

Comments on the Folsom DS/FDR Draft EIS/EIR

No.	Name	Comment
1	Keoni Almeida	<p>Rebecca, I would like to ask you some questions regarding the EIS/EIR for Folsom Dam Area as I believe I am one of the residence along the lake (1428 Lakehills Drive, El Dorado Hills) that would be impacted if the dam was raised 4, 7, or 17 feet. [#1-1 Population and Housing affected property]. I would like to confirm which residences are referred to in the report on page 3.16-15 (four parcels and one possible residential relocation; Alternative 2 with 4-foot raise), page 3.16-16 (one possible residential relocation; Alternative 3, with a 3.5-foot raise); page 3.16-16 (six possible residential relocations; alternative 4, with a 7-foot raise); page 3.16-18 (37 possible residential relocations; Alternative 5, with a 17-foot raise).</p> <p>[#1-2 PD residential effects]. As a general comment regarding the report, it seems to take the potential option of acquiring residential properties lightly. This is evident by the numerous maps shown for the various alternatives showing work areas and proposed construction sites without one of the maps showing the area that would be most impacted in terms of residential relocation. I am simply surmising that the houses along where I live will be impacted by the fact that the 500 foot contour depicting the work area on the numerous maps is above the elevation of the properties in my neighborhood.</p> <p>[#1-3 Visual new berms.] The report proposes an option to avoid relocating residences. The proposal includes the construction of new flood damage reduction berms to remedy temporary flooding of the above-referenced properties during extreme storm events. This option would disrupt the natural setting surrounding the lake in the Lakehills Estates area.</p>
2	Jason Zarghami	<p>My name is Jason Zarghami I reside in 1456 Lake Hills Dr in EDH, Ca. Our house backs up to the lake property on Lake Hills drive. We have lived in our house for about 18 years and love this area and are not at all willing to move anywhere else!! Even if it means we have to rebuild the house on a higher foundation. I have received a copy of the CD and have reviewed the 5 options. I believe that the only way our house would be effected is if the Dam is raised by 17 feet, which I believe will be unsafe for the Dam. [#2-1 Population and Housing affected property]. From the CD, I can't tell where these 37 homes are located at? Can you help me locate these 37 homes on the map.] I have the following questions for you.</p> <p>1- [#2-2 PD relation to previous studies]. There was a study done last year for raising the Dam by 7 feet and some of our neighbors received letters explaining the water level. Is this study the same as the one on this CD? The old study did not show the need for a concrete wall. Please explain the difference....</p> <p>2- [#2-3 PD residential effects]. The map of Folsom Lake shows the effected area on the Granite Bay side, but the picture gets cut off on the east side of the lake where we live. Therefore I can't tell how our resident is getting effected by these options. Is there documentation that I can obtain that shows the east side of the lake (South Fork of the American River, Lakehills Estates).</p> <p>3- [#2-4 PD alternative selection]. What is the likely hood of option 5, why is it even considered if it makes the Dam structure unsuitable for the amount of water it would store?</p> <p>4- [#2-5 Population and housing affected property]. In option 3 the CD shows only one house is effected, what is the location of this house?</p> <p>5- [#2-6 Population and housing property acquisition] What if the resident of the house refuses to move?</p>
3	Patrick Porgans	<p>Decrease in water storage due to Folsom DS/FDR action and his specific questions on:</p> <p>1) [#3-1 Reservoir storage]. Who pays for space now?</p> <p>2) How much?</p> <p>3) Where does the money come from?</p>
4	Anonymous	<p>[#4-1 PD footprint.] Does the project footprint go west of Folsom-Auburn Road?</p>
5	Ken Champion	<p>This e-mail is an effort at inter-agency coordination so that FHWA's issues may be adequately put forth, as requested of Caltrans. Federal Aid funds went into the construction of many of the bridges below the Folsom Dam in the American and Sacramento River waterways. [#5-1 PD Future Operations in relation to Downstream Bridges]. A 160,000 cfs sustained release study of potential bridge damage should be made in order for this EIR to adequately identify (1) the potential bridge impact significance of such releases</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>involving scour, destabilization, riverbed erosion, etc. , and (2) identify the various mitigations and mitigation strategies that may be employed to reduce the impact level of significance on the bridges. To date, it appears that only water release studies on the order of 115,000 to 120,000 cfs have been conducted near the bridge sites in the American River below the dam.] Please review our attached intergovernmental review comment response letter and enclosure expressing our issues. (Also see attachments)</p>
6	Jim Silvester	<p>[#6-1 PD Project Support.] Let the corp do what ever it needs to do. The lives and property of the people down stream are most important.</p>
7	Bruce Beck	<p>Mr. Oliver: I have received disturbing information about the proposed closure of Folsom Point (Dyke 8) and/or Granite Bay as a staging area for equipment for the upcoming construction at Folsom Lake. I live in Rocklin and during the "boating" season we use the Lake almost every weekend for our boating. [#7-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives]. Closing these two areas would very much cause a terrible situation on the public use of the Lake. Why can't the parking be established along Folsom-Auburn Road near the closed road to the Dam Or close Beal's Point as boaters can not use that area. What about the parking area that is closed to the public next to the Dam? There are large fields near the Dam Road in the Folsom area. Otherwise the expansion and creation of Beal's point for boat launching would help IF the closure of Dyke * were to happen. There are a large number of boaters in the Sacramento area. [#7-2 Recreation remaining access points]. Requiring boaters to travel to other locations would not only crowd those more but cause other environmental issues with more traveling, using more gas to travel to other lakes, causing more environmental issues at those locations, etc. Please establish other sites to use for staging. There are a lot of other areas that can be considered.</p>
8	Rosemary Beck	<p>We live in Rocklin, very close to Folsom Lake. [#8-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives]. We are opposed to any closure of all current boating access to Folsom Lake for use of equipment parking. Possible solutions: 1. Close down these areas during the winter only (Oct - Mar) as most boaters do not use the lake during those periods. 2. Park at Beal's Point and not Granite Bay, closer for your equipment and boaters are not allowed access there anyway. 3. Park in the parking lot next to the Dam on Dam Road, where POV's are not allowed anyway. 4. Park your equipment in the areas just north of Dam Road/Folsom Auburn areas. 5. There are areas on the other side of the Dam Road in Folsom where equipment can be parked.</p> <p>Please do not closed boating access during the heavy boating season.</p>
9	Robin Sharp	<p>Dear Mr Oliver, [#9-1 Recreation lake access closure] I hope you are the right person to contact regarding our dismay at the potential of Folsom Point for up to 7 years. While I support the effort to update the dam and keep it safe for the community I can't believe that there are no alternatives to closing a vital boat launch site. We are boat owners and launch from Folsom Point many many times during the summer. [#9-2 Recreation remaining access points]. The last thing we need is to reduce boat launch sites. Remember - Rattlesnake is a very small launch site with which can only be seen as one way street access. If you've been there you know how narrow those roads are. We drove it once and will never take a boat there again. Further more it takes about 45 minutes to even get there from Rescue. Granite Bay is nice and large depending on the water level - often launches are closed because the water level is too low. The lines in the summer can be huge and if it is the only site available I can image the traffic jams of boaters queuing up earlier and earlier so that</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>they can get their boat on the water. Want to me us there at 6AM on a Sunday? Brown's Ravine often under water most of the season. We all want to be blessed with high water levels but let's face it, high water means one less boat ramp. You are planning on closing the only reliable and convenient launch point on this side of the Lake. Please reconsider. If you do this, we might as well sell the boat. But wait, we won't be able to sell it because no one will want a boat that they can't use. Of course we could sell the house "Great Lake Views of a lake you can't get to"..</p>
10	Alan Hersh	<p>Regarding Folsom Lake EIR. Dear Mr Oliver. [#10-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I oppose any actions that would close the public areas of Folsom Lake during the summer months (boating season) the Corp of Engineers has proposed closing Folsom Point (Dike 8 area) for 7 years and perhaps Granite Bay for 2 years. The closures are proposed so these areas can be used to stage the construction of the new spillways and the raising of the dam. The Corps need to find alternatives that do no impact the public use and enjoyment of the lake. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comment</p>
11	Frank Myers Senior VP McClellan Park / Stanford Ranch	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, I understand that the modifications to the Folsom Dam currently being considered will potentially result in closure of lake access, potentially for several years. [#11-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I would be opposed to any construction solution that resulted in such a closure. There must be an alternative that does not have such a negative impact on the use of the lake.</p>
12	Phil Maestre	<p>[#12-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] Closure of Dike 8 would be devastating to the economy of State Parks Dept, local boat shops, and dealers. It would also hurt the City of Folsom by possible loss of residents.</p>
13	Mary Henriksen	<p>[#13-1 General.] Would like to continue to use Folsom Point recreation area for fishing, picnics, and family activities. Please keep this area intact.</p>
14	Aaron Boring	<p>[#14-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] My worry is that any work on Folsom Lake that prohibits recreational use will affect my families income and many many others involved in the marine industry. The Sacramento Valley sells more boats than anywhere in the US (per capita). Once publicity and word of mouth gets out that Folsom Lake is 1) closed 2) inconvenient 3) not worth boating on due to construction, it will be very difficult to sell boats. And when boats don't sell, many people will have to find new employment. It would be interesting to see the potential impact on sales, and also the potential impact on lost revenue for the state/counties/cities due to the lack of sales tax income.] I would also like to mention that many people could not be here tonight, due to a boat show in Pleasanton, LA. If it came down to a vote of proposed alternatives, I would choose either Alternative 1, or No Action Alternative if at all possible. Please think about this note when decisions are being made. Thank You,.</p>
15	Mach Bishop	<p>[#15-1 General]. Keep Folsom Point Open during construction.</p>
16	Chris Hodges	<p>CHRIS HODGES: I'm Chris Hodges and I'm from Brother's Boats. We're a boat dealer in Sacramento. Two comments: [#16-1 Public Involvement meeting notification]. One, procedurally, is we found out about the details of how Folsom Lake is going to be impacted very late. I only became aware of it last week on Thursday, and I know the report was released on the 21st just before Christmas, but the news really hasn't gotten out and I think there are a lot of people that want to comment that aren't aware yet, so that's one point. [#16-2 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives]. The second thing is as it relates particularly to the closure of Folsom Point to recreation and use, if it was a request, our request would be that that wouldn't occur. and it looks like there's an alternative to put the processing facility perhaps to the east side of the Mormon Island or Dike 9, the east end of it, and thereby avoid having to close Folsom Point. [#16-3 Recreation remaining access points.] I don't know all the factors that would be involved and how reasonable that alternative is, but closing Folsom Point would have a large impact on the whole community on the southeast side of the lake, there would only be one access point left and that is a tight access now up at the marina. There would still be access on the south side of</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>the lake, but it's only at the marina and that's a rather limited facility. So to repeat it, our request is the processing facility be moved to the east end of the Mormon Island area to keep Folsom Point open. [#16-4 Socioeconomics businesses.] It seems from the EIR over 800,000 people or users would be affected by the closure of Folsom Point, and I would think that that would translate to several million to \$10 million of lost opportunity at least and that that could be mitigated by moving the facility, the processing plant. It would be more expensive to have the processing plant in the Mormon Island area on the east side but the other side of it is that it would be much less impact to the public and I think a good idea.</p>
17	Bill Watson	<p>Comment Card: 1. We ask that mitigation of the effects on recreation, especially at Folsom Point, be made. Possibly siting the borrowing and crushing operations away from the public areas. 2. We ask that the comment period be extended. 3. We would like a presentation from the Bureau and Corps to our board in the near future.</p> <p>BILL WATSON: [#17-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] We would like to ask that the Bureau and Corps give definite consideration to mitigating the effects on recreation especially at Folsom Point. We suggest that they consider moving the burrowing and crushing operations to areas other than the public areas so that the Point can stay open. [#17-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] The economic impact of closing Folsom Point on our community, the City of Folsom, was not considered in the document at all and we've already been hit hard by the closing of the dam road. And to have this on top of it really compounds the problems in our city. [#17-3 Public involvement document notification]. Second, we would like to request that the comment period be extended. We were not notified of the document or the comment period and so we were unaware until this last Friday that we had a responsibility.] And finally, we would like to have a presentation from the Bureau and the Corps to our board of directors, if that could be arranged in the very near future.</p>
18	Steve Hodges	<p>STEVE HODGES: [#18-1 Public Involvement document notification] First, I guess the first comment was the lack of notice or actually we just didn't -- it's hard to get notified which we've discussed. We're not in the loop, the public loop. [#18-2 Recreation lake access closure] And then I think the recreational aspects we were trying to keep Folsom Point open as much as possible because that's our main access to the lake from that side, from the Folsom side which is really heavily used, one of the most-visited parks in the state. But talking to the engineers, I understand that closing Dike 8 is really part of the development -- the improvement of the Mormon Island Dam and you really can't get around it because of all the material they need to put there, and they need to get access through the main dam when they're doing the excavation at Mormon Island. So I would really like to see alternative facilities. [#18-3 Recreation mitigation] We have other locations that we could use for access point in the park or the lake, if you will, that are underdeveloped and if we could get those expanded. Like there's one a few miles from Folsom Point, the Brown's Ravine, if that facility could be expanded and that would, I think, do a lot to help the recreational loss of Folsom Point.</p> <p>MR. NEPSTAD: Right. So basically make up for the loss of access by increasing the capacity of the other access points and even getting some of these that are under development put in earlier maybe than they would have otherwise?</p> <p>STEVE HODGES: Or, yeah, I don't think there's any plans of improvement or that I know of, at least the Brown's Ravine facility, so that would be a real bonus, and we were talking to -- was it John or one of the engineers said that it's unclear that Folsom Point, at what times it actually needed to be closed so I'm not sure.</p> <p>MR. NEPSTAD: So clarity on when it would be out of operation then?</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>STEVE HODGES: Yeah, I guess that would be a question. There again, I wouldn't want to slow the project down by making it be open during the construction. I think the progress of the project would be the main concern, getting the thing finished. He also mentioned that with all the material, there could be -- Folsom Point when they're through, could be really changed and developed into a different type of facility, expanded, so that's kind of exciting to see. I don't know if the Bureau has any plans for that or not.</p> <p>MR. NEPSTAD: Okay, and that would be something good to have explained?</p> <p>STEVE HODGES: Right, because they're the ones that manage the public recreation. So that would be a suggestion. That's it..</p>
19	Jerry Toenyas	<p>JERRY TOENYAS: I've got some comments here. [#19-1 PD – 3 Projects] The first comment I have is it's not abundantly clear when you look at the EIS document that there's kind of three different segments. There's the Dam raise which is the Corps engineers project; there is the auxiliary spillway, which is the Joint Federal Project; and then there's the Mormon Island which is the safety of dams project. And I think it would be good right up front to make that so that it's real clear when you look at the document that there's kind of three separate parts there. And you could include I'm sure other phases to that besides that, that's L.L. Anderson, the bridge, the environmental work, those type things and whether those are -- I think those are all Corps projects too.</p> <p>MR. NEPSTAD: And it would be to get it up-front organized a little better so it's easier to follow through?</p> <p>JERRY TOENYAS: Yeah. And then most of my comments aren't really in the EIS itself but it's stuff that certainly that has an impact on the water and power. [#19-2 Cost allocation.] The first one is the cost allocation. You know, I think it should be clear that for the, for example, the Dam raise, the Dam raise is 100 percent flood control which is a Corps project. Now, maybe you got reimbursed responsibilities there with SAFCA, but I think it should be clear as to what that is, you know?</p> <p>MR. NEPSTAD: Right. How the cost are allocated for the various phases?</p> <p>JERRY TOENYAS: That's right. For the spillway, now that's going to be one that's going to be split between flood control and safety of dams. And then we've got the Mormon Island that's going to be safety of dams. But on the split between flood control and safety of dams, how that's going to occur in the process. Quite frankly, we just rolled out in the 2002 report a proposal, you know, here's the number. It was kind of like set in concrete. We didn't have any input into it and then later on it was said that, well, no, it wasn't really wasn't 48 percent/52 percent, we made an error. It should have been 42 percent/58 percent. We don't want to have that surprise. We want to be able to have the public input, know it and understand it, okay, we got it and we support it. [#19-3 Alternative costs.] And then I think kind of in conjunction with that too should be the cost of the alternatives. In the listing, there's nothing in the EIS on that. I understand there's another document maybe that has some of that but, I mean, this was the first time I saw this, the \$950 million. So I think it would be good to have a listing of what the costs are, and I'm assuming that the fuse plug would be cheaper than the Joint Federal Project, but I mean, and you can't see that from there and that's very helpful, quite frankly, for cost allocations.</p> <p>[#19-4 PD temperature control device]. One other item to comment on is the temperature control device. I think there's a real opportunity here. I think, you know, it isn't, again, clear in the EIS what's going to be done on the temperature control device. I think there's a real opportunity to do something similar to what was done at Shasta where you're able to go down below where the penstock level is too and so that you can really control what the temperature is. And I think the environmental community would be very supportive of that too because they would want to know what the temperature is and be able to manipulate that. Right now, it's pretty rudimentary. You pull off a shield or whatever that is, you know, it's just got three segments. It's pretty rudimentary, and I think with</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>maybe just a little more thought and maybe not too much more cost, you can put a pretty good temperature control device.</p> <p>[#19-5 PD Folsom reoperation.] The next comment would be there are different projects going on, different parts, but one part is the reoperation of the Folsom Dam which is separate from this but certainly linked because what you come up with here for the preferred alternative is going to have a tie-in on the reoperation there so something should be matched a little bit more on the reoperation. And what I really encourage is any EIS/EIR, you have a statement in there that the flood control reservation is 400,000/600,000-acre feet. But I think there's a opportunity to -- you also talk about doing prereleases. Well, what I might encourage is don't get set on 400,000/600,000. I think as we get smarter as we go through this and talk about for case-based operations which the Corps is looking at. Maybe, I think, it would be easier – it should be better, I think the environmental community and water and power users would like to see a fuller reservoir but make prereleases two or three days ahead of when the storm's coming in to get down to whatever level you think is going to be necessary for the storm. And if you don't have a storm, which is nine times out of ten you're not going to have a storm coming, so it won't affect it. But then you've got a higher level, especially in dry years, to carry over to meet all your water quality issues in the American River and the Delta and all that, and plus you've still got water obviously for the water interests and power, M&I interests, and Fish and Wildlife interest. So I just encourage you to stay flexible in that reservation about whether you're locking that in because once you lock something and here's the rule. I think we need to be wiser as we go in the future on that one because water's going to get tighter and tighter, so making prereleases and then not having the reservoir filled up is not in anyone's interest. And we certainly have an example of that just in 2004, so pretty recently that occurred.</p> <p>[#19-6 PD security features and cost allocation.] And then the last comment I have is on security, security features. That's more of a Reclamation feature, I think, but you know it's mentioned but it isn't mentioned what the project's going to be and how much of that, again, is going to be the responsibility of water and power to pay. And, you know, probably there's some national security where you don't want to go in and do much detail, but you've got to give us enough information so we know what's going on as far as what our cost responsibility is. If you're stringing out a big powerline or something like that, you know, we need to know that as far as what the capital costs and what the O&M cost responsibility is going to be on that.] So I will be submitting these type of comments in writing too before the 22nd, but as long as I'm sitting here today, I want to give you the oral comments too.</p>
20	Russ Harrington	<p>[#20-1 Cost Allocation.] 1. Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers need to engage in a public review process PRIOR to finalizing a Flood Control/Safety of Dams cost allocation.</p> <p>2. The Dam Raise component should be exclusively allocated to Flood Control.</p>
21	Madeleine Moseley	<p>[#21-1 PD Auburn Dam.] Anyhow, the reason why I came is that I don't think we should raise our dam. The main thing we should do is build the Auburn Dam. Our Folsom Lake is just a puddle. And they said that they're going to close Dike 8. I don't want Dike 8 closed, and I know that is for the -- I think they're going to put a tunnel if there's a big rain so that they can divert the water. They were talking about the main dam to put in more openings to release the water, and instead they're going to not do that. We've got enough openings in that dam to open up, so we don't need -- but this here is going to be like a tunnel and diverting from the Dam Road and it's terrible. But anyhow, I don't want them to do that, and the main thing to do is to build the Auburn Dam and that will give us water and everything else because our little dam out here, they said it would take about four or five years to fill it up.] The first year, we had a rain, and it overflowed. I've been a resident in Folsom in the area of Folsom since 1939. [#21-2 Visual dam raise.] We want to be able to use Folsom Lake and to see it because we can't see it if they raise it. We had an observation point up there and we used to go out there and of course, you know, like the Bureau, they told us that that was just temporary and the City of Folsom would not do anything about it, so now that's the reason why we've got to have a new bridge. [#21-3 Cultural] Mormon Island Cemetery. And another point I'd like to make is what are they going to do with the Mormon Island Cemetery? Nobody knows where it's at and it's not being addressed and they just hope it will disappear, and I will not let it disappear. There are bodies still there. The thing is that there's people -- you can't move bodies unless you get permission from their family and we don't know where their family is. The reason why the bodies, some</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		bodies, were moved from there before, they flooded the lake and they moved it over to Mormon Island off of Green Valley Road. But those people, they had relatives to sign them out but the other ones, they're still there which is a shame because they said they're going to put their equipment there.
