing prices paid for eminent domain acquisitions.

KISL2-2 *Payment should be based on: Fair Market Value and/or actual cost paid by owner(s)*

KISL2-3 Cost paid by owners can be verified by owners receipts/construction cost payouts/escrow closing statements.

KISL2-4 The "final" occupancy permit on our newly built house is just six years ago (October 13, 2008). We have over three million dollars invested in our lake front property. There are no lake front residences comparable to our investment. There is no market value established to compare our new home value.

KISL2-5 *Eminent domain prices, therefore, need to be updated.

Sincerely,

Tom & Mardi Kisling
17860 Lake Drive
Lakehead, CA 96051
(530) 238-2616
mardikisling2@gmail.com

SCANNED	
Classification	PRJ-23,00
Project	214
Control No.	13043592
Folder I.D.	1224516
Date Input & nihal	9-27-13 RM

Response to Comments from Tom and Mardi Kisling

KISL2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, "Effects to Private Residences and Businesses."

KISL2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

KISL2-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

KISL2-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

KISL2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

33.11.110 Tom and Mardell Kisling

KISL3

COPY

August 18, 2013

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	
OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED	
AUG 21 2013	
CA 96019	FILE NAME
700	KDuncan
150	21 Aug 2013
70	Received off
	to: K Chow
Raising of Shasta Dam	

U.S.A.

Bureau of Reclamation

Attention: Brian Person, Bureau of Rec./No. Ca. Area Manager, 16349 Shasta Dam Blvd., Shasta Lake, CA 96019
 Chuck Johnson, Bureau of Reclamation/Mid-Pacific Regional Realty Officer
 2800 Cottage Way, MP-720, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898
 Katrina Chow, Bureau of Reclamation/Mid-Pacific Region/SLWRI Project Manager
 2800 Cottage Way, PM-720, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898
 Sheri Harral, Public Affairs Specialist, 16349 Shasta Dam Blvd., Shasta Lake, CA 96019

KISL3-1

RE: Public Comment(s) Period to Raise Issues Regarding Property Owners on the Proposed Raising of Shasta Dam

The reason for writing to you is, the Bureau has stated in public meetings that they will follow the law on paying a market value....if someone has overbuilt over the market price, they will not bail the homeowner out. Some owners, like us, took today's life savings, paid cash for building their homes, and it would not be fair for the government to pay two, three or four hundred thousand to take property that clearly can be proved to have cost more. Please amend the law for the government to pay a "FAIR VALUE" when taking property.

KISL3-2

Two issues:

A. Regarding our lake front recently built log home, any appraisal for our residence will need to include two (2) parcels. One parcel, Lot 13, fee title which includes our log home (APN 085-040-15 @ 17860 Lake Dr., Lakehead, CA) plus parcel two (portion of APN 083-040-14) being a very large area composed of an exclusive right of way. (Legal descriptions, and map copies are enclosed) Your records only show one parcel.

KISL3-3

B. The need for Congress to include reasonable and fair payment to the property owners for value spent on construction costs in addition to the land value. It is widely known many houses built in the 50's, 60's, 70's and 80's have an average today's market value of 200-400 thousand dollars. Some like ours, only five years old, were built with today's money and costs far exceed this amount. See aerial photo and entry photo, to easily see that our log home is worth more than four hundred thousand dollars. Congress needs to amend the rules now in effect to be based on proven new construction costs, comparable sales, land values and market values to determine a FAIR VALUE.

Congress must update their MARKET VALUE terminology to a FAIR VALUE in their proposal to take private owners property, the term MARKET VALUE is outdated and not in tune to custom built homes around the lake, as well as throughout the U.S.A.

Please amend the Bureau's guide lines before approving raising Shasta Lake Dam. Suggested amendment: Prices to be paid for property acquisitions must be based on A FAIR VALUE. At one public meeting, a Mid Pacific Regional Realty Officer told the public: If owners overbuilt, that's their problem. The Bureau will pay market value. This is wrong and clarification of the law governing eminent domain should be worded more realistic to be fair.

Sincerely,



Tom Kisling and Mardell Kisling
 Kisling Family Trust/Owners
 17860 Lake Drive, Lakehead, CA 96051 mardikisling2@gmail.com (530) 238-2616

cc: Doug La Malfa, Representative, 280 Hemsted Dr., Suite 105, Redding, CA 96002
 Diane Feinstein, Senator, 1 Post, Suite 240, San Francisco, CA 94105
 Barbara Boxer, Senator, 70 Washington, Suite 203, Oakland, CA 94607

NOTICE: IF YOU DETACH
 ENCLOSURE PLEASE INSERT

CODE NO. _____
 INITIAL _____
 DATE _____

COPY

SCANNED

Classification	LND-6.00
Project	214
Control No	13038674
Folder I.D.	1156933
Date Input & Initials	8/21/2013


**SURVEY REPORT FOR
17860 LAKE DR, LAKEHEAD, CA 96051**



S:\GIS\City\Shasta\Division\Shasta\Dem. GIS\Shasta Bureau\ElElevations\ElElevations_August12
 Date Shared: 11/07/2012 3:06:00 PM

Legend

- F Ground elevation (feet)
- Approximate parcel boundary*
- Approx. full pool from 18.5' dam raise with buffer (1093' elev.)**
- Approx. full pool from 12.5' dam raise with buffer (1088' elev.)**
- Approx. full pool from 6.5' dam raise with buffer (1082' elev.)**



Notes:

1. Survey conducted in August 2012 as part of the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation.
 2. All elevations based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988.
 3. Information is subject to change.
- *-Parcel boundaries from Shasta County Assessors Office are approximate, shown for reference only and may not represent actual property boundaries.
 **-Estimated water surface elevation of the reservoir when filled to full pool plus an approximate vertical buffer of 3 feet. These elevations were calculated from aerial mapping with a 2-foot contour interval; actual location of contours may vary from plotted line.