22	Robert Giacometh	<p>I wanted to offer my input into objecting to Folsom Point being closed. [#22-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] The City of Folsom will be denied recreational access, it would have a significant impact on the community denying us access to the lake. [#22-2 Socioeconomics businesses]. It would have a financial impact too. I'm an avid bass fisherman and I have a fishing guide service that will be impacted by closing access. We'll have to go significantly out of our way to access the lake for my business, and it will have an impact on possible fishing tournaments coming to Folsom Lake because they'll have less areas to launch in.</p> <p>A fishing tournament -- a good fishing tournament can bring 100 anglers from outside of the area who may be here for two days. They'll stay in rooms, they'll buy meals at restaurants, and not having that in the communities is going to have a significant financial impact on the community. If you close one of the areas that gives access to the lake, it may impact -- make the other one so crowded that these organizations won't come out to Folsom Lake at all so it will affect the outlying areas also. [#22-3 Socioeconomics property value.] One of the other major issues is when I purchased my home, one of the attractive things for me was being close to Folsom Lake, and that's what was listed in the listing, because pursuit of the outdoors. So I feel by closing Folsom Point, it's actually going to have a negative effect on my property value because I'll no longer be able to access the lake. So I would really encourage the powers that be to look at finding an alternate site to do whatever staging they have to do to keep the Folsom Point open. [#22-4 Recreation mitigation.] If they are going to submit mitigation, offer mitigation of some sort, it needs to be in the form of some sort of recreation for the citizens. Citizens are losing recreation; they need to be mitigated with recreation. I don't have any specific suggestions at this time I can think about, but may come up with them later.</p>
23	Doug Pepper	<p>I'm here to voice objections to the alternatives that proposed closing Folsom Point for up to seven or eight years for what appears to be staging of equipment. I'm not here because I care whether they build a gate, dam, spillway, or an auxiliary spillway. The technical part does not matter. I'm here because of the impacts it will have on recreation for the lake, the impacts it will have on traffic and the environment. [#23-1 Transportation impact analysis.] My understanding is this is supposed to be to review the Environmental Impact Report, and I don't believe most of the Environmental Impact Report properly addresses the impact. Most of it is blown off, that's the technical term for ignored, including traffic and frustrations. I believe the issues with traffic will be worsened because this is starting before the new dam bridge will be completed, increasing more traffic through town and to other areas of the lake. So my objection is to the way they're planning it. [#23-2 Public Involvement meeting notification.] I'm also objecting to the way they communicated this meeting. Most people here I believe are here only by word of mouth. The Bureau did a really poor job in communicating -- actually, they didn't even do a job of communicating it, there was no public information in newspapers or on TV until today. Today was the first time we saw it in the paper and the meeting was tonight. I believe the Bureau needs to have another session, not propaganda, but a session where people can give comments in a public room and hundreds of people can cheer on the person speaking against the Bureau of Reclamation, w-r-e-c-k, wreck-lamation, which is exactly what they're trying to do to Folsom, wreck it with closing the Dam Road, wreck it with closing the Folsom Point and other Folsom Lake access points. I think that will be my comments for now, how's that?</p>
24	Alfred P. Bulf	<p>[#24-1 Geology and soils dam stability.] I came tonight because I believe by raising the present dam, you weaken it. Some of the engineers I work with have said this. My brother has said this and he's a soil engineer, and [#24-2 Auburn Dam.] I believe they should build the Auburn Dam because I moved to the Auburn area in 1949 from San Francisco and we saw, over a number of years, we saw the bridge at the bottom that leads from Placer County to El Dorado County get carried away twice because of flood waters.] And my father always told us that water was the most important thing. And I know aboard a ship, where I was in a nuclear ship, where you can either store water or you can make it. And you have to use energy to make it. So going along with building Auburn Dam, I believe</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>reforestation is very important for the surrounding watershed. I spent a lot of time in Japan because our ship needed repairs in a port down from Yokohama in Tokyo Bay. We used to go up to Hakone National Forest. This was the forest that surrounds Mt.Fuji, so you know, the Japanese holy mountain, Shinto religion. I saw a lot of Japanese dams up there and I talked to some of Japanese forest people and they told me that maintaining a good forest in back of the dam was just as important as building a good dam as far as storing water, and we have been very neglectful doing that. I know the Chinese had trouble with the Yangtze for thousands of years and spent \$24 billion and that took care of the problem. And I know the Brazilians built the Parana River -- on the Parana River built the Itaipu, which is one of the largest dams in the world shared by Paraguay and Brazil. And then I know the Chinese now are building additional dams in the upper Mekong and Brahmaputra, the rivers that drain from the Himalayas and India too because of their expanding populations. I, myself, like to take a shower at least once a day and I know how water is precious because I have a lot of Palestinian friends that get their water turned off and on by the Israelis who control the utilities over in the Gaza Strip and also in the west bank, people don't realize that, so water is very precious. Here in the United States everybody uses an average of 300 gallons per person. If you were in Africa, you'd be lucky to use 10 gallons. So water is very precious and it's going to be even more precious in the future with the impressions of -- because the impression of larger populations in California because the population now in California is 35 million. In 20 years, it's supposed to go to 50 million and we need to plan ahead, and I hope Mr. Arnold under the dome realizes that. Because where my father's from, he was an Austrian, and they do that, they maintain their forest and they build nice dams for water. Thank you for your time.</p>
25	Mechelle Gooch	<p>[#25-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] Obviously, I have to let the professionals decide what's best as far as the flood control and financial end of it; however, as a Folsom person who moved here because of the lake, I don't want Folsom Point/Dike 8 closed off to recreational activities. I own a boat, I have kids. Six years is a long time in a lifetime of a child. My youngest is nine and six to seven years optimistically he's going to start going to college and won't even be here. We're losing the time we want to spend on the boat with our son. So they need to find another alternative to closing down Dike 8.</p>
26	Ian Cornell	<p>I'm here representing actually multiple viewpoints. And first of all, I've got to say that I support the flood control measures that are being proposed. I'm president of the Sacramento Sports, Boat, and RV Show. Through that, I'm representing interests of the hundreds of outdoor product dealers and as a de facto representative of millions of outdoor enthusiasts who have visited the show -- Sports, Boat, and RV Show I should say -- during its 54-year history. [#26-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] Folsom Lake is an important asset for outdoor recreational enthusiasts. Closing access to its shorelines and boat ramps would be very detrimental to recreational enthusiasts and also extremely damaging to the boat, recreational vehicle, and outdoor products retailers in the region. I'm also a boater and I buy the annual pass to use Folsom Lake and we use Folsom Lake dozens of times each year. It's a source of recreational entertainment and pride, and as a side note, as I'm sure there are representatives of Chamber of Commerce will be saying, it's true that when we go to the lake, we stop at the stores, the restaurants to stock up the ice chests, to fill the gas tank on the way into the lake. And after a day at the lake, we're starving. We hit the gas station to fill up, we hit the restaurants to grab dinner. So the local economy is greatly impacted by us as users and boaters as a whole. [#26-2 Recreation remaining access points.] My third representation is I'm a multi-sport athlete. I use the lake and its shoreline for training and biking, running, and swimming, and I participate in the triathlons and duathlons that are held at the lake each year. The lake access points are already impacted. They're very busy at peak times. There's lots of room on the water but limited room on the launch ramps. If one launch area closes or is reduced in its capacity, the others cannot carry the increased load. Other waterways in the region, such as the American River and Sacramento River, also cannot handle the increase. [#26-3 PD alternative to lake access closure]. As a representative of the businesses impacted by access to the lake, outdoor recreational enthusiasts, and as someone who enjoys the lake as a boater and an athlete, I encourage the continued access to the lake and its shoreline before, during, and after the construction. Thank you.</p>
27	Carol James	<p>[#27-1 Recreation mitigation.] My comment is to -- I would suggest increasing the parking facilities at the remaining existing launch</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		areas to accommodate more boats and trailers. I feel that people will be able to accept longer lines for launching but the big issue is whether or not there will be enough space for them to leave their vehicles. I think this would be a permanent and positive long-term impact because it would improve the existing facilities that are worked on and it would allow more recreation use than maybe is being considered at this time.
28	Elinor Brady	[#28-1 Inundation affected property.] I live in the cove off of Lake Hills Drive and the cove is just where the south fork enters the dam and I face right directly on the water, so I am interested in seeing how far the water will come up when you decide that you're going to raise the dam by seven feet or more. As I understand, it is now slated to be three and a half feet and I don't think that will impact my property, but if it should go higher, it will impact the property I do believe. So I'm interested in knowing very definitely what is likely to happen there. [#28-2 Population and Housing property acquisition]. I'm concerned about eminent domain and recompense for property, the property that I might lose. That's my main concern at the present time. I do have some concern about people being flooded out if the dam is not reinforced properly, it would be a disaster, huge disaster, because so many homes are being built in the flood plane so just as a private individual, of course we would all be impacted by that. So I want the Corps of Engineers to do a very good job. I want them to get the money to do it.
29	Renee Howle	[#29-1 Auburn Dam.] First of all, I don't see the Auburn Dam being mentioned anywhere as an alternative to any of the aspects that this project is proposing to do, and I think it would solve most of the problems. [#29-2 Purpose and Need.] The Folsom Dam really needs the main gates to be repaired or replaced, that's the main problem. All of this is not adding any new hydroelectric power which is needed desperately. It should be incorporated somehow into something, either this or the Auburn Dam or whatever. But the main flood problem could be addressed by fixing the old rusted-out crappy gates that they can't even control the flood level. One of the purposes of a reservoir is to store water. Folsom Lake could store more water if it were dredged aggressively, and it wouldn't raise the water, it wouldn't do anything to the environment. The water level could stay the same, it would hold more water. The alternatives to raising the level of Folsom Lake as opposed to flooding the American River Canyons due to the Auburn Dam are detrimental, I believe, because there's a dwindling foothill habitat and the upper-level habitat has already been ruined because of logging and mining and it needs to be repaired. In creating new reservoirs up in the American River Canyon, it could be done in association with ecosystem rebalancing which would increase the riparian habitats and could restore the forest habitats. Right now, I mean, the Foresthill Divide is covered with Manzanita. They never replanted, okay? So a holistic approach to the Auburn Dam could address environmental concerns to pretty much everyone's satisfaction. Lastly, the increased hydroelectric power that could be added through the Auburn Dam or added to the Folsom Dam project would be a CO2-free form of energy which, considering global warming, is something we should be trying to incorporate in every long-term infrastructure project that we are doing as a people regardless of the cost.
30	Mike Coffman	My concern is the Mormon Island auxiliary dam which is an earthen dam; it's not concrete, it's an earth dam. To me, it's a ticking bomb. Not only is it on an old riverbed on nonsolid bedrock on nonsolid ground, it's also right next to or on top of an earthquake fault. Additionally, Mormon Island Dam has a known water seepage issue. Now at this point the water is clear and not cloudy but that can change over time. [#30-1 Mormon Island Dam stability]. My real concern is that the increased pressure placed upon Mormon Island auxiliary dam by a raise of the lake level will lead to a catastrophic failure and collapse of the Mormon Island Dam and then all the houses are downstream -- originally when the dam was built in 1948 to 1956, the only thing downstream of Mormon Island Dam were cattle pastures. Now there are hundreds of homes, thousands of residents in the path of that potential 30-foot wall of water. So my concern is that why are we continuing this project knowing we have this ticking bomb? I understand there's going to be an engineering study done on the bedrock and foundation of Mormon Island Dam. I would like a copy of that result sent to me or made available to me. That's what I have.
31	Patricia Gibbs	[#31-1 Land Use – Property Line.] Please identify any changes to the current federal property line that surrounds Folsom Lake as these changes relate to the various proposed alternatives regarding raising the dam level. Please provide this information graphically

No.	Name	Comment
		showing contour lines at lake level as well as the surrounding properties around the lake. [#31-2 Recreation trails]. And please identify any changes to trail use around Folsom Lake.
32	Robert Holderness	<p>Again, my name is Robert G. Holderness. I'm the president of the Folsom Tourism Bureau. I'm a former Mayor of the City of Folsom, a former Vice Mayor, a former member of the Folsom City Council. I'm also an attorney in private law practice. Tonight I'm appearing on behalf of the Tourism Bureau. I have some extensive comments to make regarding the proposal to close Folsom Point, but to begin with, I want to put my comments in a historic context, if you will.</p> <p>To begin with, this is the third time in less than 15 years that Folsom community, its businesses, have faced the occasion of irreparable injury at the hands of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation. In July 1995, by virtue of negligent maintenance activity at the Bureau, Gate Number 4 at Folsom Dam broke and they had to close the Dam Road for several years to make repairs that should have been done in the ordinary course of business.</p> <p>In March of 2003, the Bureau of Reclamation closed Folsom Dam Road and thereby irreparably injured businesses as well as the residents of our community, most particularly in the Historic District, and did so on the pretense that they were protecting us from terrorism. And now they are proposing to close Folsom Point for a period of seven years by virtue of the necessity of implementing a dam raise program to add additional safety to downstream dwellers of Folsom Dam. We're not here to argue the merits or demerits of the overriding project. I am here to comment upon the impact of that project based on the proposals that are before us tonight. We are advised by Jeff McCracken that the closure of Folsom Point is the worst-case scenario, implying that it would only happen in a worst-case scenario; however, we are further advised that all five alternatives that are being considered in the scope of the EIS contemplate closing Folsom Point for an extended period of time. [#32-1 Study authority.] We are further advised by a gentleman named Frank Piccola -- who is identified as the chief of projects within the Corps of Engineers -- that the decision of whether or not to close Folsom Point will be based on engineering needs. That is an incorrect statement of the obligations of the Federal Government in general, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation in particular. Folsom Dam and Folsom Lake were created by act of Congress in 1944, signed into law by United States President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Under that Enabling Statute, the Federal Government assumed a specific obligation to maintain access to Folsom Lake for the benefit of the citizens of the City of Folsom and the region around Folsom Lake. There was a specific stipulation that the Congress specifically signed into law when President Roosevelt signed the statute. Closing Folsom Point for seven years violates -- violates -- the stipulations under which Folsom Dam was created and Folsom Lake was created. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers do not have the power or the authority to violate that Enabling Statute. To attempt to do so as they are currently planning to do is arbitrary, it's capricious, it's clearly illegal, and it is contrary to law and it will require the necessity of litigation against them for which they have no legal defense. [#32-2 PD alternative staging areas]. The solution to the problem is to work with the community in Folsom, to find a way to keep access to Folsom Lake available to the residents of Folsom, to the tourist business and industry of Folsom, during the entirety of the construction project.] We know that there will be challenges in doing that, but those challenges do not mean it's impossible. This is not to be decided by engineering alone, that's only one factor and, frankly, it's probably the least significant factor. The more significant factors are political needs, economic needs, fiscal needs, environmental needs, construction needs; all of those take priority over engineering needs. Engineering, in this case, is simply a functionary activity. Once the policies are determined, then the engineers implement the policy. The policy that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps has to adopt is that Folsom Point will be open to access for the entirety of the seven-year project. That's the policy. The engineering staff is obligated by law, specifically the 1944 Enabling Statute, to implement that policy and that is precisely what the Bureau and the Corps needs to explain to their employees and those persons who have been assigned the task of implementing this project. To do otherwise will be to violate the law and to invite litigation. I make these comments with a firm purpose of achieving their goals. The Folsom Tourism Bureau is a body created under California law, it is funded by a BID, which is a Business Improvement District, in the City of Folsom. We raise about \$300,000 a year of money from hotels to fund our programs, and</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>in the past, those funds have been used to advance the cause of tourism within our community for the benefit of our citizens, for the benefit of our businesses, and frankly, for the benefit of those persons who seek to enjoy the tourist opportunities of our community. [#32-3 Socioeconomics.] In the face of this closure, we will be obligated to try to find ways to spend that money not on advancing tourism but trying to help businesses that are on the verge of failure as a result of implementing this policy should it be implemented. We say that not from scare tactics or imaginings but from experience. When the Dam Road was closed in March of 2003, we had several businesses close within a year by reason of a failure of customers to be able to get to their place of business. Even those businesses that survived suffered great consequences, a great drop in revenues. We've seen the statistics; we know that to be true.] We know that this is what is going to happen if indeed Folsom Point is closed for seven years, and we intend to vindicate our rights and seek compensation for those damages on behalf of the Tourism Bureau itself as well as working with other private businesses and associations who will advance the cause of their members as well. The solution is one of collaboration. The Bureau and the Corps should have already collaborated with the City of Folsom, the Tourism Bureau, the Chambers of Commerce and so forth before the publication of the draft EIS. They chose not to do that. That was an imprudent decision. They need to face the consequences of that decision by taking remedial action now before litigation eventuates, litigation that in my judgment they cannot prevail upon. [#32-4 Public Involvement meeting format.] The last thing I'd like to comment upon is the truncated methodology that's being used here to frustrate our right to exercise our right of freedom of assembly, our right of seeking redress of grievances and our right of freedom of speech. All three of those rights are rights that are guaranteed us as American citizens under the Constitution of the United States which was adopted in 1787. By virtue of requiring us to either, A, submit written comment, or B, subject ourselves to the awkward and embarrassing setting of having to explain our position to a court reporter, who knows nothing of the subject matter, whose only job is to take down verbatim the statements made by the persons who are making statements, does not in any way satisfy the obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers under the American Constitution.] They have to meet the precepts of that constitution just like everybody else does. There's no exception in the Constitution for them. And for them to use this truncated method is disrespectful to the citizens of Folsom, it's disrespectful to the businesses of Folsom, it's disrespectful to all of the institutions of the City of Folsom, including the City Government, the Tourism Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce, et cetera, and it's astonishing to me. After all, the Federal Government is our servant. They work for us. The Bureau works for us, the Corps of Engineers works for us. We as American citizens are their employer. We pay the taxes that end up in their pocket as a salary and a paycheck. They need to show us that they know that, that they know that they're working for all of us rather than showing us how capable they are of ignoring the important interests of our community, of our tourist industry, and of our city government.</p> <p>It's not too late to remedy the situation. They can do it, we know they can do it because we had the same problems with the bridge closure and it was very difficult to get the Bureau and the Corps to come around, but they did come around and now we're about to build a new bridge below the dam which is a product of a high-level, a historic level of cooperation between the City of Folsom, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers, and so we know they can do it. They haven't done it yet on this project. We hope they will understand that these comments are serious, they're based in law. They're not meant to be adversarial; they're meant to get their attention. We will be adversarial if we must, it's not our preference. Thank you.</p>
33	Don Reid	<p>[#33-1 Recreation and Socioeconomics businesses]. I believe the EIR does not reflect the impact on the recreation at Folsom Point and the corresponding economic impact on the City of Folsom. Folsom Point has 800,000-plus visitors a year. [#33-2 Recreation mitigation]. It appears that Folsom Point will be shut down or at a minimum severely impacted. This impact should be mitigated by relocating the staging and processing areas or creating an alternative recreation area during construction that minimize the recreation impact and the corresponding economic impact on the City of Folsom and El Dorado County. If there are conflicts between the construction haul roads and the access to Folsom Point recreation areas or any alternative areas, and the access for the public, temporary bridges should be built over the public access roads for safety reasons.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
34	MK Veloz	<p>I'm M.K. Veloz of the Northern California Marina Association. [#34-1 Recreation lake access closure]. One of our concerns, obviously, from the boating community is closing off access to the lake and that would have, you know, a terrible impact on the State's boaters and also of our businesses. [#34-2 Recreation and Socioeconomics Parks and Rec Dept.] But another related concern is the fact that Parks and Recreation obviously operates a facility here. If those are closed down for a substantial amount of time, they're going to lose revenue. And what's happening now in the state is Parks and Recreation through the legislative process is ripping off \$27 million from the Harbors and Watercraft Fund, revolving fund. And so that money is going out of the Harbors and Watercraft Fund which funds facilities like new marina developments or refurbishing of marinas, programs and things like that. If Parks loses more money, goes after more of the funds, there's a cascading effect that impacts not only this area but facilities all over the state, so I just wanted to get that point down. [#34-3 Public Involvement.] One more thing: An idea that I've heard expressed here is that you folks hold a forum with some of the stakeholders and the interest groups and come up with solutions, because I think some of the people that actually operate businesses up here and use the lake have some ideas about how to lessen some of the impact so that it would work better for them and for everyone. So I would encourage that you do that.</p>
35	Victor Becerril	<p>[#35-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Basically, I'm in favor of all the changes that are being made, the spillway, the raised level, on top of that. But the one thing I'm really concerned with is Folsom Point, the closing of the park there to use in place of the equipment purposes that is being talked about. That's basically my comment.</p>
36	Kent Zenobia	<p>I would like to comment as a resident that could be potentially significantly impacted by the proposed alternatives presented on the poster boards here tonight. I also have a background in civil and environmental engineering and am a registered engineer in California and in nine other states. I'm currently working on the levy reconstruction projects with the Department of Water Resources and the Army Corps of Engineers. So I'm familiar with how these activities would occur and the details of how they would be conducted. [#36-1 Public Involvement clarity of presentation materials]. First, I'd like to point out that on this "Proposed Alternatives" poster board over here that Alternative 3 does not clearly indicate that it would include the overlay to Mormon Island Dam which would also thereby have a major impact on the Folsom Point recreation area and the boat launch. One of the gentlemen over here, John Wilson with Reclamation, indicated that the poster summary appeared to contain a shortfall in the bullets that were listed under the particular alternatives. Although it has shown up later on the lower right-hand corner of elements common to all alternatives, it's not real clear for the public to recognize these alternatives include potentially major impacts to Folsom Point recreation area, boat launch, park, the immediate neighborhood, and residences.</p> <p>Point Number 2: [#36-2 Recreation access closure/alternatives.] I would like to see a water haul alternative using barges to carry the fill from the proposed spillway excavation location over to the Mormon Island Dam seismic upgrade location. This fill-hauling alternative would also require short truck hauls to carry the rock from the excavation site to the barge and then from the barge to the fill location on Mormon Island Dam. In addition, conveyors could be implemented to deliver the fill material to the specific location on Mormon Island Dam where it would then be worked in with heavy track equipment like bulldozers and compactors. I suspect this could potentially be very cost-effective and may avoid a lot of the expense of the proposed coffer dams, haul roads, long truck route construction, truck traffic, labor and environmental impacts to the Folsom Point recreational area, and other impacts to the residences and church. It appears that the residences, the church, new commercial facilities, and new homes in the immediate area along Natoma Street and Briggs Ranch will be significantly impacted by the red construction zone shown on the maps that depict the coffer dams and haul routes over to Mormon Island Dam. These impacts should also be considered when judged against a water haul and barge route from the excavation site to Mormon Island Dam. For example, as a civil engineer on the DWR and Army Corps levy projects, we've evaluated the barging of major tonnages of fill materials to repair the levees for the State of California. We found barge hauling was significantly cheaper than truck hauls to repair these levies. In addition, Point Number 3 is that these alternatives don't clearly depict here what appears to be major impacts to the Folsom Point recreation area, the park, and the boat launch. I think there's about a</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		thousand homes that are in this immediate vicinity. The residents, including students and the public, use Folsom Point since it's literally on the other side of Natoma Street. In addition, there are a lot of families that go over to the park, walk over there in the park with their pets and their children. And also, there are many families that simply drive across Natoma Street from Briggs Ranch to launch their boats at the Folsom Point boat launch. It is a significant feature for the residents in the neighborhood, and I'd like that to be considered highly when the final decisions are made with regard to the most appropriate alternative. The impacts of shutting down Folsom Point for extended periods of time, which I understand could be from one to seven years, would be a major negative impact to the residents in our community.] I appreciate you considering these comments and hope they can be evaluated in the EIR process. Thank you.
37	Kris Gardner	[#37-1 Recreation remaining access points]. I'm wishing to go on record to have the Folsom Point Dike 8 remain open during this construction project; that the estimated seven-year time would be a huge impact to the recreational aspects of the boat ramping areas. And the additional impact to Brown's Ravine and others around the lake would be excessive, so Dike 8 just must stay open for the amount of boaters that have come to use the lake from around the region. The growth of Folsom has been so huge that there's an enormous amount of use of the boat ramps. And even now, Dike 8 on a summer day, the lines waiting to launch there and at Brown's Ravine are enormous. So you wouldn't even be able to get out on the lake, it would take you hours to do it if that one went away. So if you can find a different way of staging, that would be really good.
38	Taylor Zenobia	[#38-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Hello. My name is Taylor Zenobia, and I'm a nine-year-old fourth-grade student at Folsom Hills School and resident in Briggs Ranch. I'm also a Student Council officer at Folsom Hills School in Briggs Ranch, and I'm sure all of our school would like to be able to keep going to Folsom Point. I like to go to Folsom Point often with our dog and walk him by the lake. Our school also has field trips to the lake and I hope that this activity will allow us to keep going there throughout the rest of the years. Plus, there are a lot of wildlife and flowers that you can see in the summertime and I think that that makes the lake a very special place that we should be able to go to.
39	Sarah Griffith	[#39-1 Recreation trails.] As a recreational trail user of the trails around the lake, one of my main concerns about the project is that the trails, when the project is finished, be left in a way that they are still usable in the way that they can be used now by horses, by hikers, and by bicycle riders. [#39-2 Recreation Trails Inundation]. Another concern I have is that if there was a 1-in-200-year flooding event and that the water level came up and possibly temporarily touched the trails, that the trails would be able to be restored to a usable recreational condition. And I'm also concerned that the project not negatively impact the public's use of this area also for boating and for hiking, bicycle riding, and anything that people are doing with this. [#39-3 Geology and Soils asbestos.] The other thing I'm slightly concerned about is that I don't know the specifics of the geology of the area where they are going to be digging the spillway, but there's a lot of serpentine rock in some areas of the foothills such as El Dorado County, and I would be concerned about potentially disturbing serpentine rock and creating extra asbestos exposure for both the people working on the site and for the people living in the area and driving through the area. And I would hope that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps would have some sort of system to deal with that so the public would not be exposed to extra asbestos because it's dangerous. [#39-4 PD warning for flow release]. And I haven't studied the entire document yet, but I would be hoping that if the spillway, the proposed spillway that they want to do was opened to release extra water flow, that there would be some sort of public warning system for the people downstream so they wouldn't accidentally get caught in an extra water flow and we wouldn't be having people getting flooded, accidentally drowning. So something like a siren or something would be a good idea to consider.
40	Keoni Almeida	[#40 Inundation map request.] On behalf of my neighbors, I would like to request that the detailed maps showing the high water levels be posted to your web as not all could attend. Several properties in my neighborhood will be impacted by high water level in the event of a storm. Real estate ownership maps sheets 1-12.
41	Cindi Dulgar	"A family that plays together, stays together". Families in the Folsom, El Dorado Hills Area value the opportunity to spend quality time

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>on the water as a family, to sail, swim, picnic, ski, fish etc. [#41-1 Recreation and alternative staging areas.] This project will displace recreation users for 5-8 years; that is an entire phase in a family's life. If access is closed the Marina and Granite Bay will not be able to accommodate summer users. The ramps will be closed. It is our request to look into other options for storage and rock crushing – and not negatively affect recreation on Folsom Lake by limiting access to the recreating community.</p>
42	Paul Moynier	<p>In the interest of time, I have prepared a statement.</p> <p>Good evening and thank you for hosting the Public Hearing tonight. I'm Paul Moynier, President of Sacramento Valley Marine Association. The organization I represent has 30 members who have boat dealerships within the greater Sacramento Metropolitan area and generate in excess of \$100 million dollars in annual sales.</p> <p>Tonight I hope to provide information that will help the Bureau of Reclamation better understand the impacts this project will have on Boat Dealers, Merchants, City of Folsom Parks and Recreation, and the local economy in the Sacramento region.</p> <p>As an organization representing the recreational industry, we support properly managed valuable water resources, the flood control upgrade and the bridge crossing at Folsom Lake. It is not our desire to stop this project...but instead help minimize or eliminate the impacts to the business community. As stated in the EIR with interpretation.. this project WILL cause hardship on the local economy.</p> <p>The City of Folsom, El Dorado Hills, and the South Placer Communities use Folsom Lake as the barometer for success. The business community is directly tied to lake levels, public access, and water availability at this facility. After reviewing the EIR for this project, it suggests the closure and or partial closure of several major access points on Folsom Lake which include Folsom Point, Beal's Point, and Granite Bay. [#42-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] Closure or restriction of any access points to the lake will have significant revenue impacts on the local Boat Dealers and merchants, the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation who solely depend on this facility for their revenue.</p> <p>[#42-2 Public Involvement and PD alternative staging areas.] We ask that you allow us to provide input and include us in any way possible through focus groups to help mitigate the lost revenue exposure described in the current plan. We submit to you there are alternate options and ways to complete this project that will minimize impacts to lake access and maintain a healthy business environment for the merchants.</p> <p>[#42-3 Recreation mitigation.] The following items are a few suggestions that should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify alternate staging areas to eliminate park access point closure ▪ Minimize or restrict construction during peak summer season time ▪ Construct additional lake launching access points and possibly retain after construction is complete] <p>These are just a few examples of alternate ways to manage this project and help minimize financial loss to the business community.</p> <p>On behalf of the Sacramento Valley Marine Association, we look forward to providing input and working together to make this project business and community friendly.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration this evening.</p>
43	Gene Moynier	<p>[#43-1 PD alternative staging areas.] Please consider alternate construction locations for encompassing equipment and materials to lessen the need for closure of park areas, the economic impact from closure, and disruption will be significant based on current proposal. [#43-2 Cumulative and recreation mitigation]. The long term cumulative negative impact is directly proportional to the amount</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		of closure and disruption. Consider: establish alternate storage, install new ramps or expand existing, schedule construction to non-prime season, develop forum for input of new ideas prior to final draft.
44	Michelle Lipowski	[#44-1 Lake Access Closure] I have concerns regarding the closure of Folsom Point during work on the dam. Folsom has already experienced long term closure of the park facilities (powerhouse) for 2 years. There must be some way to keep Folsom Point open during this construction and keep the revenue [#44-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] flowing from the use of that site.
45	James Clayburn	[#45-1 Recreation remaining access points.] I am fully on board with the project and why we are doing it, however I have a large concern about the closure of Folsom Point Recreation Area without providing an alternate option other than overflow to Granite Bay or Brown's Ravine for boat launching. The lake launches are already overly crowded in the summer months and there should be an alternate option to closing Folsom Point launch. You need to either consider not closing it or provide an alternate launch facility in the interim. I live and play in Folsom, if I cant play here anymore it makes me think its time to move to a more accessible lake.
46	Jon Soderman	[#46-1 PD alternative staging areas.] I am in favor of improvements. I would favor looking at any other alternate sites other than Folsom Point, as the closure of the Dam Road has already significantly and financially put a burden on the town of Folsom and its residents.]
47	Charles A. Hooper	[#47-1 Recreation lake access closure]. Need more access, not less. Please do the project(s). But wed very much like access to the lake. More; not less. [#47-2 Dam Road.] And we'd like access across on the Dam Road until the new bridge is built. Thank you very much.
48	Renee Howle	[#48-1 Dam Road bridge]. While this project is well merited, and would yield numerous benefits, it will take resources away from more immanent needs. The proposed bridge would be better located crossing the lake at Horseshoe Bar. It would remove potential danger of attack further from the dam. It would streamline auto and truck traffic as well. [#48-2 Auburn Dam.] Be that as it may, the entire levee system of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers need more immediate attention. The Auburn Dam should be built and this project will add to the delays for that. The Auburn Dam would provide much needed CO2 free electrical energy – something that would better address the most serious environmental problem, global warming. I would be glad to participate in the environmental planning related to reservoir expanding or formation as in the case of the Auburn Dam. It could be done wisely, scientifically, and with enhancements to the riparian habitats and surrounding forests. I sit on the Board of Golden Sierra a 501(c)3 organization dedicated to environmental enhancements and ecosystem rebalancing. Thank You. P.S. Please provide access to the DEIS/EIR for the proposed projects.
49	Dennis Swenson	[#49-1 Population and Housing affected property.] I am a home owner in the Park Vista neighborhood (next to the Granite Bay entrance of the park) and would like to know how the project will affect my property.
50	Ken Christensen	[#50-1 PD Use of excess material at Browns Ravine]. I manage Folsom Lake Marina at Browns Ravine. I just wanted to point out that if you have extra material and are looking for a place to store it, we could sure use it. We really need an earth breakwater at the marina so we would be able to increase the number of slips and to better protect all the boats. We currently have one breakwater on one side of the entrance, but need to have them on both sides. Our current breakwater goes under at elevation 450ft and needs to be raised.
51	Russ Knapp	[#51-1 In Support of Project.] We prefer Plan 3 and strongly oppose alternate plans 4 and 5.
52	Duane Cooney	[#52-1 PD alternative staging areas.] Find an alternative to closing Dike 8/Folsom Point for 7 years. Do not close Dike 8. Thank you.
53	Cindy Speer	[#53-1 Public Involvement meeting notification.] Today on the news was the first I heard of this meeting. Why were the residents in Folsom not notified of this meeting before today? [#53-2 PD alternative staging areas.] Where are the alternative sites? We moved to Folsom (and use Folsom Point every weekend during the summer). Because of the access to the lake is why we moved to this area.
54	Melissa Green	[#54-1 Socioeconomics property values]. Project is needed but must be done without denying public access to current facilities at Folsom Lake, including Folsom Point and Beal's. Long term (more than one year) denial of access depresses home values and is unacceptable.
55	Russ and Lisa Hoy	[#55-1 PD Closure Time.] Specify times of closure! [#55-2 Recreation and Socioeconomic mitigation.] Need plan to mitigate recreational and economic effects for the community. Your public presentation of the project highlights the need for dam improvement

No.	Name	Comment
		but does not address community impact quality of life issues for the multi-year project duration. There must be a way to spread project impact in other areas so as to not put undue burden on any one lake access recreational point – especially the one that impacts the Folsom Community the most.
56	Jason Zarghami	Alternative 3 to raise water level by 3.5 feet is the right alternative. [#56-1 In support of Project]. Alternative 5 to raise the water level by 17 feet is plain bad. Safety of the dam plus too many properties will be effected by 17 feet of water. Why even consider such a bad alternative?] Also have area photos and water line information available on a web page for all affected property owners to review.
57	Ericka Cooney	[#57-1 Recreation lake access closure] As a 10 year resident of Folsom, I will not stand by silently and allow my main source of recreation and a huge draw of young families in the area to be shut down for 7 years. Folsom is a large lake, Dike 7 is already closed to the public, make use of it for storage. There are other options that would not leave thousands of Folsom residents out in the cold. I am absolutely opposed to closing Dike 8 for 7 years or 1 year. Find another option.
58	Brian and Cindi Dulgar	[#58-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] The Sacramento State Aquatic Center uses Folsom Point as a staging area for our summer youth basic ski camp. University P.E. classes, P.W.C. classes and multi-level ski classes. Students and children park and walk to the ski beach to meet their instructors – no where else on the lake can accommodate our numbers or program. Our request is to look into other options for storage and rock crushing, and not negatively affect recreation on Folsom Lake by limiting access.
59	Sandy McKaig	[#59-1 Recreation lake access closure]. As much as I realize that the project (of some sort) is necessary, public access to the lake at Folsom Point should not be limited or even denied.(I would hate to see Beal's Point impacted as well). [#59-2 Public Involvement meeting format.] I really believe that there should be additional meetings (town mtg-like) to express viewpoints, to clarify alternatives and impacts, and discuss options or other solutions. The way this project is being presented and by given only a “comment” card to write concerns on – seems like a done deal where decisions will be made without public opinion.
60	Jim Snook	[#60-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am extremely concerned for the impact of closing any of the public access to the lake. While the need for flood protection is agreed upon, eliminating any of the launching recreation facilities would be incredibly detrimental to thousands of boat owners. [#60-2 Socioeconomics EIS Process.] In addition, I was disappointed to see that ECONOMIC impact was not a consideration relating to IMPACTS and MITIGATION. This City has thousands of visitors to the lake that contribute to the local economy. Please consider how any closures to facilities would impact our city.
61	Craig R Larson	Major concerns I have: [#61-1 Recreation lake access closure]. Loss of water access for the thousands of people that call Folsom their home lake. [#61-2 Socioeconomics businesses]. Loss of revenue to companies that depend on recreation use of Folsom Lake, who have always supported the lake. The youth of Folsom and outlying areas that will not be able to take part in the wonder and beauty of Folsom Lake. The overall loss of interest into the use of Folsom Lake and the activities such as boating that have helped make Folsom the city it is today. Please leave our boat ramps and access areas open to the people and families that build their memories on the lake!! The loss of revenue to the boat dealers in the Folsom area would be great and could not be made up for.
62	Carol James	[#62-1 Recreation mitigation]. Although it appears necessary to reduce boat launching facilities, would it be possible to enlarge those areas that will still be available for the public to park their vehicles and trailers? The public will surely adjust to longer lines for launching, but knowing they CAN launch and store their vehicles will lessen the negative impact. I believe this investment would not only be a good permanent upgrade, but show the public their recreation interests are still acknowledged. Thank you for your attention.
63	Chet Bloyd	[#63-1 Socioeconomics businesses]. The proposed closure will affect not only the immediate surrounding areas in the loss of taxable revenue generated by the recreation areas. It will also be devastating to the marine industry in the Sacramento and surrounding areas. The loss of revenue to these businesses will be greatly felt by most and some may even be closed. If there is an alternative, I believe we should explore!
64	Mike Garner	[#64-1 Socioeconomics.] Keep the vitality of the lake and the surrounding community at the top of priority list. Keep the flow of the 1 million plus visitors flowing when the project begins. Enough has happened already with the closure of the dam road. Don't hurt the

No.	Name	Comment
		livelihood's of these people anymore than what they've been subjected to already.
65	John Poimiroo	[#65-1 Visual loss of observation point] I am also concerned about the loss of the public viewing area (observation point) at the south end of the dam. That is potentially in the State Park plan as a future restaurant and public viewing area. I do not see any mention of this as a long-term recreational impact. Some sort of accommodation to retain this viewing area should be allowed.