Order No. 1401-13394
AMEND

PARCEL ONE:

EXHIBIT "A"
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE LAND DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SITUATED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SHASTA, UNINCORPORATED AREA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

LOT 14 OF SHASTA LAKE SUBDIVISION UNIT NO. 2, IN SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 5 WEST, M.D.B. & M., AS PER MAP OF SAID SUBDIVISION RECORDED OCTOBER 16, 1952 IN BOOK 8 OF MAPS AT PAGE 14, SHASTA COUNTY RECORDS.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM AN UNDIVIDED ONE-HALF INTEREST IN AND TO ALL VALUABLE MINERALS, OIL, AND GAS, IN OR ON SAID LAND, AS RESERVED IN THE DEED FROM J. L. "RENNIE" RENFRO, ET UX., TO HARRY O. JOHNSON ET UX., RECORDED JANUARY 24, 1935 IN BOOK 448 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS AT PAGE 134, SHASTA COUNTY RECORDS.

A.P.N. 085-040-014

PARCEL TWO:

AN EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT FOR LEACH LINES, DISTRIBUTION BOX, INGRESS AND EGRESS, PARKING, MAINTENANCE, LANDSCAPING, FENCING, PROPANE TANK, GENERATOR, WATER & GAS & ELECTRICAL LINES AND RELATED PURPOSES OVER THAT PORTION OF LOT 14, SHASTA LAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 2, RECORDED ON OCTOBER 16, 1952 IN BOOK 8 OF MAPS AT PAGE 14, SHASTA COUNTY RECORDS, LOCATED WITHIN SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 5 WEST, MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE MOST NORTHERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 14, SOUTH 33 DEGREES 53'06" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 53.08 FEET TO THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 14, ALONG A 90.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, THE RADIUS POINT OF WHICH BEARS NORTH 80 DEGREES 14'43" WEST, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 51 DEGREES 14'43", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 54.585 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 61 DEGREES 00'00" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 19.185 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHEAST LINE, NORTH 5 DEGREES 57'09" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 92.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHWEST LINE OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHWEST LINE, ALONG A 90.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, THE RADIUS POINT OF WHICH BEARS NORTH 27 DEGREES 48'22" WEST, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 6 DEGREES 05'14", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 9.56 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

EXCEPTING FROM SAID EASEMENT, THE RIGHT TO INGRESS AND EGRESS, THE RIGHT TO PARK, THE RIGHT TO LANDSCAPE AND USE FOR UNDERGROUND LEACH LINES, AND THE RIGHT TO MAINTAIN THE SAME, ON ANY PORTION THEREOF LYING SOUTHERLY OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID EASEMENT, FROM WHICH THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER THEREOF BEARS SOUTH 5 DEGREES 57'09" WEST 25.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 50 DEGREES EAST 28.00 FEET MORE OR LESS TO A POINT IN THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID EASEMENT.

CLTA Preliminary Report

PRK-CRMA

RECORDING REQUESTED BY
Thomas P. Kisting Trustee
Mardell F. Kisting Trustee

MAIL TAX STATEMENTS TO
AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL.
Thomas P. Kisting Trustee
Mardell F. Kisting Trustee
17860 Lake Drive
Lakehead, Ca 96051

*PARCELS
TWO
CREATED*

*12/27/2006
Doc # 0065199*

COPT of Document Recorded
27-Dec-2006 2006-0065199
Has not been compared with
original
SHASTA COUNTY RECORDER

*AND Subsequent Deed
From Kisting 10/26/06 in June 2007*

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

APN: 085-040-14(PTN), 085-040-15

EASEMENT DEED

The undersigned grantor(s) declare(s):
Documentary transfer tax is \$ 0.00 *(transferred from less than one hundred dollars)*
 computed on full value of property conveyed, or
 computed on full value less value of liens and encumbrances remaining at time of sale
 Unincorporated area City of _____, and

FOR A VALUABLE CONSIDERATION, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.
Thomas P. Kisting and Mardell F. Kisting, Trustees under that certain Trust Agreement entitled "Kisting Family Trust"
dated May 26, 1987 and Amended December 4, 2001 and December 26, 2002

reby GRANT(S) to
Thomas P. Kisting and Mardell F. Kisting, Trustees under that certain Trust Agreement entitled "Kisting Family Trust"
dated May 26, 1987 and Amended December 4, 2001 and December 26, 2002
the following described real property in the County of Shasta County, State of California.

See Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof

Dated: *Dec. 10, 2006*
~~December 10, 2006~~

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF *SANTA CRUZ*

On *Dec 24, 2006* before me, *Andrea*
Kisting (Insert Name of Notary Public) a Notary

Public, personally appeared
Thomas P. Kisting and Mardell F. Kisting
personally known to me (I proved to me on the basis of satisfactory
evidence) to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the
within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed
the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by
his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity
upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument

His Sign. From 6 years
SS. *[Signature]*
Thomas P. Kisting, Trustee
[Signature]
Mardell F. Kisting, Trustee

WITNESS my hand and official seal

Signature *[Signature]*



MAIL TAX STATEMENT AS DIRECTED ABOVE

Order No. 1401-13394
AMEND

EXHIBIT "A"
LEGAL DESCRIPTION continued

THIS EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IS APPURTENANT TO AND IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ADJOINING LOT 13 OF SAID SHASTA LAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 2, NOW OWNED BY THOMAS P. KISLING AND MARDELL F. KISLING, TRUSTEES UNDER THAT CERTAIN TRUST AGREEMENT ENTITLED "KISLING FAMILY TRUST" DATED MAY 26, 1986 AND AMENDED DECEMBER 4, 2001 AND DECEMBER 26, 2002

A.P.N. 085-040-014 (PORTION)
A.P.N. 085-040-015

IT IS AGREED BETWEEN THE GRANTEE AND GRANTOR THAT THE GRANTEE, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAINTAIN THAT PORTION THE EXISTING SEPTIC AND LEACH FIELD SYSTEM LYING WITHIN SAID EASEMENT THAT CURRENTLY SERVES THE FIRST HEREINABOVE DESCRIBED PROPERTY

CLTA Preliminary Report

LEGAL 7

EXHIBIT "A"