66	John Poimiroo	[#66-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] Im John Poimiroo, Staff Commodore of the Folsom Lake Yacht Club. We are one of the oldest and largest recreational groups on Folsom Lake, having been established in 1956. Our club conducts sailing programs including races, cruises, water safety, instruction, and social events on Folsom Lake. On behalf of our members, I urge the Bureau of Reclamation not to close Folsom Point during the time that Folsom Dam is being raised. [#66-2 Recreation remaining access points]. Closing Folsom Point would seriously impact Folsom and communities surrounding it, as well as public use of Folsom Lake State Recreation Area. Should the boat launch facility at Folsom Point be closed, most of the boaters who now launch at Folsom Point would shift to the next nearest launch ramp at Browns Ravine in El Dorado Hills. There is not enough trailer parking at Browns Ravine to accommodate this shift which now runs at capacity on most weekend days throughout the boating season. Through most of the year only one ramp is available at Browns Ravine. [#66-3 Recreation Transportation.] Closing Folsom Point would increase traffic both on Natoma Street and Green Valley Road. It would also discourage boaters from using Folsom Lake because of the inconvenience of long waiting times to launch, lack of parking, conflicts arising at the launch ramp because of delays and not knowing whether there will be space at Browns Ravine to launch. [#66-4 Socioeconomics businesses.] Should Folsom Point be closed, reestablishing boating among those who have shifted to other recreational pursuits will take years. In the meantime, clubs such as FLYC and the marine industry in the Sacramento area will suffer and perhaps be irreparably damaged. Alternative locations to stage construction equipment and materials exist closer to the dam than Folsom Point, such as near the intersection of the Folsom Dam Road and Natoma St. Large areas of land owned by the California Department of Corrections are accessible from Folsom Dam Road that would allow staging materials on public land closer to the dam and that would also require that construction traffic travel along Natoma St north that Folsom Point be closed for nearly a decade. So we ask that you not close Folsom Point and avoid these negative impacts on the Folsom community and boaters.
67	Kevin Kraft	[#67-General.] Not sure about this,as avid boaters,a bigger lake would be cool but.We need the flood protection, I guess, IMHO we need more bridges over the American river and Sacto too,as this would help with traffic. As a native sacramentan,I am bitter about all the traffic and really would like to see the house construction and builders go away.If the bigger dam will give the builders the go for more houses,I say no.Just my opinion.
68	Peter Clark	Hello, I was not able to attend the meeting last night in Folsom, so my friend/colleague sent me your address so I could provide my two cents. Closure of ANY ramps/facilities would mean certain negative impacts: 1. Being a regular boater at Folsom Lake over the last 12 years, I have seen a steady increase in traffic/delays/safety issues/parking problems/congestion/turn-aways at every ramp. This would only be compounded by a closure of one of the more popular, more accessible and convenient launch facilities. 2. [#68-1 Socioeconomics recreation fees]. Access fees would probably increase due to an overall decrease in patronage due to the other ramps' capacities not being able to handle the diversion from Folsom Point. Fees are already borderline outrageous, even if you purchase a season pass like I do. 3. [#68-2 Recreation] People would find even more "creative" ways of accessing the lake. This would include driving on otherwise forbidden hillsides/embankments to swim, picnic, launch craft... especially PWC's. This is already a problem. 4. [#68-3 Recreation remaining access points.] The south end of the lake could only be serviced by ONE facility, which often operates at half capacity since the Hobie Cove portion is often inaccessible (I'm not complaining about lake levels here!). The lake

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>must be at a maximum of about 75% to expose Hobie Cove for use. There would still be a significant increase in traffic to the marina area from the closure, which is something I am not sure this quite narrow/tight facility can handle. Most of Folsom's population is on the south side of the dam, thereby making these southern facilities the most convenient for the public.</p> <p>5. [#68-4 Recreation indirect effects.] If the capacity of the lake were increased (I believe part of this project is to raise the level by 7 feet), then most or all of the other ramp facilities would need to be modified since the current 100% waterline at those facilities is at the top of the ramp. This would cause a closure of the other facilities at some point as well, since the "new" 100% mark would render these facilities useless.</p> <p>6. [#68-5 Transportation.] There would be an additional increase in traffic through downtown Folsom as some would try launching at Granite Bay. As you may know, the traffic through downtown has been a huge issue since the Dam Road closure.</p> <p>7. [#68-6 Purpose and need.] Personally, I haven't heard or read convincing arguments on why the dam and dikes need work in the first place. If there is a mechanical concern with these structures, then come out and say it. At least the public would understand and accept it. "Flood control" isn't enough explanation to warrant 7 years of inconvenience trying to use my floating entertainment investment. What specific work is proposed to control flooding? It's kind of like shutting the Dam Road down 1.5 years after 9/11, citing "security reasons" as the driver for the closure. If the Dam can't handle the increased traffic, then that's a much more logical reason than what was provided to the public.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if these could be forwarded on to any other appropriate individuals.</p>
69	Todd Drybread	<p>I was unable to attend the public hearing last night, so please excuse myself if I am out of line. [#69-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am incredibly upset with the possibility of closing Folsom Point. My family and I use the facility for walks and runs year round as well as boat access during the summer months. [#69-2 Recreation remaining access points.] Folsom lake has gained in popularity and closing Folsom Point would drive a large number of people to Granite Bay and especially Brown's Ravine. Browns Ravine will be continually overcrowded, plus it does not have the recreational access as does Folsom Point. Please let me know what I can do to help stop this closure.</p>
70	Scott Howlett	<p>[#70-1 Recreation lake access closure.] We seriously disagree with any decision to close Folsom Point. We use the facility 5 times a week from May through Sept. It is a very busy boating launch and picnic area. I can't imagine Browns Ravine being able to accommodate the extra traffic. There must be another staging area that could be used!</p>
71	Rick and Pam Patterson	<p>Shawn, [#71-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I'm opposed to closing Folsom Pt. I never go anywhere else on Folsom Lake except there, there is shade. Big mistake,</p>
72	Sheila and Tom Leard	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, [#72-1 Recreation lake access closure]. I write this as a very concerned resident of Folsom that the closing of Dyke 8 is an unreasonable burden that the residents of Folsom are expected to endure. Not only have we had to tolerate the closing of the Dam road, traffic on Sutter Street, but the inconvenience and lack of forthright public notification is too much to sit quietly this time.] My own personal story is of the enjoyment I have of running with my dog in the Folsom Point area. There are elderly men who have had 10 year ritual of walking in the early morning and stay connected to the world while exercising. This is the place I take all out of town relatives and friends to show off our gorgeous lake and vistas. This is the lake that several friends swim in while we train for various events. This is the lake that is part of an annual second grade field trip to learn about our local habitat. [#72-2 Vegetation and wildlife.] The loss of local vegetation and wildlife will be an irreversible loss to our children. The closing of Folsom Point has a ripple effect here that needs to be addressed before there is anymore disruption to the residents and near by communities. In the report it states that Folsom Point is 'only for day use and a boat launch'. It is so much more than that! I urge you to carry out an alternative plan for a staging site for this project.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
73	G R Petersen	<p>[#73-1 PD alternative staging areas.] Being a current resident of Folsom and long time Sacramentoan, I must say I was very concerned to hear that Folsom Point may be closed for 7 years for work on the dam. I understand that there is the need for a staging area for the dam, but I urge you to choose one that will not have such an impact on a community. Close access to the lake is one of the reasons we moved to Folsom from Carmichael. We enjoy being able to go to the lake, swim and boat from the close proximity to our house. I know that we would still be able to access Folsom Lake, but it wouldn't be the same.</p>
74	Greg Fales	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>[#74-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am writing to let you know my great concern and disapproval of shutting down Folsom Point for any length of time. My family and I moved to Folsom over ten years ago and we use all of the parks located at the lake on a regular basis. Having access to Folsom Point or any other Park at Folsom Lake is a big reason that we moved to Folsom and it's part of the quality of life that we paid for when buying our home. Giving up access for even one summer is not acceptable, let alone for seven years. Please keep the parks open.</p>
75	Marco and Patti Pailla	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver,</p> <p>[#75-1 Recreation lake access closure.] As a long time resident of Folsom we are strongly opposed to the potential closing of Folsom Point for a long term staging area for proposed construction of a new spillway for Folsom Dam. Folsom is such a desirable city to live in part to the beautiful recreational lake we have in our backyard. We recognized that right away when we moved into the Briggs Ranch neighborhood with our 3 daughters after relocating from Atlanta, GA 16 years ago. Folsom Point (formerly Dyke 8) has been a constant destination for our family over the years that has included enjoying the point on our walks, on challenging bike rides, exploring the Point with our Girl Scout troops, spontaneous family picnics, taking the opportunity to enjoy the visual beauty of the lake since the closure of Folsom Dam Road and of course, the abundance of fun-filled boating opportunities through the convenient boat ramp access.</p> <p>Please reconsider what a huge negative affect this would have on the families of Folsom and on the wonderful quality of life that having such a beautiful, convenient destination has provided the ever growing number of Folsom residents. Eliminating access to Folsom Point for 6-7 years would be a devastating loss.</p>
76	Jonathan Walburger	<p>[#76-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This would be a terrible idea. One of the benefits to living in Folsom is the easy Lake Access. My family and I love being able to ride our bikes to Lake. Please don't take this away.</p>
77	Dawn Lockwood	<p>Mr. Oliver,</p> <p>[#77-1 Recreation lake access closure] As a long time Folsom resident, I am writing to urge you to reconsider closing Folsom Point. We value that area for our "warm weather" recreation; we moved to Folsom for this beautiful lake. Closing Folsom Point would not only [#77-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] impact businesses in Folsom but also the way of life for many of our residents.</p>
78	CVP Water Association	<p>[#78-1 PD No Action Alt.] Use of the 400,000/670,000 acre-foot rule as a key assumption in the No Action Alternative is flawed due to the uncertainty on continuation of that rule for Folsom reservoir operation over the design life of the Proposed Project. Firstly, although the 400,000/670,000 acre-foot rule is embodied in the 2004 agreement between Reclamation and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), that agreement terminates in 2018 or earlier and nothing compels SAFCA to enter into a new agreement with Reclamation with the same rule to span the design life of the Proposed Project. Secondly, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (WRDA) characterized the 400,000/670,000 rule as in interim rule until such time as a flood damage reduction plan for the American River has been implemented. The pre-1993 400,000 acre-foot rule presents the most plausible default for incorporation into the No Action Alternative.</p>
79	CVP Water Association	<p>[#79-1 PD Proposed Project.] The Proposed Project enables and contemplates studying a wider range of operations rules for flood control and other purposes than those in use today, and any changed rules resulting from those studies will have various impacts, both positive and negative, on water users and the environment. [#79-2 Range of alternatives.] In addition, the range of alternatives for flood</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		control does not address the range of possible alternatives involving downstream levees. Simply adopting existing plans for levee strengthening and upgrades falls far short of the realistic range of alternatives that should be addressed. For instance, WRDA of 1996 contemplates development and implementation of a flood damage reduction plan for the American River. No such plan is incorporated in the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS). As such, the alternatives and their impacts are too narrowly described in the current DEIS to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The studies must be completed and described in a more comprehensive set of alternatives before a revised DEIS is issued.
80	CVP Water Association	[#80-1 Hydropower Folsom reoperation]. Extension of the prior comment: there are no estimates of the economic/financial impact to CVP water contractors, power customers of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), or other water users, of plausible or likely changes to operation of Folsom Reservoir as a result of the Proposed Project or other alternatives. No remedies are identified to compensate CVP water contractors, power customers of WAPA, or other users, due to reduced water or power supply caused by plausible or likely changes to Folsom Reservoir operation as a result of the Proposed Project or other alternatives. [#80-2 Hydropower cumulative effects]. In short, the document fails to consider fully the indirect and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project.
81	CVP Water Association	[#81-1 CVP cost allocation.] We would also like to reiterate our general understanding that there cannot be an allocation to CVP Contractors for costs for projects that do not meet an authorized CVP Project Purpose and/or are not designated as a Financially and Operationally Integrated part of the CVP. This general understanding is consistent with Reclamation Law. Neither document provides the background calculations from which the cost allocations were derived. In addition, neither document specifies cost shares to specific entities. We are very interested in this information.
82	CVP Water Association	[#82-1 CVP cost allocation.] We also believe that any Safety of Dams allocation for any of these costs would be of sufficient significance to warrant a separate repayment period beyond the 2030 repayment deadline for pre-existing CVP Plant-In-Service costs as of 1980. Because these projects are not expected to be completed until time periods ranging from 2010 (at the very earliest) to 2020 (if there are scheduling delays), a 2030 repayment period would considerably compress the repayment period for these costs relative to the useful life of the project. Moreover, the CVP ratesetting policies incorporate a 50-year repayment period for capital costs, which was used as the basis for determining a 2036 repayment date for the San Felipe Unit out-of-basin facilities costs.
83	CVP Water Association	[#83-1 Executive Summary text clarification.] Page ES-2: Within the last paragraph, elements that Reclamation and the Corps would implement separately are mentioned, and a list "as summarized in the following paragraphs" is referenced. On what page is this list provided?
84	CVP Water Association	[#84-1 Study Authority.] Page ES-3: Regarding the top paragraph, was separate authorizing legislation provided for the Folsom Outlet Modifications Project, which was morphed by the Corps into the Auxiliary Spillway Project? What was the PL number for this authorizing legislation for the Folsom Outlet Modification Project?
85	CVP Water Association	[#85-1 PD Fuseplug Relation.] Page ES-9: Will the referenced fuseplug in the top paragraph be built prior to the completion of the auxiliary spillway?
86	CVP Water Association	[#86-1 Relationship with security project.] Page ES-11: In the top paragraph, why is there a reference to security activities? Have security activities been defined as part of the Joint Federal Project and either the Flood Damage Reduction or Safety of Dams program?
87	CVP Water Association	[#87-1 Study Authority for MODS.] Page ES-11: Did the authorizing legislation for the Folsom Outlet Modification Project (which was subsequently revamped as the Auxiliary Spillway) specify a 100% flood control allocation?
88	CVP Water Association	[#88-1 Hydrology dam storage capacity.] Page ES-13 to ES-15: What incremental acre-foot storage capacities would be provided by 3.5, 6 and 17 foot raise levels to the Folsom Storage Facility? How does this compare to the acre-foot capacities that are expected to be generated through a Probable Maximum Flood?
89	CVP Water	[#89-1 Safety requirement.] Page1-1: Are there specific (non-security related) safety requirements for the Folsom Facility based on the

No.	Name	Comment
	Association	basis that it is designated as a National Critical Infrastructure Facility?
90	CVP Water Association	[#90-1 Study Authority]. Page 1-20: Why is the authorizing legislation for the Folsom Outlet Modifications Project not included in the legislative citations?
91	CVP Water Association	[#91-1 Study Authority/Security.] Page 2-73: Is site security being incorporated into this project? If so, under what authorization is this being done?
92	CVP Water Association	[#92-1 PD Alternative definition.] Page 2-85: Why is alternative 1 designated as a purely Safety of Dams alternative?
93	CVP Water Association	[#93-1 Water Supply impacts.] Page 3.2-4: Would any of the proposed projects impact water deliveries while construction is in progress?
94	CVP Water Association	[#94-1 Water Supply impacts.] Would deliveries to the City of Roseville, San Juan Water District, and Suburban Water District be significantly impacted during construction of any of the Corps Folsom Dam Modifications Projects?
95	Jim Bayless	<p>Shawn – I have reviewed the EIR and have a few questions. I apologize that the answers may lie in the document, but I could not put my fingers on them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [#95-1 PD Dam capacity.] The alternatives include raising the reservoir's containment level by 3.5' to 17'. Would that additional capacity be considered merely as freeboard, or would the facility be operated with the water storage goal of filling the facility to a higher level than the current capability? 2. [#95-2 PD roadway construction.] Would each alternative include relocating or rebuilding all roads, parking lots and facilities above the new high-water line? 3. [#95-3 PD vegetation.] Would the existing trees on the shoreline be cleared to above the new high-water line? 4. [#95-4 PD hiking trails.] Would all impacted hiking and biking trails also be relocated above the high-water line? 5. [#95-5 Hydropower/Water Supply]. Presumably at least alternative 5 would impact some county roads. Would it also impact the Salmon Fall bridge, or any EID water intake facilities? 6. [#95-6 PD alternative development.] Is there any consideration of alternative strategies that have less impact on Folsom Point park operations? 7. Should official comments be sent to you?
96	Lyndsay Smith	<p>Mr. Shawn Oliver & Mrs. Becky Victorine, [#96-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am a student at Sacramento State and an resident of Folsom. I've just been informed about the plan to potentially close Folsom Point (Dyke 8) for upwards to 5 years because of the project for Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage reduction. I understand the need and encourage the project, but would like to strongly and earnestly urge the consideration of a plan that would not include closing Folsom Point. I am an avid wake boarder and use the boat launch at Folsom Point from late March through November. I live just five minutes from Folsom Point and would be greatly inconvenienced to have to drive to another location to drop my boat in. I know many other friends and family members that this would affect as well. If there is any other plan though could be implemented to prevent the closure of Folsom Point for 5 years, it would be greatly appreciated by the entire community. Thank you for your consideration</p>
97	Anonymous	<p>Dear Friends, The project for Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage reduction is very important! [#97-1 Recreation.] We would however like to request a more supportive approach where recreation is concerned and other solutions are offered. This project is proposed into 2012 (or longer) Closure of Folsom Point will negatively affect families,</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>boaters and Aquatic Center clients who access the Lake though Folsom.</p> <p>#97-2 Recreation remaining access points. During the busy season Folsom Lake Launching Ramps will actually close due to lack of space (parking). Browns Marina and Granite Bay are the other options, which will be heavily impacted, with early closures due to limited space. This community is special because of the opportunities to recreate! Access to the water is critical! Please consider the other options for debris storage and rock crushing.</p> <p>KEEP FOLSOM POINT OPEN!!!</p> <p>Any consideration for future recreation in this community is highly valued. Please look at the finished product.</p> <p>#97-3 Recreation mitigation. IS THERE BIKE TRAILS?? Have the existing trails been replaced? HAVE THE HORSE TRAILS BEEN REPLACED AND REPAIRED? HAVE TREES BEEN PLANTED FOR PICNICS (WITH PICNIC TABLES)?]</p>
98	Terry and Jim Lehman	<p>Mr. Mayor,</p> <p>#98-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives. We am very distressed at the idea of closing the Folsom Point (Dyke 8)recreation are for seven years as it is used for a site to stage the dam reconstruction. We feel this is removing a vital part of the recreation for the city for an extended length of time. #98-2 Transportation. Not to mention the construction vehicles that will be traveling in and out the site for seven years. This will impact the traffic on Natoma (which will just be opening up for traffic across the dam once the new bridge is built), and will negatively effect our neighborhood due to the traffic and noise. We can not believe that there is not a more appropriate place on the opposite side of the dam that cannot be used for this purpose. Our city and neighborhoods have taken such a hit in the past 5 years, can you not give us a break and use an area that will not negatively effect us for the next seven years? Please rethink your possibilities.</p>
99	Brian Austerman	<p>Dear Shawn,</p> <p>I'm a very avid boater and live minutes away from Folsom Lake. My friends and I use the lake most of the year and throughout the winter. I see all the boating issues concerning Folsom Lake and I have some concerns with the new construction proposals.</p> <p>#99-1 Recreation Mitigation. Unfortunately, I could not attend the latest meeting but I believe that the construction plan for the necessary flood protection improvements needs to include an interim access point to the lake before moving forward with the dam and dyke raising project. The number of lake visitors has been increasing along with the growing population every year and a new or interim access point needs to be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. I understand that everyone needs to share the burden of the proposed construction efforts, but maintaining access to the lake is crucial to the public and should be a high priority on this project. I hope that careful consideration of my concerns and those of the public, in general, will be addressed before a plan is approved. Thank you for taking the time to hear my out and good luck with your project.</p>
100	Mark Duer	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I have recently read about the plans for shoring up and reinforcing the Folsom Lake Dam. It has come to my attention that this process may include the closing down of Folsom Point, Beal's Point and parts of Granite Bay. #100-1 Recreation lake access closure. My family and I engage in recreational activities such as wakeboarding and waterskiing on Folsom Lake every summer and have been doing so for many years and I would hate to see part of the Lake closed off. As you may be aware, the lake is already crowded and lines for boat launching are long. Closing down any part of the lake for the several years it would take to complete this project would only add to the crowding on the water and hassle at the marinas and ramps. I realize that work on the dam and recreational areas around the lake may be necessary for the long-term safety and protection of the lake, however I would ask you to consider minimalizing the amount of the lake that needs to be closed. It would be a shame to see such a fine part of Northern California lose its recreational value due to over-crowding and waterway restriction. Thank you for you time.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
101	Tim Steele	[#101-1 PD Folsom Point use as staging area.] Please let me know what the rationale is for attempting to close Dyke 8? I have heard that it may be closed for up to 7 years for a new construction project. That seems a bit excessive to me. If this is true, please let me know any specifics you may have so I can address them to the proper staff. The Closing of Dyke 8 would significantly impact the daily/weekly and annual recreation of many Folsom Citizens.