AN EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT FOR LEACH LINES, DISTRIBUTION BOX, INGRESS AND EGRESS, PARKING, MAINTENANCE, LANDSCAPING, FENCING, PROPANE TANK, GENERATOR, WATER & GAS & ELECTRICAL LINES AND RELATED PURPOSES OVER THAT PORTION OF LOT 14, SHASTA LAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 2, RECORDED ON OCTOBER 16, 1992 IN BOOK 8 OF MAPS AT PAGE 14, SHASTA COUNTY RECORDS, LOCATED WITHIN SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 5 WEST, MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:


BEGINNING AT THE MOST NORTHERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 14, SOUTH 33°53'06" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 33.08 FEET TO THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 14, ALONG A 90.00-FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, THE RADIUS POINT OF WHICH BEARS NORTH 80°14'43" WEST, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 51°14'43", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 54.585 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 61°00'00" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 19.185 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID SOUTHEAST LINE, NORTH 5°57'09" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 92.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHWEST LINE OF SAID LOT 14; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHWEST LINE, ALONG A 90.00-FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, THE RADIUS POINT OF WHICH BEARS NORTH 27°48'22" WEST, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 6°05'14", AN ARC DISTANCE OF 9.56 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THIS EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IS APPURTENANT TO AND IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ADJOINING LOT 13 OF SAID SHASTA LAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 2, NOW OWNED BY THOMAS P. KISLING AND MARDELL F. KISLING, TRUSTEES UNDER THAT CERTAIN TRUST AGREEMENT ENTITLED "KISLING FAMILY TRUST" DATED MAY 26, 1986 AND AMENDED DECEMBER 4, 2001 AND DECEMBER 26, 2002

APN: 085-040-014 (PORTION)
APN: 085-040-015




Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
 Environmental Impact Statement



FOR REFERENCE ONLY
 This map was prepared by the
 Shasta County Surveyor
 on 11/11/14

Shasta Lake Subdivision, Unit 2, R.M. 8-14,
 11/11/14



Response to Comments from Tom and Mardell Kisling

KISL3-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

KISL3-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

KISL3-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

33.11.111 Ruth Koenig

10/18/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - SHASTA DAM

KOEN



SLWRI, BOR, MPR <sha-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>

SHASTA DAM

MESSAGE

RUTH KOENIG <ruth2341@msn.com> Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 12:48 PM
To: "BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov" <bor-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>

To: Bureau of Reclamation staff and project manager
From: Ruth Koenig, Eugene, Oregon 97405
Re: Shasta Dam and twin tunnels proposals

KOEN-1 It is irresponsible to move forward on a plan to raise Shasta Dam 18.5 ft. That
action would scrap viable plans for return of Chinook salmon to the McCloud
River,
KOEN-2 and destroy remaining sacred sites along the McCloud.]The US government has
KOEN-3 been responsible for past violations of human rights and creation of environmental
degradation. These practices **MUST stop.**] Moving forward on the dam raise, and
KOEN-4 creation of twin tunnels for transport of water is unconscionable. You have
a responsibility to future generations to do the right thing now. Please act
responsibly.

In sincere hope for water and human rights sustainability.
Ruth Koenig

Response to Comments from Ruth Koenig

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

KOEN-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”

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

KOEN-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” and Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

33.11.112 Eitam Kohen

KOHE

9/25/2013

Eitam Kohen
3411 20th street,
San Francisco, CA, 94110
Sep 25 2013

Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager,
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 cottage way, MP-726
Sacramento, CA, 95825

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OFFICIAL FILE COPY RECEIVED		
SEP 30 2013		
CODE	ACTION	SUBMITTED DATE
769	K. Kohen	
18	Oct 13	

RE: Public comments on the SLWRI DEIS

Dear Ms. Chow,

KOHE-1

I write you this letter as a response to the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal to increase the height of Shasta dam. The two main objectives of the proposed project are (a) to increase water reliability for municipal and industrial use as well as for agricultural use, and (b) to improve the survival rates of endangered anadromous fish in the Sacramento River. As a state and federal taxpayer, I want to be sure my money is put to the best use. It is my opinion that this project fails to offer other alternatives in an attempt to meet the goals it had set and that in the long run it doesn't solve the underlying problems but only exacerbates them. Furthermore, my study of the social impact of the project lead me to conclude that there will be an unfair share of the burden, with one group in particular, the Winnemem Wintu Tribe (WWT), paying a huge cost, while other groups benefit from the project.

KOHE-2

KOHE-3

Water reliability

KOHE-4

One of the main objectives of the proposed action is to increase water supply reliability for municipal, industrial and agricultural use. Whereas I understand the urge to meet the needs of a growing California population, I do believe that other alternatives to increase water reliability should take precedent to a project of this size, considering its ecological and social footprint.

KOHE-5

Reducing our consumption of water and maintaining an overall better water management are some things individuals and industries alike could do at the end of the pipe. Citizens of California need to be better educated about water shortage problems. It might be painful to some, but shouldn't we try to convert our irrigated grass lawns to other, more sustainable methods of gardening? Can't we sacrifice some of our golf courses first, before we cut down thousands of trees?

KOHE-6

The project that the American taxpaying community is being asked to help fund here has a significant impact on the environment, not only in the immediate surrounding of the lake but also further downstream. Because the dam was built as part of the Central Valley Project, allocated water flows from the lake to irrigate the farms along the central valley. Because farmers had used massive amounts of water to irrigate the central valley, an area that has historically been dry with high evaporation rates, a new set of problems had sprouted. Both soil salinization and the mobilization of heavy metals to the surface has resulted in a change in the soil's chemistry that negatively affects the health of the crops and wildlife that grow and inhabit this region.

KOHE-7

One short-term solution, a wasteful one in my eyes, would be to just irrigate with more water in order to dilute or flush out the minerals and heavy metals. Raising the height of the dam would only make this option more viable. Since taxpayers' money helped build the dam, and in an attempt to increase water reliability, perhaps the government should ensure that the crops that are grown there are not water intensive crops like cotton or rice, that the methods to deliver the water are as efficient as can be, and that the produce is meant for local (national) human consumption.