102	Beth and Jim Carlsen	Dear Mr. Oliver: [#102-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am a resident of Folsom and specifically of the neighborhood next to the entrance to Folsom Point called Briggs Ranch. We use the Folsom Point access no less than once a week during the spring and summer for our boat. My husband runs there every single day with his dog. [#102-2 Socioeconomics businesses]. My husband and I are also business owners in the City of Folsom and have been residents for over 15 years. We feel very strongly that the City will be HARMED GREATLY by the closing of Folsom Point.] The City has already been harmed greatly by the closing of the Dam Road. I understand that there needs to be a place to stage equipment, etc, but there must be another location that would do less harm. Folsom Lake is the jewel of the City. You've already made it difficult to get to Beal's Point by the closing of the Dam Road and anyone who know's about the lake access, know's the limited space available at Brown's Ravine. WHAT DO YOU EXPECT THE RESIDENTS TO DO FOR THE NEXT 7 YEARS? There has got to be another solution.
103	Cindy Becker	Dear Sir, [#103-1 PD alternative staging areas]. I am writing to ask for you to not close Folsom Point due its potential use as a staging point. It provides much needed access and we would like to see an alternative with less public impact considered. Thank you.
104	Jim Thompson	Mr Oliver, [#104-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Just heard of the possible closing of Folsom Point. I realize the work on the dam requires certain inconveniences. My family and I have been in Folsom 18 years and use that access 1 to 4 times per week. Running, mountain biking or just hiking. This would detract from our community in a major way. It would CHANGE our community. Lets not be just another town. There must be another way.
105	Michael S. Hardoin	Mr. Oliver, [#105-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] I am a resident of Folsom, Ca and am writing to you today to request that the Bureau of Reclamation come up with alternatives to closing Folsom Point for up to 7 years during the Folsom Dam maintenance project. Folsom Point is the only Folsom Lake access point for Folsom residence and closing this facility would be detrimental to Folsom Businesses and would negatively impact our quality of life in Folsom.] Closing for up to 7 years would be a nightmare. [#105-2 PD alternative staging areas.] This is simply not acceptable and there are alternatives that would be a win win for everyone. There are other options. Build a new access point between Folsom Point and the Dam or at some other part of the lake that does not disrupt existing access points. This is a minor cost relative to the budget for the total project and would allow the Folsom Dam project to proceed without the significantly negative impact closing Folsom Point would have on thousands of people. Thank you for your consideration.
106	Angela Ankhelyi	Dear Sir, [#106-1 Socioeconomics businesses] I am a resident of Folsom and very concerned with the proposal to close access to Folsom Lake in Folsom for seven years, during the construction of the new bridge. I ask that you consider the economic stress this would place on our city. [#106-2 Property values.] Folsom's tourism and housing markets are tied into the lake. We are a lakefront community. Seven years is an unreasonable time to close this part of our community. There are other alternatives. Please seek another solution.
107	Chris and Susan Zaffree	[#107 Recreation lake access closure.] Please keep our access to Folsom Lake open. We utilize Folsom Point more than any other entrance to the lake.
108	Lynda Lescault	[#108-1 PD alternative staging area.] Please reconsider taking away such a beautiful park setting and recreation area from our city!

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>There must be another "staging" area closer to the damn, behind the blocked off Damn Road area. As a fifteen year Folsom resident residing in Briggs Ranch, we utilize Folsom Point every day as a place to take walks, relax, and view the magnificent lake.]</p> <p>[#108-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] As a professional in the relocation industry who provides "candidate tours" to area firms, this location was always a highlight of my tour in my quest to help "sell" the best and brightest candidates select a relocation to Folsom. Not many other cities in this state boast a beautiful lake and many professionals from around the country and around the world elected to take a relocation and accept their job offer because of this lake and all that it has to offer.</p> <p>Please, please reconsider this choice. Do not allow this decision to impact our city for seven years - it would be such a shame.</p>
109	Doug Zezoff	<p>[#109-1 PD alternative staging area.] I have lived in Folsom for 20 years and one the highlights is being able to go to Folsom Point. Don't ruin this. You need to find another location to do your work.</p>
110	Jim Cassio & Deborah Moreno	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>[#110-1 Recreation lake access closure.] On behalf of our family, we wish to go on record as Folsom residents that strongly oppose any plan by the Bureau of Reclamation to close Folsom Point to public recreational use.</p> <p>We realize that the Bureau views recreational use of its properties as a privilege and not a right. However, many Folsom residents depend on access to Folsom Point. [#110-2 Recreation Transportation.] Our moving to Granite Bay, Beal's Point and Brown's Ravine would cause two problems: one, the heavier usage of the other Folsom Lake sites will cause numerous environmental impact problems; and two, the roads through Old Town Folsom and onto Granite Bay and Beal's Point will be impacted from the increased traffic. [#110-3 Alternative recreation sites]. A third problem would be the spillover effect on other area sites, such as Lake Natoma, from the crowds turned away from Granite Bay, Beal's Point and Brown's Ravine when they reach capacity.</p> <p>We would suggest that all of these potential problems can be avoided by devising a practical plan in which Folsom Point remains open for public recreational use.</p>
111	Jamie Ellsworth	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>[#111-1 Recreation lake access closure.] It was brought to my attention that you are considering closing Folsom Point to utilize the space for storage. I have serious concerns about this decision. I have been the manager at a local health club since 1995 and many of my members utilize that access to the lake. They train for triathlons, walk their dogs, enjoy time with their children, and gather with friends among other activities. It would sadden me to think that you would be limiting local residents to the lake access. Please reconsider the decision to use Folsom Point as a staging area. There has got to be an alternative place to store the materials need for the repairs. I would appreciate a response to my concern. If I can assist in any way please do not hesitate to ask. I also know of several other individuals who are passionate about saving our gathering place and they would be interested in helping find an alternative as well. Thank you for taking the time to read my email.</p>
112	Darcie Eichner	<p>[#112-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This is a concern regarding convenient access to Folsom Lake. Please do not close the lake entrance at Folsom Point.</p>
113	Vicky Cackler	<p>[#113-1 Purpose and Need/Bridge Project] My husband and I are Briggs Ranch residents and understand that you plan to close Folsom Point to use as a staging area for the building of the new bridge. I want to express my concern for several reasons. For the residents of Briggs Ranch (there are over 600 homes in this neighborhood), who have already been hit hard by the closing of the dam road in the first place, and will be dramatically effected by the increase in traffic once the new bridge opens due to building up of the Empire Ranch and El Dorado Hills areas in the years since the dam was closed, this is just another slap in the face. The building of the bridge stands to cause huge noise levels, increased traffic pouring through and behind our neighborhood, and thus, a decrease in our property values. Closing Folsom Point, which is one of the features that draws people to live in Briggs Ranch, will further cause a decline to the value of our neighborhood specifically.</p> <p>[#113-2 Recreation lake access closure.] My second area of concern is for the residents of Folsom in general. Folsom Point serves as</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>an entrance for many in the area of recreation. People bike, walk and boat from this point, and while yes, there are other areas to begin your day of fun, this is a convenient place for so many and again a reason to have chosen to live in the immediate area.] I think I definitely speak for the residents of Briggs Ranch when I say - we have had enough. While building a bridge is necessary due to the increased population - we are already being hurt by it's determined placement when there were other options. It is time to spread some of the pain and find another location to work from.</p>
114	Casey Keller	<p>Friends, [#114-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the closure of Folsom Point ! I do realize work needs to be done to improve and enhance the dykes and dam. For this, I commend your efforts. However, Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and thousands of residents and visitors use this access. I myself use it almost every day. Whether I am walking my dog, running, cycling, kayaking, picnicking, boating, playing with my children, catching a moonrise or sunset, this access is invaluable to Folsom residents and visitors. I strongly oppose the closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. Please find other alternatives to this proposal, as closing this gem is unacceptable.</p>
115	Chris Storz	<p>[#115-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the people of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating, picnicking, and its closure would be an outrage. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
116	Lesley Storz	<p>[#116-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the people of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating, picnicking, and its closure would be an outrage. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
117	Donna Gentry	<p>[#117-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point Recreation Area! This Proposition is unacceptable to the people of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating, picnicking, and its closure would be an outrage. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.] Donna Gentry, Creekside Drive, Folsom</p>
118	Joanna Diaz	<p>[#118-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the people of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating, picnicking, and its closure would be an outrage. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
119	Kimberlee Jones	<p>[#119-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Hello I want you to know I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to me, the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking, its closure would be an outrage. My childrens' school take the second graders on a walking field trip their yearly. Some years this is the only outside educational activity the school could afford. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom. Why would you want to close the only access? Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
120	Liz and Andrew Byer	<p>To whom it may concern: [#120-1 Recreation lake access closure] Please do not close Folsom Point access to Folsom Lake till 2013!!! This will be devastating to the city of Folsom and very unfair to the residents who live there. We use this access every summer and cant imagine the chaos this will create! Please reconsider and find another option!</p>

No.	Name	Comment
121	Chris Jennings	I understand that the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to close the Folsom Point recreation area for seven years to retrofit the Folsom Dam. [#121-1 Public Involvement meeting notification] I seemed to have missed the public hearings and the EIR. When were they and where do I get a copy?] Surely there's a better, less disruptive, alternative. I visit the park nearly every other day to run. I bought my house, for among other reasons, because it's near Folsom Point. [#121-2 Recreation lake access closure] Put me down as being opposed, not only to the proposal, but also to the process by which this idea was hatched. Bad idea. Really bad idea. [#121-3 Veg and Wildlife] PS: Aren't there burrowing owls out there?
122	Mike Brady	[#122-1 Recreation lake access closure] Closure of park land needs to be very carefully considered, and if there is even a halfway reasonable alternative don't do it. Recreation areas are important, even if they're mainly (as with Folsom Point) boat launch zones.] Highway projects are essentially prohibited from using public recreational land, unless a very stringent process of looking at alternatives and mitigating remaining effects is followed - you should do the same. In other words, find an alternative location for staging areas, and minimize or eliminate use of Folsom Point and other recreation areas you may be affecting. Convenience and cost are not the only considerations that should be used.
123	Kathy Boyd	[#123-1 Recreation lake access closure] First the government closed the dam bridge, bringing huge traffic problems and a wallop financially to our Old Town. Now the government wants to close Folsom Point for 6-7 yrs! For heaven's sake, I don't believe there are absolutely no sites that will work besides closing our recreation accesses; in fact, according to Sreve Miklos, you won't even consider other sites that don't involve closing Folsom Point. Perhaps you didn't realize how heavily used these lake accesses are. While I understand the need to upgrade the dam, and appreciate the work you do for all of us, please find a way to do so without closing Folsom Point.]
124	The Colldeweih's	I am writing to you in regards to the proposed closure of Folsom point boat launch/picnic area .We are avid boaters and users of Folsom point boat launch/picnic area and would prefer other alternatives be explored. We as a citizens of Folsom understand the importance of flood protection and support the retrofit project. [#124-1 Socioeconomics Traffic] I am deeply concerned that the proposed closure would negatively impact the City of Folsom ,both financially and in added traffic congestion that this cities infrastructure can not handle. People who would normally use Folsom point would have to find alternative facilities around the lake thereby stressing already overwhelmed launch/picnic areas. Closing this area would cost this area hundreds if not thousands of tourist dollars. This city can not afford to take another financial hit such as the one dealt by the post 9/11 closure of the dam road. 6-7 years is way to long a time to keep this area closed. I urge you to consider the other possible alternatives that have been placed on the table. Thank you for your consideration in this matter,
125	Mr. Neely Downing	Dear: Mr. Oliver I am writing to express my strong opposition to any plan to use the area known as MIAD (N. of Green Valley Rd, E. of Natoma) for any staging, construction, rock crushing and any like activity regarding the Folsom Lake Dam construction project. [#125-1 Noise] I am a resident of Folsom CA and live in the foothills community of Empire Ranch which is across from Green Valley Rd. and Mormon Island. The noise levels are already extremely high from normal road activity 24 hours a day. As noted in the current Executive Summary, noise levels will increase to unacceptable levels. This valley is shaped like a bowl, so noise would travel without being muted. [#125-2 Geology and Soils asbestos] Also, the prevailing wind comes out of the north blowing across the current structure. In addition to `carrying' the noise further distances. A potentially greater issue or threat to this family community is the exposure to asbestos and other construction dust and debris and the health problems these will create now and in the future. In closing, the option would be unacceptable and would likely lead to considerable resident disruption and legal activity.
126	David and	Dear Mr. Oliver,

No.	Name	Comment
	Patty Soulsby	<p>[#126-1 Recreation lake access closure] Please do NOT close Folsom Point. I'm sure you could find another alternative for your construction staging area. [#126-2 PD Socioeconomics businesses] The merchants of Folsom have already been hurt by the closure of the Dam Road. Now, more merchants near Folsom Point will also be hurt.</p> <p>Folsom Point is also used by a lot of families who enjoy spending the day swimming and picnicking at the lake. It is very convenient. If you close it, then we would have to go to Beals' Point and boaters would have to go either to the Marina in El Dorado Hills or Granite Bay. [#126-3 Traffic] This is a big inconvenience especially during the warm months as you would be closing a boat launch which would cause more traffic on the boat ramps at Granite Bay and the Marian.</p> <p>So not only merchants will be hurt, but the boaters and families who enjoy going to this side of Folsom Lake will also be affected.</p>
127	Mike Stinson	<p>Folsom has suffered enough due to the Dam Road closure.</p> <p>[#127-1 Traffic, Socioeconomics property values,] Safety Please don't make it worse for our economy, home values and children's traffic safety by closing Folsom Point.</p>
128	Marianne P. Blake	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>Have you ever been to Folsom Lake on a hot summer weekend--and I'm not talking holidays. The picnic tables are full; the lines at the boat ramps are long. It doesn't make any difference which part of the lake you go to or what time, it's busy.</p> <p>[#128-1 Socioeconomics state parks] Close Folsom Point and the State is going to be losing money. It's just going to be too difficult to get to the Lake. Folsom Point is used by numerous families who enjoy spending the day swimming and picnicking at the lake. It is very convenient for us who live on this side of the lake. If you close it, then we have to drive through town to use Beals' Point. Boaters would have to go either to the Marina in El Dorado Hills or once again, through town to Granite Bay. [#128-2 Traffic] This is a big inconvenience especially during the warm months as you would be closing a boat launch which would cause more traffic on the boat ramps at Granite Bay and the Marina. Please do NOT close Folsom Point. An alternative for your construction staging area could be the area on the Dam Road which the government has already closed and made traffic in Folsom a nightmare. [#128-3 Socioeconomics businesses] The merchants of Folsom have already been hurt by this closure.</p>
129	Steve Paladino	<p>[#129-1 Recreation and Socioeconomics businesses,] I'm very disappointed that there has been any serious consideration given to the closure of the subject recreational area for dam and/or dike repair. This would have a devastating impact on recreation throughout northern CA, and Folsom commerce and home values. Furthermore, this would be adding insult to injury after Folsom residents and businesses have had to endure the highly detrimental consequences of the Dam Road closure following 911. There simply has to be a better alternative because the closure of Folsom Point for any extended period of time (beyond 30 days) is completely unacceptable for any reason whatsoever.</p>
130	Gary & Lia Odell	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>[#130-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives,] We strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking, its closure would be an outrage. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom.</p> <p>Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.]</p> <p>On a more personal note, we, like many families chose to relocate to Folsom primarily because of the proximity and accessibility to Folsom Lake. 8 years ago when my husband was transferred to the bay area, we knew we didn't want to raise our family there. We had the choice to live anywhere within 2 hours of the Oakland airport, and we CHOSE FOLSOM BECAUSE OF THE LAKE! Only after that did we realize that Folsom had other great aspects such as our schools, etc. However, had it not been for the lake there are other great communities with these other factors. [#130-2 Socioeconomics property value,] Also, our home is located in the development directly</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>across the street, once considered one of the most desirable in Folsom. The closure and activity planned for this area is going to effect our property values tremendously.</p> <p>We haven't even brought up the impact will it will have on the next closest access to the lake at Browns Ravine....you'll be hearing from El Dorado Hills next. This decision will affect the lives of many families like mine, who not only enjoy this lake throughout the year, but want to continue using summers on the lake to strengthen our families and creating memories for our children.</p> <p>PLEASE CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS!</p>
131	Nina Pucci	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>[#131-1 Noise], I deeply oppose the Folsom Point Boat Launch being closed to build the bridge. I live right across from Folsom Point and the workers will basically be in my backyard. I do not want to hear the noisy trucks and have people looking into my backyard.]</p> <p>[#131-2 PD alternative staging areas]. Why can't you use the Folsom Dam Road exit where there are no residents besides the prisoners. I think the prisoners deserve to listen to the noise instead of me.</p>
132	Kevin, Suzanne, Katie, and Amanda Reinard	<p>[#132-1 Recreation lake access closure], We want to register our serious opposition to the proposed closure of Folsom Point. As residents of Folsom, we use Folsom Point for boating, biking, and picnicking, so closing this lake access point will have a negative effect on our and every other Folsom resident's quality of life. One of the main reasons we moved to Folsom (in particular the Briggs Ranch neighborhood) was for access to this excellent resource, one that we use quite often. [#132-2 Socioeconomics property value]. Closing Folsom Point would also have a negative effect on our housing values, as the area would loose much of it's appeal to people looking to relocate to Folsom based on the access to the state park through Folsom Point.</p>
133	Allen and Julie Carlson	<p>It has been brought to our attention that Folsom Point State Recreation Area may be closed for seven years during the dam repairs. There are many reasons we are concerned about losing this access to the lake. We moved to Briggs Ranch because it was a quiet and safe neighborhood, and because we wanted to be near "The Lake". East Natoma Street used to be a fairly quiet street. [#133-1 Noise and Traffic]. Ever since the dam closed, the noise level has increased immensely because traffic has increased, not to mention pollution. The noise and traffic will be even worse with all of the construction trucks coming and going from the site. [#133-2 Socioeconomics businesses]. The businesses on the corner of East Natoma and Blue Ravine rely heavily on the boaters and lake visitors to purchase gas and food for their days on the lake. Some of these businesses are already hurting because of the vacancy left with the departure of Ralph's. Closing this entrance will definitely have a negative impact on these businesses. [#133-3 Recreation lake access closure]. Folsom Point is used by thousands of Folsom residents throughout the year for picnics, walking, biking, running and boating. The entrance on East Natoma Street is the only access to Folsom Lake in the city of Folsom. [#133-4 Recreation remaining access points]. In addition to local and out of town boaters, Granite Bay and Roseville residents use the Beale's Point entrance which is already busy and fills up on regular basis. Brown's Ravine is also busy and used regularly by local and out of town boaters, as well as El Dorado Hills residents. If access to the lake is difficult, people will just choose to go elsewhere... Lake Tahoe, Lake Berryessa, Don Pedro, Lake Camanche, The Delta, etc.</p> <p>We understand that there are other alternatives for equipment storage, so we are asking that you seriously consider the other options or come up with an alternative solution. Closing Folsom Point will seriously hurt our city.</p>