KOHE-8

KOHE-9

The DEIS must reflect the latest possible word in science. As studies about climate change and its effects on the environment continue to be done by the scientific community, Reclamation cannot rely on outdated information surrounding this topic. I'm sure I am not the only

Classification	FNV-6.00
Project	214
Control No.	13043860
Folder I.D.	1230427
Prepared & Initials	J. L. TW

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement

KOHE-9 CONTD	<p>one concerned about the dam's ability to meet its goal of increased water availability when facing global and regional changes in weather patterns. One component of climate change is that precipitation patterns change as well, resulting in the possibility of less precipitation in the Shasta lake watershed. This raises the question of whether or not the reservoir can even fill up at all after all the energy and resources we put into building it. The information from the most recent researches about climate change could help answer this question and therefore ought to be included in the DEIS.</p>
KOHE-10	<p>Global warming is yet another main component of climate change that may affect the project's ability to meet its goals. We know that global warming affects climate patterns and we know that we contribute to the enhanced greenhouse effect by increasing the concentration of specific greenhouse gases in the atmosphere by burning fossil fuels on the one hand and removing carbon sinks such as forests on the other hand. While this project is expected to increase the capacity of the Shasta dam to produce "clean" energy, its construction will have a big carbon footprint. Not only will it require the burning of massive amounts of fossil fuels to produce the concrete for the building of the dam, the increase in surface area of the lake means that we will clear cut a large amount of forest. The remaining vegetation that would be flooded will rot underwater and release to the atmosphere greenhouse gases of varying potency, depending on <u>underwater oxygen availability</u>. Furthermore, as temperatures rise, so do evaporation rates.</p>
KOHE-11	<p>Therefore, increasing the lake's surface area, coupled with higher temperatures yields one possible outcome - loss of more water as a result of evaporation.</p>
KOHE-12	<p>Finally, a few questions that rose during a discussion I was part of, touched at some alternatives that weren't mentioned in the DEIS that I wanted to ask you about. The first dealt with the Sacramento river's carrying capacity - <u>how much water it can carry without flooding</u> - and the other was about removing sediment from the bottom of the lake. While the second question is</p>
KOHE-13	<p>pretty straight forward - whether another way to increase the volume of water in the lake would be by <u>removing material that had accumulated along the years</u>. The other question was harder for me to understand at first. If we look at the water needed to reach the south, there is pretty much one way of its delivery and that is by the Sacramento River. If we add more water to the lake, we need to add more water in the river. How much more water then can we safely add to the river without the risk of flooding it, and is it really worth raising the dam for that amount of extra water?</p>
KOHE-14	<p></p>
KOHE-15	<p><u>Fish survival</u> The other primary objective of the proposal to raise Shasta dam is to increase the pool of cold water, which is thought to be a factor that will help endangered salmon populations better <u>survive and rebound</u>. A healthy fish population, like the one that was here before the construction of the dam, is one that is allowed to swim to pristine spawning grounds. Historically those grounds were upstream of where the lake is located, and the dam acts as an effective barrier, blocking the fish and denying them from swimming further upstream. It makes sense to me then, that if we want a healthier fish population, we ought to help them reach their desired destination.</p>
KOHE-16	<p>Any proposal to raise the dam will allow the destruction of even more spawning grounds upstream of the lake, and increase the distance that anadromous fish will have to swim before reaching these locations - two factors that work against the fishes' survivability as a specie. Therefore, any proposal to raise the dam should be coupled with a proposal to create a viable <u>passage</u> for these fish to return to the rivers upstream of the lake.</p>
KOHE-17	<p>The salmon plays an important role not only in the larger ecosystem, but also in a cultural way. The Winnemem Wintu tribe sees the salmon as an integral part of their life and identity. As a San Francisco State University student, I had the privilege to go on a field trip and visit members of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe. After meeting with them, and hearing about their way of life, it had become apparent to me the severity of the impact they will face by the raise of the dam. They have such a deep and important connection with the land, and all of their sacred sites lay either right above or below the level of water in the McCloud arm of the Shasta reservoir. raising the dam would flood most of the remaining 10% of historic land they claim belongs to them. As a Jewish person, that studied the history of my people, who had wandered across the face of the Earth for millennia, I can understand the importance that land and sacred sites have to a culture. I cannot imagine what would happen if any entity would propose to flood, demolish, or simply</p>

KOHE-17
CONTD

↑
relocate the Wailing Wall. Bringing it closer to home, it is hard for me to foresee a situation where the people or the government of the USA would be okay with the demolishing Mount Rushmore for any reason. Why then is it so easy for our government, the same government that failed to keep their promise of providing the WWT with like land after its inundation by young Shasta lake, to propose a plan that would result in the flooding the remaining 10% of WWT land still above water. The DEIS should have included the WWT in their preliminary scoping process as the framework for the project was built.

KOHE-18

When combining all the points I had mentioned above, it is clear to me how deeply I object the idea of raising the dam by any number of feet. We live in a state that is very rich in resources. However, I feel that we have forgotten that these resources are not endless, and it is my opinion that disrupting the balance of the natural world cannot last too long without nature pushing back and being altering us too. Water shortage and declining fish populations are problems that this project cannot fix. At best, it can offer relief for a short while, although I am not even convinced that is true. We need to look at every option that is out there, even the ones we are most afraid of before choosing our path. I want that path to include those whose voices we hear the least at the tables in Sacramento, whether they are special groups or members of the greater web of life.

Sincerely,
Eitam Kohen

signature: _____



date: _____

9/25/2013

Response to Comments from Eitam Kohen

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

KOHE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

KOHE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-5, “Environmental Justice.”

KOHE-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” and Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

KOHE-5: 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.”

KOHE-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.”

KOHE-7: Thank you for sharing your opinion on this topic. Central Valley agricultural water quality issues are outside the scope of the SLWRI and are being addressed by Reclamation and other stakeholders under separate programs from the SLWRI. Examples of these programs/initiatives include the San Luis Drainage Reevaluation Program, Grassland Bypass Project, and the Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS). This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

KOHE-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

KOHE-9: The information used in this EIS reflects current understanding of the potential range of climate change effects. A list of technical articles that were reviewed during the climate change analysis is presented in the Reference section of Climate Change Modeling Appendix. The future climate projections described in the Climate Change Modeling appendix include a wide range of potential climate changes. The modeling analyses indicate that enlarged Shasta Dam will result in more storage than could be achieved with the current reservoir regardless of whether there is more or less precipitation than occurs under present climate conditions. Refer to Figures 3-120 through 3-122 of the Climate Change Modelling Appendix. Please refer to Master Comment Response CC-1, “Climate Change Uncertainty and Related Evaluations.”