134	Julie Calderwood	<p>Dear Army Corp. Engineers,</p> <p>I was stunned to read that the Army Corp. of Engineers is considering closing Folsom Point for up to 7 years. [#134-1 PD alternative staging areas]. Surely the Army Corp. can come up with an alternative that does not have such a devastating impact on the surrounding community. As you know, Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom and is used extensively by community members as well as tens of thousands of people who come from outside our community and benefit area businesses. The closure would be very upsetting to my family. We purchased a home a year and a half ago, which is 4 blocks from the entrance to Folsom Point, in order to take advantage of the recreational opportunities there. My children are in 3rd and 5th grade. The extended</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>closure would mean that we would not have this very important part of our local experience until they were nearly out of high school. I walk at Folsom Point almost daily, and enjoy boating, swimming and picnicking there in the summer. It is an area of great beauty, fun and joy. After 7 years as a construction site, surely much of this would be lost. Certainly all of it would be lost to us for the duration of the project. This is an unacceptable loss to us as a family, and to our community.</p> <p>I have not studied the proposals being considered by the Corp. yet, but certainly there must be a better alternative, in terms of the fiscal and quality of life impact on the City of Folsom, for the staging area for the Dam project. Substantial areas of undeveloped land lies near the dam. Surely the Army Corp. can utilize land that will not impact the entire community so dreadfully.</p> <p>I want the Corp of Engineers to utilize an alternative to closing Folsom Point that meets the needs of your project while retaining this most important asset for the citizens of Folsom and the many thousands who come here to enjoy it.</p>
135	Kenneth Doherty	<p>The closing of Folsom Point is completely unacceptable. No, No, and No. [#135-1 Socioeconomics property values.] There is no reason to close this recreation area to accommodate the dam retrofit project. This would ruin property values and devastate people's lives. People move here specifically for the value of having access to Folsom Lake recreation.</p> <p>[#135-2 EIS Process.] Hiding this information within a 500 page document is reprehensible. This was handled in an extremely sleazy manner with regards to letting the citizens of Folsom know exactly what was being planned. [#135-3 Recreation lake access closure]</p> <p>Again, NO, NO and NO to closing Folsom Point.</p> <p>It is imperative that you to come up with other options that do not make such a negative impact on the citizens of this area.</p>
136	Maria & Jeff Sickenger	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>[#136-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation such as walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.]</p>
137	Frances Leon	<p>Hello,</p> <p>[#137-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I live in the Briggs Ranch area and I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking, its closure would be an outrage. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom.</p> <p>Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
138	Cindy Sobotta	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#138-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
139	Tracy Nordheim	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#139-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
140	Lisa Tomiak	<p>[#140-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I writing this to voice my opposition and concern over the closure of Folsom Point. As a resident of Brigg's Ranch my neighborhood will be most adversely effected by this proposed project. We use the park on a daily basis. [#140-2 Traffic due to recreation site closure.] The closure of the boat launch will adversely effect an already overcrowded Green Valley Road with the added traffic of boaters launching at Brown's Ravine. I enjoy morning walks by the lake at Folsom Point, have picnics with my family and friends at picnic area, boating and swimming, not to mention the enjoyment the sheer beauty of this Park brings. These are all selfish reasons to not want the park to close but I have some true and valid concerns also. [#140-3 Air quality construction.] As the mother of children with asthma how is this going to effect the air quality. The added exhaust from construction vehicles, concrete particles in the air, and the impact of asbestos from the soil being disturbed. [#140-4 Socioeconomics property values.] Living in the neighborhood directly by the proposed project will effect home values. [#140-5 Noise.] The noise will also cause a disturbance to the residents of Briggs Ranch. [#140-6 Wildlife.] Environmentally this project could have a devastating effect on the wildlife living there. [#140-7 Public Involvement.] Please allow for an independent environmental study to be done. I feel that this project was kept from residents. It seems like you would have alerted residents of your proposed actions. Especially when they will so adversely effect their quality of life. [#140-8 Socioeconomics businesses.] I am asking that you explore other options and don't close a state park that brings so much to the city of Folsom. The closure will effect tourism and hurt businesses that count on tourist dollars. I can see nothing positive about the proposed location for the tax payers of our community.] With the inventiveness of the Army Corps of Engineers I am sure that another location could be found or built. Please find an alternative.</p>
141	Mark and Kathy Van Saun	<p>To: Shawn Oliver From: Mark and Kathy Van Saun</p> <p>We are contacting you in regards to the proposed closing of the Folsom Point Recreation Area or Dike 8. We are very concerned about this matter and ask that you would not only reconsider this proposal but give us more information. We have been Folsom residents and Briggs Ranch homeowners for over 11 years and we can not imagine what such a closure would do to our community and our neighborhood.</p> <p>[#141-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Like many of our neighbors, we moved here primarily because of the lake access. Our family loves to take walks, run and mountain bike at the lake. [#141-2 Socioeconomics businesses and property values.] We are extremely concerned about the devastating effect such a closure would have on the near by businesses as well as our home values. We personally know of a family that was considering several homes in the area to purchase and said yesterday that they will not buy here due to this issue.</p> <p>[#141-3 PD alternative staging areas.] Why haven't other access points been chosen to help with this matter without closing down an entire recreational area? Folsom Point is Folsom's only access where as Granite Bay has two access areas. We have dealt with the burden of the Dam Road closure and saw the effects of that decision on businesses, commutes and community access. We cannot stomach another blow to our community. We ask you to please reconsider this decision and find an acceptable solution.</p>
142	Jennifer Thompson	<p>[#142-1 Socioeconomics.] It has come to my attention that the Army Corp of Engineers is considering closure of Folsom Point. It is my hope that this will not come to fruition as the closure of Folsom Point will negatively impact the City of Folsom by significantly decreasing the resources the community has to offer its residents and tourists.</p> <p>[#142-2 Transportation.] As you are aware, the result of the closure of the Folsom Dam and resulting redirection of traffic has been</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>significant to the community in the loss of revenue and closure for businesses; and the traffic congestion on streets not designed for the volume of vehicles currently utilizing them on a daily basis.</p> <p>[#142-3 Socioeconomics businesses] In the event of the closure of Folsom Point, the lake visitors will be diverted to lake access elsewhere, directing the potential revenue away from Folsom to El Dorado Hills and Granite Bay. Neighborhoods close to Folsom Point will no longer have quick access to Folsom Lake for the many recreational purposes aside from boating and this certainly may decrease the associated property values. Folsom residents are proud of Folsom Lake and it would be terribly ironic if the only community near Folsom Lake without access would be Folsom itself. Please consider options that would allow Folsom Point to remain available to our residents and tourists so that we may enjoy it and continue to benefit from the revenue it brings to our community. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
143	Assunta L. Seivert	<p>[#143-1 Recreation lake access closure.] It is unthinkable that closing Folsom Point is to accommodate the Army Corps of Engineers' storage needs. Residents of Folsom have been using Folsom Point and its trails for years and provides the community a place to share in nature's beauty. This is an established area for the people. Please use alternative places that are available but not Folsom Point. Thank you.</p>
144	John and Cheryl Mandsager	<p>We understand the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing to close Folsom Point/Dyke 8 to all visitors for a duration of up to 7 years effective Fall 2007 while the Folsom Dam is retrofitted. [#144-1 PD alternative staging areas.] While we support the dam project, we understand there are many other alternatives that have yet to be explored. These alternatives would allow Folsom Point to remain open to the public.</p> <p>[#144-2 Recreation lake access closure.] Since we enjoy visiting Folsom Point many, many times a year, this closure would have a negative impact on our family. We imagine the impact on most, if not all, of the families in our neighborhood would be the same. We urge the Bureau of Reclamation to pursue the Dam project in a manner that will allow Folsom Point to remain open to the public.]</p>
145	Maria Paladino	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am very frustrated and disappointed to hear about the closure of Folsom Point and strongly object to it. I am shocked that this has even been considered. As a Folsom resident and homeowner in the immediately affected area, I am outraged that I am to be put through yet another devastating inconvenience. After the damn road closure and the detrimental affects on not only Folsom, but to my particular neighborhood (Briggs Ranch), this closure is absolutely unacceptable.</p> <p>[#145-1 Recreation lake access closure.] The entire Folsom community will be losing out on our use of this beautiful facility for boating and picnicking (among other things). Our access to the lake via Folsom Point/Dyke 8 is a vital part of living in this area. [#145-2 Transportation] [145-3 Socioeconomics property values.] As a resident of the immediate area, we will have to endure more traffic congestion, as well as this detrimentally affecting our local environment and our property values.</p> <p>There has to be a better/alternate solution to this extremely long closure.</p>
146	Phil	<p>Hi Shawn,</p> <p>I was given your name as a contact for the raising of Folsom Dam. Are you the program manager for this project? If not, please direct me to the lead person on this project. I wish to comment on the potential 7 yr. closure of Folsom Point SP.</p>
147	Jennifer Hamilton	<p>To whom it May Concern,</p> <p>[#147-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the closing of Folsom Point. My family and I use this area on a weekly basis (boating, picnicking, walking etc) and would be devastated by this closure. There are many families in my neighborhood that also use this area on a regular basis and I know that losing this option to experience some peace and tranquility right in our own community would be a great loss to many.</p>
148	Michelle Thompson	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#148-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
149	David Lancisi	<p>Dear Bureau of Reclamation and US Army Corp of Engineers</p> <p>[#149-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am writing this email to you to register our strong objection to the closure of the Folsom Launch Point as proposed for the purposes of Folsom Dam improvements. This is a HUGE recreation area for our town and one of the main reasons why people buy homes and live here. It absolutely was for our family. The closure of this facility will make it virtually impossible for Folsom residents to use this very highly regarded resource called Folsom Lake. [#149-2 Recreation remaining access points.] It will force the residents to use other already over-crowded launch points such as Browns Ravine and Granite Bay. I can assure you that this will create major problems for these other areas as well As our town has grown, the use of the Launch Point as well. As a matter of fact, you would be hard-pressed to find a weekend day that it wasn't completely filled. We reside in the Briggs Ranch area and use this resource extensively.</p> <p>[#149-3 Socioeconomics property values] In addition to the chaos you would create at the other launch ramps, this would also have other major negative impacts, such as property value implications, increased traffic of trailered watercraft through the already overwhelmed downtown streets of Folsom as people try to make their way to Granite Bay. Browns Ravine is already so small, it will hardly be an alternative launch point. [#149-4 Transportation.] The largest impact will be the movement of construction vehicles through the area. This will create major issues with noise, pollution, congestion and access to city street for the residents in that area and those traveling through Folsom, which as we already know, is a very large amount (see ATD numbers from your previous traffic studies).</p> <p>One solution would be to use the lookout point farther up the dam road for these purposes. This would allow Launch Point to remain open and keep the construction activities away from the local resident. In the past, this was used for that purpose.</p> <p>In any case, we strongly object to the closure of this recreational area for many reasons and are sure you can find an alternate solution to fit the construction needs.</p>
150	Ann Lindner	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>[#150-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am a resident of Folsom and have been for nearly 14 years. Six years ago my husband and I built a home right across the street from Folsom Point. This is where we planned on staying until our children are done with school. My youngest is 8 years old. When you talk about closing the Point for 7 years you are talking my children's childhood.</p> <p>We use the lake on a weekly basis. We walk there, take the dog, swim, boat, picnic and bike. You are talking about changing a part of our lifestyle. This may be temporary for you, but it is not for us. This will permanently change our life. [#150-2 Socioeconomics property values]. On others levels, this will decrease our property value and cause much undue traffic and congestion. It will create a mess on the streets with trucks coming and going. [#150-3 Transportation] You will be destroying the shore line with the trucks traveling back and forth. Our school walks there for field trips to see the wildlife and learn about nature. You say you will be done in 7 years but for the lake to return to what it is now will take years past the damage you will be creating.</p> <p>[#150-4 Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses that depend on that summer tourism will be destroyed. All of my neighbors who have speed boats say they will sell them if you close the Point. The impact upon the other launches will discourage those from boating on the lake.</p> <p>I hope you really understand the impact you will have on the community if completely close the point. These are our homes and ways</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		of life that you will be effecting. Please make sure you have pursued all of your options and make the decision that is best for EVERYONE.
151	Heather Sibilla	<p>January 18, 2007</p> <p>To all of our honorable representatives:</p> <p>RE: " PROPOSED" CLOSURE OF FOLSOM POINT STATE PARK (A.K.A. DYKE 8) by BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.</p> <p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA, have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. [#151-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#151-2 Vegetation and Wildlife.] I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. [#151-3 Air quality]. The environmental impact on our air quality could be dangerous for residents. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#151-4. Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern.</p> <p>We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. [#151-5 Public Involvement.] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th. 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially " no notice." We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p>
152	Ann Linder fwd by Heather Sibilla	<p>Dear Mayor Morin,</p> <p>I know that you have received several e-mails about the closing of Folsom Point but I wanted to inform you about the rally that will be taking place on Saturday at 12pm in the church parking lot as you enter Folsom Point.</p> <p>As mayor of the city, we, as a community, are expecting your support on this matter. Whether we can appeal to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corp of Engineers, we still need to know that you and your council stand behind your community.</p> <p>We hope to see you all there!</p>

No.	Name	Comment
153	Lynn Derrick	<p>Mr. Starsky,</p> <p>As a homeowner of Folsom, and specifically, Briggs Ranch, I wanted to write to you. I understand the City Council will be deciding whether or not to close Folsom Point for the next 7 years while the new bridge is constructed. I wanted to let you know I am very opposed to this idea. One of the reasons we live in the Briggs Ranch area is because it is so close to Folsom Lake and the quick and easy access to the boat launch at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#153-1 Transportation.] I am also very concerned about all the construction trucks that will be disturbing this residential area. [#153-2 Socioeconomics property value.] I am also concerned what this closure and construction will do to property values in the Briggs Ranch area. This closure can only hurt our lake and boating experience as well as tourism to Folsom Lake.</p> <p>Please vote on the side of your fellow residents and the welfare of your community. Voters have good memories about these issues when election day rolls around again!</p>
154	Terry and Jim Lehman	<p>Mr. Mayor,</p> <p>We am very distressed at the idea of closing the Folsom Point (Dyke 8)recreation are for seven years as it is used for a site to stage the dam reconstruction. [#154-1 Transportation.] We feel this is removing a vital part of the recreation for the city for an extended length of time. Not to mention the construction vehicles that will be traveling in and out the site for seven years.</p> <p>This will impact the traffic on Natoma (which will just be opening up for traffic across the dam once the new bridge is built), and will negatively effect our neighborhood due to the traffic and noise. [#154-2 PD alternative staging areas.] We can not believe that there is not a more appropriate place on the opposite side of the dam that cannot be used for this purpose. Our city and neighborhoods have taken such a hit in the past 5 years, can you not give us a break and use an area that will not negatively affect us for the next seven years? Please rethink your possibilities.</p>
155	Greg Fales.	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>[#155-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am writing to let you know my great concern and disapproval of shutting down Folsom Point for any length of time. My family and I moved to Folsom over ten years ago and we use all of the parks located at the lake on a regular basis. Having access to Folsom Point or any other Park at Folsom Lake is a big reason that we moved to Folsom and it's part of the quality of life that we paid for when buying our home. Giving up access for even one summer is not acceptable, let alone for seven years.</p>
156	Doug Pepper	<p>Andy,</p> <p>[#156- Public Involvement meeting notification.] I just read on www.myfolsom.com that the Bureau of Reclamation is considering planning on closing Folsom Point for 7 years as part of the flood protections changes planned for Folsom Lake. There apparently has been no public notice of this (at least that I saw) and yet I read there is a public hearing on Wednesday night. Does the city have a position on this? Folsom Point is the only lake access point (day use and ramp) in the Sac County portion of the lake. It appears that once again the Bureau is doing whatever it wants without concerns for Folsom. Will the City Council be responding to this with a position? I won't go into all my concerns at this point, hoping that the city officials share the same concern. I'm hoping that the city will back many of us who will be showing up at the meeting on Wednesday night.</p>
157	Vicky	<p>Dear Mr. Morin, Ms. Howell, Mr. King, Mr. Miklos and Mr. Starsky,</p> <p>Attached is the e-mail that I just sent to you regarding the closing of Folsom Point. While messages are making the rounds in our neighborhood encouraging us to voice our displeasure at the closing of Folsom Point, my understanding was that the closure was due to the building of the planned bridge. After reading another e-mail which I received just shortly after the one I sent you, I see my mistake and that the closure is due to the retrofit of the dam. However, my comments remain the same as this is yet, as I said below, another slap in the face for the residents of Briggs Ranch. How many ways can The City and the Bureau of Reclamation</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>choose to affect one neighborhood? [#157-1 PD alternative staging areas.] My request is that another location for the staging area be chosen. [#157-2 Transportation] [157-3 Noise]. The residents of Briggs Ranch stand to loose property value, have increased traffic pouring through, and the noise levels caused by the construction of the bridge followed by it's use, will be unpleasant to deal with to say the least. To add to that the closure of Folsom Point, is just not right. Not to mention the mess, traffic issues and noise due to the construction of the retrofit. Thank you for listening.</p>
158	Chantell Harp	<p>[158-1 General] Save Folsom!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>
159	Anonymous	<p>[#159-1 Recreation lake access closure] I heard a rumor that there is a possibility that Folsom Point on Folsom Lake might be closed temporarily so it can be used as a staging area for construction of the new bridge at Folsom Dam. I am a Civil Engineer and I specialize in heavy construction so I understand the need for a laydown yard and staging area but I must protest the use of this vital recreation area for construction use. [#159-2 Recreation remaining lake access] This is a heavily used lake and the facilities for lake access are already impacted and overused. The boat ramp and parking lot at Folsom Point are always filled to capacity especially on weekends. This would be a tremendous impact on the community and should be avoided at all costs. The location itself does not lend itself to use as a laydown and staging area for the bridge as there is no overland access to the bridge site without entering the public right of way. The size and type of equipment and material needed for constructing this bridge would not be allowed to travel on the public roads. [#159-3 PD alternate staging areas] I would think the property bounded by the Jail, Natoma Rd. and the exiting Dam Rd. would be better suited for this purpose. As a resident of Folsom and frequent Lake user I urge you consider other alternatives to closing Folsom Point.</p>
160	Robert Flores	<p>To Bureau of Reclamation,</p> <p>I am submitting this letter to you regarding the irresponsible actions you and your administration are taking in your plans on closing Folsom Point (Dike 8)</p> <p>It is to be noted that over 140000 persons use this location to view and use Folsom Lake. Thus far Folsom has lost the use of the access the lower point parking lot near Negro Bar (After the construction of the new bridge), Then in 2001 you decided to close Vista Point due to security reasons (This decision did little to improve security by any means, I am a security specialist and Army Veteran) And now finally you want to close Folsom Point.</p> <p>I own a scuba shop in Folsom and made the decision to build here due to easy access to the lake. Over the years I have adapted to the closures of the other two sites and found myself training students off of Folsom Point. While the restrictions have become difficult, they were manageable. It has taken over 10 years of my life to build and develop a successful business here in Folsom. [#160-1 EIS Process economic study] Your lack of conducting a financial impact study or minimum impact study is atrocious to say the least. [# 160-2 PD alternate staging areas] I have having difficulty in understanding why the Bureau of Reclamation cannot use the parking lot at Vista Point (currently closed site) for a staging area for its equipment. Why is it that you cannot use an area that has security guards, with restricted vehicle access already in place. If equipment needs to be moved via water that a simple boat ramp could not be graded in place. I have surveyed the area at Vista Point both on land and underwater and It would seem to me that a boat ramp could easily be built there at minimum cost without impacting the general public. This option would not effect the general public at all, and with security being present and limited access all of your equipment would be in a much more secure location. The parking lot at Vista Point is large enough to secure any equipment you have for the entire project. I realize that this may also cause you some minor logistics issues as equipment may have to be moved to the work area. But the needs and desires of the many out weight the needs and the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>desires of the few.</p> <p># 160-3 Recreation remaining lake access As far as impacting the boating general population, I have seen lines as far back as 20-30 boats waiting to use Folsom Point during the summer. Now you expect these same people to go to Browns Ravine, Beales Point or Granite Bay to launch their boats. With their compacity already over 100% use. One only has to contact the Folsom Parks and Recreations Officers and ask them how many times, altercations have occurred, over boat ramps being used beyond their limits. Short tempters due to long waits in line, just to gain access to launch at Granite Bay or Browns Ravine are normal already. The closure of Folsom Point and redirection of these boaters to above mentioned launch ramps, will no doubt have considerable repercussions on the entire lake area.</p> <p>#160-4 Public Involvement notification of project If the Bureau of Reclamation has a need to conduct repairs or construction, I am confident that you have known of these repair for quite some time, You have had plenty of time to prepare for this repair, and part of it should have included an impact study and preparations should have been made long in advance with notification being given to local businesses and residence to address this issue. Poor planning results in poor performance.</p> <p>The actions over the last few years regarding the access to the water at: Lake Natoma, Vista Point and now Folsom Point. Seem to show little if no regard to impact on the public use of these facilities. I would be willing to bet that if a endangered field mouse or other species had habitat in the area you would halt this action. But no thought has been given to the HUMANS that paid for access to use of this facility.</p> <p>#160-5 Public Involvement Dropping the decision on our laps, with little response time, and little ability to react, only demonstrates that the Bureau of Reclamation was not interested in hearing about any of the repercussions of its decision. It further demonstrates that a totalitarian attitude of the Bureau of Reclamation exists and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>#160-6 Socioeconomics businesses I am opposed to closure of any part Folsom Point (Dike 8) for any amount of time. You have made decisions without looking at the financial or environmental impact it will have on Folsom. The general population and all businesses and will be impacted by this poor decision, including mine. Our government is supposed to work for us not against us. This aligns on a 12000.00 dollar Air Force hammer purchase, as far as government overlooking spending and decision making abilities.</p>
161	Naomi Wooten	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>#161-1 Recreation lake access closure Please do not close Folsom Point to scuba divers! We have already lost several important local spots. Folsom Point is a convenient place to practice skills when I cannot get to Monterey. I have spent many hours there honing my skills and having fun, and I hope to continue to do so in the future. I think it's an especially great place to have scuba classes because you don't have to deal with surf, salt, and sand; diving there reduces stress for new divers or those of us practicing skills.</p>
162	Kristine Olding and Family	<p>#162-1 Recreation lake access closure PD alternate staging areas It has been bad enough that the DAM Road has been closed but to ruin the wonderful recreation area of FOLSOM POINT by closing it for 7 years is ridiculous. Do the construction at Beale's point or at the DAM road or on the prison grounds but don't wreck our lives by closing the Folsom Point.</p> <p>DO NOT CLOSE FOLSOM POINT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>
163	Daryl Stieve	<p>Shawn, Becky</p> <p>#163-1 Recreation lake access closure I feel that closing Folsom Point is not in the best interest of the area business and boat dealers, Lake recreation would be cut by at least 35 % , Granite Bay and Browns Ravine are a zoo with Folsom Point open, closed it would be impossible to access the lake, the monetary loss to state parks is also added into this situation including my yearly pass. I'm sure that other areas could be used for staging, A 5-6 acre site at the north and south ends of the dam could be used that are now growing weeds and the area behind Morman island dam, I'm sure the city of Folsom would assist as well.</p>
164	Dan & Sheri	<p>To who it may concern:</p>

No.	Name	Comment
	Stafford, and family	<p>[#164-1 Recreation lake access closure] I am writing this to you in hopes that you will reconsider the closure of the Folsom Point Boat Launch area.] Folsom has already been hit hard with the closure of the Damn Road. Folsom is a beautiful community with a great lake that supports, Granite Bay, El Dorado Hills and Folsom, having three entrances into the lake for boat launching. You have already crippled the city with the damn closure; now you want to attack our Lake. [#164-2 Recreation remaining lake access] You can only load your boats in three different locations, which accommodates many local cities, with a lot of boaters. This is what drew people to buy in this area. The "Lake" is the "draw" to Folsom and the surrounding cities. Why would you do this to us? Closing this point will effect all of our summer activities. Please, Please reconsider this for our community. We have a boat, we love the lake, this is where our we and our neighbors spend time in the spring, summer and early fall. Do not take this away from us!!!!</p>
165	Robert Halldorson	<p>[165-1 General] Losing folsom point for seven years, this is a bad idea all around. There has got to be another way. I say you don't let them proceed until they find it!</p>
166	Garth C Hall EBMUD	<p>Hi Shawn ... Please use me as your primary contact at EBMUD in this regard.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Garth C. Hall <i>East Bay Municipal Utility District</i> 375 Eleventh Street, MS 407 Oakland, CA 94607-4240 tel: 510.287.2061 fax: 510.287.1295</p> <p>January 24, 2007</p> <p>Mr. Shawn Oliver U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 95630</p> <p>Ms. Rebecca Victorine U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1325 J Street Sacramento, CA 95814-2922</p> <p>RE: Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction EIS/EIR</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver and Ms. Victorine:</p> <p>The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS/EIR prepared on the Folsom</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project. EBMUD is responsible for supplying water to parts of Alameda and Contra Costa counties on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay in northern California. EBMUD's water system serves approximately 1.3 million people in a 325-square-mile area. In 2006, the District executed a long-term renewal contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) for a supplemental dry-year supply from the Central Valley Project (CVP). As a CVP contractor, the operations of Folsom Dam and its appurtenant facilities are of concern to EBMUD. It is in this context that we offer the following comments on the Draft EIS/EIR.</p> <p>[#166-1 No Action Alternative] 1. <i>The document does not adequately support the use of the 400,000/670,000 acre foot variable reservation of flood control space (operating rule) as a key assumption in the No Action Alternative.</i></p> <p>The Interim Flood Operations Agreement (Agreement) between the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) and Reclamation includes an interim 400,000/670,000 acre foot operating rule. The Agreement and operating rule were intended only to provide a temporary, interim flood damage reduction benefit until the Corps' outlet modification project was completed. At this time there is no mechanism in place to compel continuation of the interim operating rule beyond 2018. NEPA requires that a no action alternative account for a predicted change in future conditions. Given that the agreement is currently scheduled to expire shortly after or during the construction of the improvements described in the DEIS/EIR, the no action alternative should use the pre-1993 400,000 acre foot rule as the default.</p> <p>[#166-2 Impacts reoperation] 2. <i>The Draft EIS/EIR's discussion of impacts and alternatives is insufficient because the document fails to address the implementation of new operations.</i></p> <p>The document states that any consideration of the impacts of changed operations cannot be determined and defers this discussion and development of operational alternatives to a point after this project has commenced. At that later point, however, operational alternatives could be constrained or favored by the physical solution that is selected and constructed. In addition, the range of alternatives examined in the Draft EIS/EIR does not encompass alternatives involving downstream levees. Where the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 contemplates development and implementation of a flood damage reduction plan for the American River, no such plan is accounted for in the Draft EIS/EIR. As a result, the flood control alternatives and their impacts are too narrowly described in the Draft EIS/EIR to meet the requirements of NEPA. The studies should be completed and described in a more comprehensive set of alternatives before a revised draft EIS/EIR is issued and operational impacts should be considered to the extent possible.</p> <p>[#166-3 Impacts indirect and cumulative economic impacts to water users] 3. <i>The Draft EIS/EIR should address the range of financial impacts on CVP water contractors.</i></p> <p>Because the Draft EIS/EIR has deferred any discussion or evaluation of operational rules, there are no estimates of the economic/financial impact to CVP water contractors, due to likely changes to the operation of Folsom reservoir resulting from the Proposed Project and other alternatives. In turn, no remedies have been identified to compensate CVP water contractors for likely operational changes that could result in reduced water supply. The document, in other words, has failed to consider the indirect and cumulative impacts that are likely to result from the project.]</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>EBMUD requests that the Corps and Bureau of Reclamation consider these issues in finalizing the Draft EIS/EIR. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document and look forward to future opportunities to participate in the changes contemplated for Folsom Dam.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alexander R. Coate Manager of Water Supply Improvements</p> <p>ARC:GCH:acr cc: Rob Alcott, EBMUD Karen Donovan, EBMUD</p>
167	Kelly James	<p>Hello,</p> <p>[#167-1 Recreation lake access closure] I saw the article on Folsom Point on the News 10 website regarding the closing of Folsom Point for seven years. I live in Folsom and use the lake on a regular basis. Closing a major ramp and parking lot is going to cause major problems during the summer, not only for Folsom residents but for all who use Folsom's recreational facilities.</p> <p>I urge you to find another solution that will not adversely impact the community.</p>
168	Gary Devers	<p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>[#168-1 Recreation lake access closure] If you intend on closing Folsom Point I will sell my boat and for the first time in twenty years not buy a season pass. This launch is used by myself and most of my friends in the area. Please revise your staging area somewhere else, my family loves the lake and will miss it in the event you use the parking lot for a staging area.</p>
169	Director Raynor Tsuneyoshi	<p>Calif. Dept. of Boating and Waterways 2000 Evergreen Street, Suite 100 Sacramento, Calif. 95815 Tel: 916.263.4330 Fax: 916.263.0648</p> <p style="text-align: center;">January 22, 2007</p> <p>Shawn Oliver Bureau of Reclamation 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 93630</p> <p>Dear Shawn Oliver:</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#169-1 Recreation lake access closure] The California Department of Boating and Waterways strongly urges the Bureau of Reclamation to refrain from closing the Folsom Point recreation area to visitors while Folsom Dam is undergoing modification.</p> <p>The Folsom Point boat launching facility is very important to the thousands of recreational boaters each year who rely on this launch ramp for access to Folsom Lake. [#169-2 Recreation remaining lake access] While there is another boat launching ramp at nearby Browns Ravine, it is not large enough to handle the additional boater demand that would be created by the closure of the Folsom Point launching facility.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sincerely,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Original Signed By:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Raynor Tsuneyoshi Director</p>
170	Karin Miller	<p>[#170-1 Recreation lake access closure] I would like to voice my opinion not to close Folsom Point. My husband and I moved here from our childhood homes in the Bay Area specifically to be close to the lake and enjoy the recreation of the Folsom area and quaint neighborhood. We live in Briggs Ranch and bought a boat two years ago, we take my 10-yr. old son and his friends on the boat each summer and feel privileged to be so close to the lake. The reason people move to Folsom is for all of the wonderful things (especially the lake). We hope you make decisions that are for the benefit of the people that live their today!</p>
171	Joel & Cathy Miller	<p>Mr. Oliver, sacrifice is necessary, even though we will be affected.</p> <p>[#171 In support of project] Those same people that are against the closure would be the 1st to put the blame on the gov. if there was a flood. Do the right thing!</p>
172	Leslie Nagel	<p>Mr. Finnegan:</p> <p>[#172-1 Recreation lake access closure PD alternate staging areas] I would like to put my two cents in about the possibility of closing Folsom Point for work on the dam at Folsom Lake. My family and I are against the closing of Folsom Point and would prefer that an alternate site be found.</p>
173	Derek & Deborah Reinbolt	<p>Mr. Shawn Oliver, Bureau of Reclamation and Ms. Becky Victorine, US Army Corp of Engineers Hello, My wife Debbie, our two school age children and myself have lived in Folsom since August of 1993. One of the main reasons we moved to Folsom was the wonderful lake (Folsom Lake), located in the town. This lake provides much needed recreation, boating, picnicking, etc.... for area residents during the warm months of the year. We frequent the lake often during the summer and have enjoyed many days boating there. We have introduced many families and children to boating, water skiing, tubing and other water sports over the years. [#173-1 Recreation lake access closure and remaining lake access] As you may or may not be aware, there is VERY limited access to the lake and there are principally only three boat ramps. Granite Bay, Browns Ravine and Folsom Point are the launching points on the lake for power boats and each includes limited parking for lake guests and car/trailer parking. On most weekends and holidays, these three ramps are busy most of the day and parking lots filled by late morning, at which point no more boats are permitted on the lake. Browns' Ravine has the most limited facilities for launching boats and parking vehicles. If Folsom Point was to be closed, this would leave two ramp/parking facilities, one of which is the least desirable of the three.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>The Folsom community was injured after the events of 9/11 when the Bureau of Reclamation took advantage of this opportunity to close the Dam road. Many businesses have closed, were forced to relocate to stay in business or have been strapped financially due to the traffic created as a result of this closure. The community has endured the closure of a main artery to and from Folsom and is hopeful that the bridge connecting Granite Bay with Folsom will be built soon. [#173-2 Socioeconomics businesses] [#173-3 Property values] Closing Folsom Point for SEVEN years will deal the community another blow and likely cause property values to fall, businesses to close, increase traffic and hurt the style of living that many of us moved to Folsom to enjoy. Some might say "it is only seven years". In seven years my oldest daughter will be a junior in college and my youngest will be a senior in high school. The Folsom community is primarily families and I would fully expect that most feel the same way about the possible closure.</p> <p>The best location for construction and staging is right next to where the spillway is scheduled to be built. This area has been closed to the public since 9/11 and would be ideal, as it is not currently used and the materials would be at the closest point for ultimate construction placement. There is ample truck access to this area as existing roads could be used and the area is already secured from the public. Security and safety would be better than anywhere else as a result.</p> <p>We understand that another spillway may be needed for Folsom Lake. The people of Folsom are not against building the spillway, only the negative impact on this great community as a result of closing one of the few access points to Folsom Lake in Folsom that is simply not necessary. Please reconsider the location for staging the spillway construction and keep Folsom Point open to the public so the community can enjoy this wonderful Lake.</p>
174	Stacey Mefford	<p>Mr. Shawn Oliver and Ms. Becky Victorine, [#174-1 Recreation access closure/alternatives] As a user of the Granite Bay launching point to Folsom Lake I'm very concerned over the news I heard about the closure of Folsom Point for seven years!! It is already very crowded at the launch areas on the weekends and closing another point will make it even worse. We have already had to endure the closure of access to Folsom with the closure of the Dam road, which hurt Folsom deeply. Aren't there some alternatives for the construction and staging like right next to the spillway where a road was already closed to the public?</p> <p>I understand that the spillway is needed but can't it be done without more inconvenience to the residents and uses of the lake? Please reconsider the location for staging and the spillway construction and keep Folsom Point open to the public so we can enjoy the lake.</p>
175	Cheryl & Andy Kurimay	<p>Dear Mr. Finnegan, and To all of you who can make a difference:</p> <p>[#175-1 Recreation lake access closure] As a resident of Folsom, I am asking that you do everything in your power to keep Folsom Point State Park open..... It is such a Blessing to have this beautiful park in our midst. What a loss it would be if it was taken it away..... This is a family community. We bring our children and grandchildren to the area to walk, picnic, fish and enjoy nature....At the least it is such a peaceful place to get away from busy schedules and just reflect on what is important.....and this issue is important!!</p> <p>[#175-2 Socioeconomic businesses] Also, this is a popular boating area and the closure would definitely impact the businesses in the area, especially in the summer.. Business owners have expressed great concern. Folsom has already suffered a lot of business closures due to the impact of closing the DAM Road. We ask you please to help us in this endeavor,</p>
176	Chere' Presley	<p>To all of our honorable representatives:</p> <p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our local state park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. The 100% closure is for a lengthy period of 6 - 7 years. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S.Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. [#176-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] This is a family community. We bring our</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#176-2 Vegetation and Wildlife.] I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. [#176-3 Air quality]. The environmental impact on our air quality could be dangerous for residents. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point. [#176-4. Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern. We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. [#176-5 Public Involvement.] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th. 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially "no notice." We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavour.</p>
177	Dan Otis	<p>Mayor Morin: [#177-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] I want to urge you to take action to weigh in on the potential USBR closure of the major recreation and boating facilities at Folsom Lake at Folsom Point and other locations. This could eliminate the major recreation and boating access for up to 7 years! My 13 year old son would be an adult by the time the facilities reopened for our family's use. USBR needs to revise its draft EIR to include the use of other areas for spillway construction staging--other areas besides those already in use by hundreds of thousands every year. I am sure that there are sites that could be developed at slightly more cost than already developed areas such as boat launch facilities, but those minor costs are small in such a huge project as that being done on Folsom Lake. We all agree that the work needs done, but USBR needs to find alternatives that will allow uninterrupted use of the Lake's boating facilities at the busiest State Park in the area. That is a very high value, especially for Folsom residents.</p> <p>Please let USBR know that you want an alternative that does not use the valuable boating facilities as the cheapest location for construction staging. Comments are due by this Friday, and can be emailed to USBR at: soliver@mp.usbr.gov and finnegan@mp.usbr.gov, 916-988-1707.</p> <p>Thanks for helping us protect the use of Folsom State Park recreation and boating facilities for the hundreds of thousands of California taxpayers using the facilities, and the residents and businesses of Folsom.</p>
178	Angie McLaughlin	<p>[#178-1 Recreation lake access closure] The closure of Folsom Point by the Bureau of Reclamation will have a deep effect on our family community. We take our children to Folsom Lake to swim, bike, hike, fish, boat, & enjoy nature. This is our only access to the lake in this area.</p> <p>[#178-2 Socioeconomics businesses] [#178-3 Property values] Closing it will hurt businesses & have a definite financial impact. Businesses in this area have already been hurt by the closure of Folsom Dam. It will also effect housing in the area. The environmental impact also needs to be investigated before any decision is made.</p> <p>[#178-4 Public Involvement notification of project] Folsom citizens were not given proper notice of this "Proposed" closure.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		Please help prevent this closure.
179	Liz Young	<p>[#179-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
180	Teresa Romero	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#180-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am concerned about the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. It seems that Folsom Point is used by many different people in the community for both recreation and just plain old peace and quiet. My husband and I go up there with our lunch and sit and talk, it has become a place where we can relax, be away from all the craziness of our everyday lives. It is so peaceful and tranquil up there, overlooking the lake. Please do not take that away from us.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point seems tragic to me.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
181	Chris Landry	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>[#181-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly encourage you to find other options to the Corps of Engineers levee work than to closing Folsom Pt. My family and I are frequent visitors to Folsom Pt, and the proximity and ease of use of Folsom Pt is one of the primary reasons we chose the neighborhood that we now live in. The closure of Folsom Pt is simply unacceptable.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
182	Carrie Cain	<p>[#182-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating and having picnics. It's closure would be an outrage. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
183	Maria Errante	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#183-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
184	Susan Mussett SLDMWA	<p>[#184-1 Cost Allocation.] Any costs attributed solely to Flood Damage Reduction must not be reimbursable by CVP contractors. For example, since Reclamation has determined that a dam raise and operable spillway gates are not required for Dam Safety, the DEIS/R should make it clear that any costs for a dam raise or in excess of the cost of a fuseplug spillway will not be borne by water and power users.</p>
185	Susan Mussett SLDMWA	<p>[#185 New Bridge.] The bridge to be constructed immediately downstream of the dam is not related to either Dam Safety or Flood Damage Reduction and no portion of the costs for the bridge are to be borne by CVP water and power users.</p>
186	Susan Mussett	<p>[#186 No Action Alternative.] We understand that the Folsom operations are not part of this environmental review, but some of the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
	SLDMWA	language in the DIE/R could be confusing regarding this issue. It should be made clear that the Interim Operations pursuant to the agreement between Reclamation and SAFCA is a temporary plan and has not been analyzed under NEPA or CEQA as a long-term operations plan. Therefore the baseline or "without project" alternative must be based on the 400,000 AF flood reservation only and not the variable flood reservation levels in the Interim Operations agreement.