KOHE-10: The commenter expresses concern about the carbon footprint of project construction. The net change in GHG emissions associated with implementation of each Comprehensive Plan (CP) is discussed under Impact AQ-6. For CP-1, this discussion begins on page 5-43 of Chapter 5, “Air Quality and Climate,” Section 5.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”

The commenter also expresses concern about the “the burning of massive amounts of fossil fuels to produce the concrete for the building of the dam.” Please refer to Master Comment Response AQ-4, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions Associated with Cement Production.”

The commenter expresses concern about the GHG and global climate change implication from the “clear cut [of] a large amount of forest.” Please refer to Master Comment Response AQ-2, “Loss of Carbon Sequestration and Carbon Sequestration Potential.”

The commenter expresses concern about “the remaining vegetation that would be flooded will rot underwater and release to the atmosphere

greenhouse gases of varying potency, depending on underwater oxygen availability.” Please refer to Master Comment Response AQ-3, “Potential for Green House Gas Emissions Generated by the Decomposition of Soil and Vegetative Material in the Expanded Reservoir.”

KOHE-11: Please refer to Master Comment Response RE-1, “Reservoir Evaporation.”

KOHE-12: Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Section 6.1.5, “Flood Management,” of the DEIS describes major features of the flood management system in the primary and extended study areas, including reservoirs, levees, weirs, and bypasses. Historical operation of these facilities also is described. Detailed information is available in the Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management Technical Report, Chapter 1, “Affected Environment,” Section 1.1.5, “Flood Management.”

As described in Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Section 6.3.3, “Direct and Indirect Effects,” and Section 6.3.4, “Mitigation Measures,” of the DEIS, no flood management mitigation measures are proposed for the action alternatives because no potentially significant flood management impacts have been identified (Impact H&H-2, “Place housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area,” and Impact H&H-3, “Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows”). Impact H&H-1, “Change in frequency of flows above 100,000 cfs on the Sacramento River Below Bend Bridge,” could result in beneficial impacts, so no mitigation is needed. Operation of an enlarged Shasta Dam would not cause greater downstream flooding because impacts are either less than significant or beneficial.

KOHE-13: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

KOHE-14: Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Section 6.1.5, “Flood Management,” of the DEIS describes major features of the flood management system in the primary and extended study areas, including reservoirs, levees, weirs, and bypasses. Historical operation of these facilities also is described. Detailed information is available in the Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management Technical Report, Chapter 1, “Affected Environment,” Section 1.1.5, “Flood Management.”

As described in Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Section 6.3.3, “Direct and Indirect Effects,” and Section 6.3.4, “Mitigation Measures,” of the DEIS, no flood management

mitigation measures are proposed for the action alternatives because no potentially significant flood management impacts have been identified (Impact H&H-2, “Place housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area,” and Impact H&H-3, “Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows”). Impact H&H-1, “Change in frequency of flows above 100,000 cfs on the Sacramento River Below Bend Bridge,” could result in beneficial impacts, so no mitigation is needed. Operation of an enlarged Shasta Dam would not cause greater downstream flooding because impacts are either less than significant or beneficial.

KOHE-15: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

KOHE-16: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

KOHE-17: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-8, “Native American Connection to Salmon,” Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources,” and Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

KOHE-18: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

33.11.113 Christine Kovacs

10/24/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Shasta Dam - do not raise it

KOVA



SLWRI, BOR MPR <shasta-mp@usbr.gov>

Shasta Dam - do not raise it

1 message

Christine Kovacs <ckovacs99@yahoo.com> Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 1:09 PM
Reply-To: Christine Kovacs <ckovacs99@yahoo.com>
To: "BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov" <BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov>

I have only now in the last minute found out about the action proposed to raise Shasta Dam.

KOVA-1

I lived in California for 24 years.
I am aware of the Dam.

KOVA-2

I support the position of the Winnemen Winto tribe.

Do not raise the dam, **please**

KOVA-3

No everything we want is in the best interests of our global, and in this case, American, society.

We as individuals, as business or as governments cannot do something this disasterous.

We cannot balance business [even something as important as water to produce food] versus the Rivers.

KOVA-4

We must be humble.

We must find other ways OR actually know it is wrong to do everything we want to do.



<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=c2ba651c16&view=pt&search=inbox&th=141707dc28fe2676>

1/2

KOVA-4
CONTD.

↑
That is the case here.

I repeat,

I support the position of the Winnemen Winto tribe.

KOVA-5

Do not raise the dam, **please**

**That is the human way to be - can we remember how to do that?
Please.**

Response to Comments from Christine Kovacs

KOVA-1: Comment noted.

KOVA-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.

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

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

KOVA-5: 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.

33.11.114 Wesley Lachman

10/19/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Contra Shasta Dam Raising

LACH



SLWRI, BOR MPR <sha-mpri@usbr.gov>

Contra Shasta Dam Raising

1 message

Wesley Lachman <lachman@comcast.net>
To: BOR-MPR-SLWRI@usbr.gov

Sun, Sep 29, 2013 at 6:04 PM

Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Mgr.
US Bureau of Reclamation, Planning Div.

Dear Ms. Chow:

LACH-1 I am sorry to hear about the plan to raise the level of Shasta Dam in order to
LACH-2 obtain a relatively small amount of water. It also comes with a large price tag.
LACH-3 Surely the life and culture of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe and their salmon run
deserves full consideration.
When we remember the terrible injustices and murders that the American Indian
peoples suffered due to our "white man's justice," we should do all we can to see
that they are not stepped upon again during our watch.

Sincerely,

Wesley Lachman

Response to Comments from Wesley Lachman

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

LACH-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, "Comment Included as Part of the Record."

LACH-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, "Current Effects to Cultural Resources," and Master Comment Response CR-5, "Environmental Justice."

33.11.115 Desiree Lagrone



Public Comment Card

LAGR

During the 90-day public review and comment period for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation (SLWRI) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Reclamation provides several methods for the receipt of written comments. This public comment card is one method for interested persons to provide written comments, which included and addressed in the Final EIS and retained in the SLWRI Record. Please write clearly. You may leave this card at today's meeting or mail at your convenience. Written comments may also be sent by email to bor-mpr-slwn@usbr.gov provided in-person at related shops and/or public hearings. All written comments must be sent/postmarked on or before midnight on September 30, 2013.

Name: DESIREE LAGRONE Organization: SALT CREEK REC. DIST.
Address: 299. S. HOW ST, SAN JOSE, CA 95112
Email: DESIREE.LAMAGGIORE@GMAIL.COM

Comment

RECREATIONAL RESIDENCES SHOULD BE
AFFORDED SAME OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE
A PROPERTY SPECIFIC SURVEY CONDUCTED
FOR SPECIFIC IMPACT INFORMATION.
WHILE LAND IS LEASED, ALL IMPROVEMENTS
ARE PERSONAL PROPERTY, SUBJECT TO
LOCAL TAXES.

Response to Comments from Desiree Lagrone

LAGR-1: During the public comment period, several comments were received regarding the ground surveys that were performed in 2012 for privately owned structures that were potentially affected by the project. Commenters expressed their desire to have this same opportunity afforded to recreation structures located around Lake Shasta that may be affected.

As described in the DEIS Real Estate Appendix, Chapter 3, "Results," Section, "Structure Surveys," the surveys were only performed on 170 parcels for willing owners. Comments received included requests to extrapolate surveys from completed parcels to adjoining and/or nearby parcels, to conduct additional ground surveys to structures on private property and land leased by permit issued by the USFS, and to provide clarity to why USFS permit holders were not included in the original surveys. Reclamation performed the surveys to reevaluated and compare sensitivities of partial and full acquisitions to the estimated real estate impacts included in the Real Estate Appendix. This sensitivity analysis served to determine if the real estate impacts applied for the purposes of the DEIS are consistent among all structures. Survey results show that original determinations were generally within ± 5 percent.

Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-2, "Ground Surveys for Recreation Facilities," and Master Comment Response FSCABINS-9, "Structure Surveys for USFS Cabins."

LAGR-2: Comment noted.

33.11.116 Avis Lagrone

10/23/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Fwd: Submission of Public Comment for SLWRI Draft EIS



DUNCAN, KATHLEEN <kduncan@usbr.gov>

Fwd: Submission of Public Comment for SLWRI Draft EIS

1 MESSAGE

KATRINA CHOW <kchow@usbr.gov>
To: KATHLEEN DUNCAN <kduncan@usbr.gov>

Wed, Oct 23, 2013 at 1:11 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <LAAVIS@aol.com>
Date: September 30, 2013, 9:01:17 PM PDT
To: <bor-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov>, <kchow@usbr.gov>, <nrezeau@fs.fed.us>
Subject: Fwd: Submission of Public Comment for SLWRI Draft EIS

From: desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com
To: Laavis@aol.com
Sent: 9/30/2013 7:04:57 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Submission of Public Comment for SLWRI Draft EIS

Bureau of Reclamation
Planning Division
2800 Cottage Way, MP – 700
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893

Attn: Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager, Bureau of Reclamation, SLWRI

CC: Mr. Nathan Rezeau, Deputy District Ranger, Shasta-Trinity National Forest

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=20581cb21c&view=pt&search=inbox&th=141e6f114a41c6f9>

4/2

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
SUBMISSION OF PUBLIC COMMENT FOR SLWRI DRAFT EIS

	Subject: Comment on SLWRI Draft EIS
LAGRO-1	I am commenting on the SLWRI Draft EIS as both a private property owner of a potentially impacted lot on Oak Street in Lakehead and as a USFS special use permit holder with a cabin in the Salt Creek Recreation Residence tract that also "may be impacted" by the plans put forth in the SLWRI Draft EIS. I am participating in the public comment process for the following reasons:
LAGRO-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">To establish my eligibility to comment/object to the Forest Service's draft decisions relating to this project. It is my understanding the Forest Service will provide draft decisions later in the SLWRI process and I wish to participate in the public processes associated with these actions.
LAGRO-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Because there is a lack clarity on how I, a USFS special use permit holder and cabin owner and owner of a private lot in Lakehead, can determine or will be notified as to the specific impacts of this project on my personal property (the cabin in the recreational residence tract and the lot on Oak Street).
LAGRO-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">With regards to the lot on Oak Street, on August 26, I had my daughter send an email (see attached) to Ms. Katrina Chow to find out if there was a way a to access the ground-survey data for adjacent lots on Oak Street. After attending the July 16 public workshop meeting in Redding and speaking with Ms. Chow, it is my understanding I was not offered a ground survey because there is no structure on my lot. I would like to know if the lots adjacent to mine took advantage of the ground survey offer, made by the Bureau of Reclamation in 2012, and if so, is there enough data to provide me with specific impact to my lot. If not, I would like to understand how and at what point the Bureau of Reclamation will provide me with the specific impact to my lot. If a ground base survey is an option, I'd like to be offered that opportunity. To date, our query has gone unanswered.
LAGRO-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">With regards to our cabin on Lower Salt Creek Road, there is a lack of clarity on how and when it will be determined if our cabin will be impacted. Per the most recent release of the Draft EIS, "one cabin, possibly more" may be impacted in the event that CP 3, 4, or 5 are implemented. There is no further information on how I can obtain more specific information. Per this comment, we are requesting

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=20581cb21c&view=pt&search=inbox&th=141e6f114a41dff9>

10/23/13

LAGRO-5
CONTD

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Fwd: Submission of Public Comment for SLWRI Draft EIS
↑
specific impacts to our cabin be made available and if a ground-based survey is required to do that, that it be offered in accordance with the SLWRI Draft EIS Real Estate Appendix.

LAGRO-6

By participating in the Public Comment Period for the SLWRI Draft EIS, as a private landowner, USFS Special Permit holder and cabin owner, I am, respectfully, reserving my right to participate in any future draft plans and/or public processes related to this and any future SLWRI proposals for raising Shasta Dam put forth by the Bureau of Reclamations, USFS, or other governmental entities.

Sincerely,

Avis LaGrone
5032 Las Cruces Court, San Jose, CA 95118
laavis@aol.com

 Gmail-Parcel083290009000-OakStreet,Lakehead,CA96051.pdf
357K

Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation
Environmental Impact Statement



Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation

Parcel 083290009000 - Oak Street, Lakehead, CA 96051

Desiree La Maggiore <desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com>
To: kchow@usbr.gov
Cc: Phyllis/Avis & David Perkins-Lagrone <Laavis@aol.com>

Mon, Aug 26, 2013 at 3:39 PM

LAGRO-7 Good afternoon Ms. Chow,

I'm following up on a conversation we had at the SLWRI Public Workshop, held July 16, 2013. My family owns a lot on Oak Street in Lakehead. Per our conversation, owners of private land who had structures on their land, and were potentially impacted by the 18.5 foot proposed increase in the level of the dam (CP-4 and CP-5 actions) were offered the opportunity to receive a land-based survey (vs. LIDAR) of their lots. My family's lot has no structure on it at this point, but does have septic and water. You thought we might be able to get an idea of the specific impact to our lot if the adjacent property owners had opted for a survey of their lots and to follow-up with you to see what we could find out. So, here's the lot information and the street address/AP information on the adjacent lots.

Our family's lot (Perkins Trust) is:

- Parcel #083290009000
- TRA #082103
- located on Oak Street (we have not postal address since there is not a structure on the lot yet)

The lot is situated between 20620 Cedar Dr.(parcel #083290010000) and 20637 Oak Street (parcel #083290006000), both in Lakehead, CA 96051, highlighted in blue in the picture below



Is it possible for you to provide us with more specific information regarding if and how our property may be impacted in the CP-4 and CP-5 scenarios of the SLWRI. In the 2003 Shasta Reservoir Inventory, the structures on the adjacent lots are not called out, so we were thinking our lot may be okay. Please advise.

LAGRO-8

Additionally, we've been reviewing the documentation available pursuant to the public comment period and have found conflicting information regarding the close of the public comment period. The letter sent June 25 (communication MP-720/ENV-6.00) states, "Written or oral comments on the Draft EIS may be provided any time before midnight on Thursday,

↑ LAGRO-8 CONTD

September 26, 2013." On the public comment card I took home from the workshop (and, subsequently, provided to fellow cabin owners), it states "All written comments must be sent/postmarked on or before midnight September 30, 2013" (see attached). Can you please confirm the end of public comment period deadline?

Thanks in advance for your prompt response and attention to these matters.

Regards,
Desiree La Maggiore
Avis La Grone (trustee for Perkins Trust)
408-391-9603

 SLWRIPPublicCommentCard062013.pdf
38K

Response to Comments from Avis Lagrone

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

LAGRO-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-5, "Comment and Objection Process for Draft USFS Decisions."

LAGRO-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-1, "USFS Recreational Residence Tract Cabins in Preliminary Draft EIS and Draft EIS."

LAGRO-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-9, "Maps and Additional Surveys of Private Parcels/Structures."

LAGRO-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-9, "Structure Surveys for USFS Cabins."

LAGRO-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-5, "Comment and Objection Process for Draft USFS Decisions."

LAGRO-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-9, "Maps and Additional Surveys of Private Parcels/Structures."

LAGRO-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, "Sufficiency of the EIS."

33.11.117 Desiree Lamaggiore



Desiree La Maggiore <desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com> **LAMA1**

Parcel 083290009000 - Oak Street, Lakehead, CA 96051

1 message

Desiree La Maggiore <desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com>
To: kchow@usbr.gov
Cc: Phyllis/Avis & David Perkins-Lagrone <Laavis@aol.com>
LAMA-1

Mon, Aug 26, 2013 at 3:39 PM


Good afternoon Ms. Chow,
LAMA-1

I'm following up on a conversation we had at the SLWRI Public Workshop, held July 16, 2013. My family owns a lot on Oak Street in Lakehead. Per our conversation, owners of private land who had structures on their land, and were potentially impacted by the 18.5 foot proposed increase in the level of the dam (CP-4 and CP-5 actions) were offered the opportunity to receive a land-based survey (vs. LIDAR) of their lots. My family's lot has no structure on it at this point, but does have septic and water. You thought we might be able to get an idea of the specific impact to our lot if the adjacent property owners had opted for a survey of their lots and to follow-up with you to see what we could find out. So, here's the lot information and the street address/AP information on the adjacent lots.

Our family's lot (Perkins Trust) is:

- Parcel #083290009000
- TRA #082103
- located on Oak Street (we have not postal address since there is not a structure on the lot yet)

The lot is situated between 20620 Cedar Dr.(parcel #083290010000) and 20637 Oak Street (parcel #083290006000), both in Lakehead, CA 96051, highlighted in blue in the picture below



LAMA-2

Is it possible for you to provide us with more specific information regarding if and how our property may be impacted in the CP-4 and CP-5 scenarios of the SLWRI. In the 2003 Shasta Reservoir Inventory, the structures on the adjacent lots are not called out, so we were thinking our lot may be okay. Please advise.

LAMA-3


Additionally, we've been reviewing the documentation available pursuant to the public comment period and have found conflicting information regarding the close of the public comment period. The letter sent June 25 (communication MP-√720/ENV-6.00) states, "Written or oral comments on the Draft EIS may be provided any time before midnight on Thursday,

September 26, 2013." On the public comment card I took home from the workshop (and, subsequently, provided to fellow cabin owners), it states "All written comments must be sent/postmarked on or before midnight September 30, 2013" (see attached). Can you please confirm the end of public comment period deadline?

LAMA-3 CONTD

Thanks in advance for you prompt response and attention to these matters.

Regards,
Desiree La Maggiore
Avis La Grone (trustee for Perkins Trust)
408-391-9603

 SLWRIPPUBLICCOMMENTCARD062013.pdf
38K

Response to Comments from Desiree Lamaggiore

LAMA1-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-5, "Comment and Objection Process for Draft USFS Decisions."

LAMA1-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-9, "Maps and Additional Surveys of Private Parcels/Structures."

LAMA1-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, "Sufficiency of the EIS."

33.11.118 Desiree Lamaggiore

10/18/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Public Comment Submission to SLWRI Draft EIS

LAMA2



Public Comment Submission to SLWRI Draft EIS

Desiree La Maggiore

Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 3:01

<desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com>

PM

To: bor-mpr-slwri@usbr.gov

Cc: kchow@usbr.gov, "Rezeau, Nathan L -FS" <nrezeau@fs.fed.us>

LAMA2-1 We are USFS special use permit holders with a cabin in the Salt Creek Recreation Residence tract that may be impacted by the plans put forth in the SLWRI Draft EIS (per tables 18-6 and 18-8 covering impacts on recreation of comprehensive plans (CPs) 3-5). We are participating in the public comment process for the following reasons:

Primarily,

- To establish our eligibility to comment/object to the Forest Service's draft decisions relating to this project. It is our understanding that the Forest Service will provide draft decisions later in the SLWRI process and we wish to participate in the public processes associated with these actions.

LAMA2-2

- Because there is a lack clarity on how we, USFS special use permit holders and cabin owners, can determine or will be notified as to the specific impacts of this project on our personal property (the recreational residence structure itself).

LAMA2-3

- Our tract association has been proactive in seeking out information about the SLWRI work for the past decade and how it may impact us, however, it was not until late June that our tract received a mailing with a copy of the SWRI Draft EIS. We reviewed the Preliminary Draft EIS in February 2012 and attended community meetings - at that time there was no indication our recreational residence tract would be impacted in any of the materials distributed.

LAMA2-4

- We attended the SLWRI Public Workshop held on July 16, in Redding, CA. At that meeting, when queried on the issue of how we, cabin owners, would receive specific information on if and how our cabin would be impacted, we were referred to the Real Estate breakout session. Ms. Mary Paasch led the session and had no clear answer on how we'd get a more definitive answer. She recommended we make

10/18/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Public Comment Submission to SLWRI Draft EIS

LAMA2-4
CONTD

the request through this public comment process. I also followed up with Mr. Nathan Rezeau, deputy district ranger, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, who concurred with Ms. Paasch's recommendation. Per this comment, we are requesting specific impacts to our cabin be made available and if a ground-based survey is required to do that, that it be offered in accordance with the SLWRI Draft EIS Real Estate Appendix.

Secondarily,

LAMA2-5

- It is unclear how comprehensive the cost estimates tied to this project are, for example, when reviewing the plan, it seems like the full expense impact to the USFS has not been captured, e.g. cabin relocation or buyout (they've been estimated and identified in the Draft EIS, but it's not clear if they've been included in the project funding outlined in the SLWRI Feasibility Report. Where can the public obtain a summary of what is and what is not included in the funding proposed for this project?

LAMA2-6

- It is not clear enough effort is being made to protect surrounding communities, such as Lakehead, that will be significantly impacted by this proposal. There are indications of re-routing, replacing, removing parts of these communities, but there appears to be no thought as to how to holistically support/sustain these communities through the implementation of this project. In light of the forecasted increasing demand for recreation outlined in the SLWRI Draft EIS, it would seem more attention should be given to how to assist the communities that support recreation on the lake.

LAMA2-7

- When reviewing this plan and attending the 7/16 Public Workshop meeting, it became increasingly unclear how the proposal for raising Shasta Dam plays into a larger water conservation strategy for California, including the proposed Sites and Temperance Flat Reservoirs or the Bay-Delta plan. What is the scale of the problem being addressed and, how these large projects combined with other types of water conservation measures will help resolve the water shortage (not water storage shortage) issue.

LAMA2-8

By participating in the Public Comment Period for the SLWRI Draft EIS, we are, respectfully, reserving our right to participate in any future Bureau of Reclamation's, USFS's, or other governmental entities' draft plans and/or public processes related to this and any future SLWRI proposals for raising Shasta Dam.

Sincerely,
Vince Maggiore and Desiree LaGrone - La Maggiore

10/18/13

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR Mail - Public Comment Submission to SLWRI Draft EIS

299 S. 16th Street, San Jose, CA 95112
desiree.lamaggiore@gmail.com

Response to Comments from Desiree Lamaggiore

LAMA2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-5, “Comment and Objection Process for Draft USFS Decisions.”

LAMA2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-1, “USFS Recreational Residence Tract Cabins in Preliminary Draft EIS and Draft EIS.”

LAMA2-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-1, “USFS Recreational Residence Tract Cabins in Preliminary Draft EIS and Draft EIS.”

LAMA2-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-9, “Structure Surveys for USFS Cabins.”

LAMA2-5: Thank you for your comment on the DEIS for the SLWRI, we appreciate your time in responding to the document. Costs for each alternative are consistent between both the DEIS and the Draft Feasibility Report. The comment is related to CVP financing topics and/or the SLWRI Draft Feasibility Report potential funding analyses, which are outside the scope of the DEIS, and therefore does not require a response under NEPA (40 CFR 1503.4). Some of these comments directly referred to the SLWRI Draft Feasibility Report and the corresponding Draft Economic Valuation Appendix (which were released to the public in February 2012), not the 2013 SLWRI DEIS. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

LAMA2-6: 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.

LAMA2-7: As described in EIS Chapter 1, “Introduction,” the SLWRI EIS tiers to the CALFED PEIS/R. As described in the CALFED Program Plan Phase II Report Technical Appendix to the CALFED PEIS/R, enlarging Shasta Reservoir was one of five surface storage investigations authorized under CALFED as part of the Water Management Strategy Tools to address the Water Supply Reliability program objective. The other four surface storage investigations included Los Vaqueros Reservoir Enlargement, In-Delta Storage, Millerton Lake Enlargement (Temperance Flat), and Sites Reservoir