187	MK Veloz	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The Northern California Marine Association (NCMA), a non-profit trade association, represents approximately 300 member companies, the majority of which are located in Northern California. These small business firms represent businesses involved in the recreational boating industry; including boat dealers, brokers, marinas, boat yards, chandleries, marine equipment and electronics suppliers, publishers, and marine finance and insurance specialists. In addition to supplying the needs of California's 3.5 million boaters and anglers, the recreational marine industry has a significant impact on the state's overall economy. California's Department of Boating and Waterways recently determined that statewide, boating contributed approximately \$16.5 billion to the Gross State Product annually. In addition, boating contributed \$1.6 billion in state and local taxes annually. There were 8,500 boating related businesses in the state that provided more than 284,000 jobs to the economy.</p> <p>The economic health of Northern California's recreational marine industry depends on maintaining access to the area's navigable waterways. The alternatives outlined in the Draft EIS/EIR rely on closing Folsom Point for use for up to seven years as a staging site and storage area for the project. [#187-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] This proposal would seriously impact recreation access for the approximately 125,000 annual visitors to the site. Over the six to seven year life of the project 816,021 visitors would be lost.] [#187-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] Not only would this severely impact recreational marine businesses, but it would also impact the area's local economy, since many of these visitors patronize local supply shops, restaurants, gas stations, and grocery stores. Furthermore, disrupting recreational activity at Folsom Point threatens to create congestion at other entrances to the Folsom Lake Recreation Area. The California Department of Parks and Recreation, which operates the Folsom Lake Recreation Area, would suffer a serious economic loss if this were to occur. [#187-3 Socioeconomics state parks.] State Parks already diverts \$27 million from the Department of Boating and Waterways' Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund. Those funds, paid for by the gas taxes California boaters pay to fuel their boats, are used to repair and build marinas, launch ramps, and other boating facilities throughout the state. The \$27 million diversion has already negatively impacted the Boating Department's ability to adequately address the state's boating infrastructure needs. Putting further stress on the State Parks' budget, by closing Folsom Point for an extended period of time, would likely result in further attempts to divert funds from the Revolving Fund. Therefore, the economic impact would ripple throughout the state and would not just be limited to the local area.</p> <p>At the public hearing at the Folsom Community Center on January 10, several representative stakeholders from Folsom's recreational community suggested alternatives that would not so severely impact access. They suggested that the Bureau and the Corps host a series of forums with the stakeholders to identify mutually beneficial alternatives. The NCMA strongly supports this suggestion. We believe that there are alternatives that would allow the Bureau and the Corps to carry out its vital work without crippling the local and state recreational community. The NCMA would also be more than happy to participate in and to contribute to this process.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact me at 510-334-8866 or at ncma-gr@comcast.net.</p>
188	Jane Pearson	<p>[#188-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I am sickened to hear that Dyke 8/ Folsom Point has a planned closure. I object to this decision as it is the only access to the residence of Folsom on this side of the lake. We just bought a boat and launching is already problematic due to over crowded conditions. I cannot fathom how we will be able to access the lake as the proposed closures will no longer make boating feasible for those of us on the East (?) side of the lake.</p> <p>I live near Briggs Ranch Road. I've lost easy access to Roseville and I-80 North bound due to the closure of the Dam road, now I am hearing that my close residential boat launch access is being curtailed. I have been a resident of Folsom for 20 years and each</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		"improvement" has adversely effected my quality of life. Please don't close Folsom Point to the residence of the city. Please explore other options that are available.
189	Branton and Jennifer Obenaus	Hello, [#189-1 General.] Please do not close this valuable and extensively used neighborhood recreational resource (Folsom Point / Dyke 8). The state park on East Natoma is one of the reasons we chose to buy our home in this area.
190	Michael Avakian	Mr. Oliver, [#190-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am a recent resident of Briggs Ranch. A major decision in moving to this neighborhood was the Lake access at Folsom Point. We lead a very active life and enjoy the close Lake Access and have become very concerned that Folsom Point would be closed to Stage the construction of a new Dam Road. I ask that the team please consider a new location for staging their equipment. Why would this project want to impact the quality of life for Folsom Residents in such a negative manner. Please consider other locations.
191	Marcus MacTaggart	Hello, [#191-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I recently became aware of the proposal to close Folsom Point in order to increase flood protection. I have been a Folsom resident for the past 16 years and 2 years ago I was finally able to purchase a boat. My family and I use it year round exclusively in Folsom Lake for water sports, fishing, picnics etc. Folsom point is not only the best access on the whole lake, it is the most convenient for us. [#191-2 Recreation remaining access points.] I have attempted to put my boat in at both Browns Ravine and Granite Bay in the past. While Browns Ravine is not that far away, the boat ramp is often extremely crowded and the boat trailer parking is limited when the water level is high as it is for several months during peak fishing and boating season. Granite bay is at least a half hour drive away, and also it is often crowded due to the easy access from I80. If Folsom Point was closed for the proposed 6 years I am very sure that the utilization of my boat would be cut in half if not more. My kids are in their early teens and we have been able to strengthen our family bond through our many outings on our boat. By the time Folsom Point opens up again, my kids will be going away to college. Essentially this means we would miss out on critical time with our children during their teenage years. This prospect troubles my wife and I greatly. [#191-3 Socioeconomics businesses.] In addition to the loss to my family, I am also concerned about the loss to the Folsom economy. We have already suffered business loss due to the damn road closing....now this. I am one of those people who throws money into the Folsom economy to support my boating lifestyle. If that lifestyle is significantly cut back, I will be significantly cutting back on the money I spend in Folsom to support my boating activities. This includes fuel, food, drinks, boating accessories, and maintenance costs. This kind of scenario will likely happen to a lot of Folsom boating families and the city business will also suffer from the loss of people coming from out of town to use Folsom Point. I personally do not understand why another area can not be used in the same capacity as the proposal for Folsom point. For instance the old parking lot by the dam has not been used in years. [#191-4 Recreation mitigation.] At the very least if the proposal for closing Folsom Point does get approved it should require that better access and trailer parking should be provided at Browns Ravine to help make up for the loss. Thanks for allowing me to comment on this subject
192	Jill Ellis	Dear Mr. Oliver, [#192-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I live in the Briggs Ranch area in Folsom, and I am hearing that the Bureau of Reclamation is planning on closing Folsom Point while the bridge is under construction. I urge you not to do that. Folsom Point is a place where many people walk their dogs, go for runs and use the boat ramp for water recreation. [#192-2 Recreation remaining access points]. During the summer Folsom Point is so busy. Closing it would cause major traffic congestion at the other boat ramps.] One of the reasons I

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>chose Briggs Ranch to live was because it is so close to the lake. I understand there needs to be an area for the bridge construction equipment, but please consider a different area. Closing Folsom Point for seven years would not be the right decision. Thank you for listening!</p>
193	mair auerbach	<p>[#193-1 Public Involvement Process.] I am writing to object strongly to any idea of closing Folsom point, also to the underhand way this whole affair appears to have been handled.] mair auerbach</p>
194	Lisa Tomiak	<p>Mr Oliver, I writing you to voice my opposition to planned closure of Folsom Point. This proposal will impact this community in such a severe way that it may never recover, destroying the lives and financial stability of residents still struggling to recover from the closure of the dam road. Your planned proposal will not only effect the quality of life but the health and safety of residents and wildlife. According to the Bureau's Findings: [#194-1 Vegetation and wildlife.] <i>Destruction of wetlands or possible permanent loss of wetlands</i> The loss of wetlands will effect many species of birds, mammals, protected amphibians, fish, and endangered insects. Our need for more water is going to impact the wildlife of the lake possibly forever. It also mentions the creation of solid waste. This is a beautiful state park you are callously using as cement factory and staging area. This delicate environment and the many animals that call it home could be permanently destroyed and that is just too high a price for more water. One issue you did not address was our resident Eagle (aka lovingly known as Folsom) Although the Bald Eagle may no longer be on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act" It is my understanding one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern. Is your proposal in violation of this Act? [#194-2 Water Quality.] <i>Damage to Water Quality:</i> Folsom lake is known for its beautiful clear water. Families flock to enjoy it. The increased turbidity and siltation will make this impossible. [#194-3 Air Quality.] <i>Air Quality</i> This is my greatest concern. I live in Brigg's Ranch, the neighborhood directly across the street from Folsom Point. I have two daughters that have asthma. Your own study says that NOx and Particulate PM10 emissions will exceed deminiis thresholds. How is this going to effect their already challenged lungs? How are they going to hang out in their own backyard when you poison the air? What are the long term effects of breathing these chemicals. Another issue to air quality is the naturally occurring asbestos in the soil, it is not an issue until you start moving it around. The soil relocation and blasting will put these carcinogenic chemical into the air to poison Folsom Families. [#194-4 Transportation.] <i>Significant Impact to Roadways:</i> Getting around Folsom has been challenging to say the least since the Dam Road closure. Natoma Street is already severely overcrowded, the addition of construction traffic will make it impossible to navigate the city and dangerous for residents. Emergency vehicles may have difficulty responding to emergencies due to traffic congestion. The increase of traffic will also damage our roadways. [#194-5 Visual loss of lake views] <i>Permanent Loss Of Lake Views:</i> Many of us in Folsom bought our homes because of Folsom Lake and the beautiful views. This proposed closure is going to adversely effect the [#194-6 Socioeconomics property value.] property values of our homes. This will have a huge impact on the financial stability of this community. The loss of lake views is going to eliminate the very reason we moved to this community. [#194-7 Noise.] <i>Increased Noise Levels:</i> According to your study Noise levels will surpass levels at the three receptor sights. Day and nighttime noise will be an issue. Daytime blasting will cause loss of quality of life and possible damage to our homes. The solution of scheduling truck traffic during daytime hours will only further impact our roads. How are residents supposed to deal with the increase noise levels. You are destroying our quality of life. [#194-8 Recreation park post-construction.] <i>Change in Folsom Point State Park:</i> What will be left of Folsom Point after your proposed project? With increased water levels how much of our park will remain?</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#194-9 Recreation lake access closure.] <i>Loss Of Recreation:</i> I personally use Folsom Point on an almost daily basis. I enjoy morning walks around the lake for exercise, my dog enjoys walking and swimming in the lake, my family picnics and celebrates special events in the picnic area, boating and fishing are also family favorites. The lake and easy access is why we bought our home where we did.]</p> <p>[#194-10 Recreation remaining access points.] If you close Folsom Point the other local boat launches will be overwhelmed and unable to handle the added traffic.</p> <p>[#194-11 Public Utilities.] <i>Public Works:</i> Folsom recently went through the headache of putting in the Natoma pipeline. This was a necessary inconvenience for residents. Your proposal includes the possible damaging or relocation of this pipeline. What impact will this lead to on our community.</p> <p>Folsom is a wonderful family oriented community, the proposed closure of Folsom Point will destroy our quality of life. Please develop an alternative plan that will not create such adversity.</p>
195	Jackie Kolander	<p>I grew up water skiing on Folsom Lake, and although I don't water ski there right now, it is one of the reasons we chose to move into Briggs Ranch 9 years ago when coming back to this area after college. [#195-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] We use the area to hike to often as a family and walk from our home. Closing the bridge for 7 years is unreasonable amount of time. My kids will be grown and out of the house in 6 - 10 years. Closing the bridge for that long will change the memories we have of hiking and exploring along the lake shore. [#195-2 Property value.] It will affect the property values in Briggs Ranch. It is not reasonable to close off a highly utilized access to Folsom Lake because of the construction of the new bridge for a period of 7 years. I want you to know I object to closing Folsom Point, as one of the great things about living here is access to the lake.</p>
196	DS	<p>To whom this may concern.</p> <p>The Folsom Point Recreation Area (FPRA) is just what it is called; a "recreation Area".</p> <p>However, the unacceptable and unnecessary closure to the area would require a name change.</p> <p>[#196-1 Lake access/alternative staging areas.] What is sad is that there are alternative sites which can be used for the same purpose as that which the FSRA would serve.</p> <p>[#196-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] Also the unforeseen costs (the adverse of the benefits of having the rec. area) to the community which has come to depend on it as a way of life would and do far outweigh the costs of forgoing the use of this site for another one. These benefits such as : biking, boating, running, walking, nature seeking, picnicking and simply a place to relax from the everyday stresses the local and regional taxpayer encounters.</p> <p>Having the recreation area is not a luxury to the people of Folsom and its surrounding areas BUT a Necessity!</p> <p>Therefore it is strongly recommended and encouraged that another site is chosen. It must be understood that at any additional cost, it is well worth it to adapt another site than that of the FPRA.</p>
197	John and Cheryl Mandsager	<p>We understand the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing to close Folsom Point/Dyke 8 to all visitors for a duration of up to 7 years effective Fall 2007 while the Folsom Dam is retrofitted. [#197-1 PD Lake access closure/alternative staging areas.] While we support the dam project, we understand there are many other alternatives that have yet to be explored. These alternatives would allow Folsom Point to remain open to the public. Since we enjoy visiting Folsom Point many, many times a year, this closure would have a negative impact on our family. We imagine the impact on most, if not all, of the families in our neighborhood would be the same. We urge the Bureau of Reclamation to pursue the Dam project in a manner that will allow Folsom Point to remain open to the public</p>
198	Anonymous	<p>[#198-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] As a resident of Folsom I urge the Bureau of Reclamation to find an alternative site to stage improvement operations to the Folsom Dam. In the spring and summer I use Folsom Point as a place to fish and launch my boat from.] [#198-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] If Folsom Point is closed I will no longer purchase an annual recreation pass for access to the lake and I will not stand in line at Browns Ravine or any other launch facility to launch a boat (economic impact). Additionally, Folsom Lake is open to the public and access to it should remain in the public's domain. Completing the work from</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		another staging area makes sense. This would allow continued access to the lake at Folsom Point for fisherman, recreational boaters, and those using the picnic areas. Thank you for your consideration.
199	George R Koch	<p>In relation to the hearing which was recently held regarding the possible use of Folsom Point as a supply and equipment depot for the forthcoming raising of Folsom Dam, please allow me to point out what time and evolution of purpose has occurred: We are well aware of the original purpose of Folsom Dam and Lake was to provide flood protection and water source and power for our area. Well and good idea. That was a long time ago. Since then, the population has more then doubled. The recreation potential of the lake has been fulfilled in that access to it is, although minimal during the warmer months of the year, has been developed to the great enjoyment of the public.</p> <p>[#199-1 Recreation remaining access points.] Any reduction in access at this time will have drastic consequences for the public in their use of the lake, for during busy times at the launching areas long lines of vehicles and boats must wait patiently for launching. Likewise, water craft seeking to return to the shore have quite a time slipping in to a dock to gain their turn. Any reduction in access to the lake must make matters worse and simply cause many to go elsewhere, or simply reduce their water recreation. [#199-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] Of course, reduced income for access is a certainty. [#199-3 PD alternative staging areas.] Surely for a project as large as raising the level of the lake, a process taking years, justifies a specific area for both stockpiling materials and equipment and could also have its own lake access for barge transport. Yes, additional cost is involved, but, compared to the cost of the project and the benefit to the public and the reduction in income from users, it seems justified.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to contribute my feelings in this matter.</p>
200	Ian B Cornell	<p>[#200-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] We represent the interests of hundreds of outdoor product dealers and serve as the de facto representatives of the millions of local outdoor enthusiasts who have visited the Sports, Boat and RV Show in its 54-year history. While we support the flood control and security measures planned for Folsom Dam and the surrounding dykes, we wholly oppose the closure of the lake, launch ramps, and surrounding trails during the construction.</p> <p>Folsom Lake is an important asset for outdoor recreation enthusiasts. [#200-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] Closing access to its shorelines and boat ramps will be very detrimental to the people who use those amenities and extremely harmful to the boat, recreation vehicle and outdoor product retailers in the region. Some of those, which depend on their proximity to Folsom lake for their success, would very likely be forced out of business by the closure.</p> <p>The access points to the lake are already highly impacted. While there is plenty of room on the water, space on the launch ramps is limited during peak times. If one launch area closes or is reduced in its capacity, the others cannot handle the increased load. Other waterways in the region, such as the American River and Sacramento River, also cannot handle the increase.</p> <p>As boaters, we know the impact we, and the hundreds of thousands like us, have on the local economies. A typical day at the lake starts with a visit to a gas station and store to stock up on snacks, beverages, ice, and fuel. When the day ends, we refill the fuel tanks and usually visit a restaurant for dinner. Even a small group of people spending a day on a boat brings hundreds of dollars to local businesses before and after a trip to the lake.</p> <p>As representatives of the industries impacted by access to the lake and local outdoor recreation enthusiasts, we encourage continued access to the lake and its shoreline before, during, and after any construction takes place.</p>
201	Carole and David Jones	<p>We wholeheartedly agree with the need for this project and understand the benefit to all. We are impressed with the collaboration between the departments involved. [#201-1 Noise and Transportation.] As a Briggs Ranch resident, we are concerned about the noise and traffic impact during what will be a project lasting years, not months. We have the impression we may be more impacted than other sites. Please keep affected residents informed of the work schedule, maybe on your website.</p> <p>Monday-Saturday 7-7 will seem very long. Please give us our Saturday afternoons in summer and standard holidays to enjoy!</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		Please discourage worker and truck vehicles from using Briggs Ranch as a short cut! Please put yourselves in our position. We hope this will not affect our quality of life to drastically. Remember, we are homeowners and voters!
202	Rick Miller	<p>[#202-1 Noise.] I am writing as to my opposition to any plan to use the area known as MIAD (N. of Green Valley Rd, E. of Natoma) for any staging, construction, rock crushing and any like activity regarding the Folsom Lake Dam construction project. I am a resident of Folsom and live in the foothills community of Empire Ranch which is across from Green Valley Rd. The noise levels are already extremely high from normal road activity 24 a day. As noted in the current Executive Summary, noise levels will increase to unacceptable levels. This valley is shaped like a bowl, so noise would travel without being muted.</p> <p>[#202-2 Air quality.] Also, the prevailing wind comes out of the north blowing across the current structure over our community. In addition to 'carrying' the noise further distances, a potentially greater issue or threat to this family community is the exposure to asbestos and other construction dust and debris and the health problems these will create now and in the future.]</p> <p>In closing, the option would be unacceptable and would likely lead to considerable resident disruption and legal activity.</p>
203	David Graves	<p>I am strongly opposed to the closing of Folsom Point. I have lived in Folsom for 17 years and I am currently building a custom home in the Vista Del Lago development on East Natomas right next to the Lake. One of our major decisions to build in that custom development was the proximity to the Folsom Point recreation area. I have (2) teenage boys 14 & 16 and own a ski boat to enjoy family time with them. The next 5 years are critical & special years for us as a family prior to both of them going off to college. My wife and I created a strong long term plan to build and enjoy their High School years in our new custom home right up the street from Folsom Point. Our whole family enjoys boating, picnicking, and jogging at the lake for family time. All of which we do by accessing the Lake at Folsom Point. You can imagine our disappointment and shock when it was announced January 9th 2007 the Folsom Point recreation area would be closed for the next seven years. [#203-1 Socioeconomic property values] This would devastate us as a family let alone our life investment into the custom home we are building just up the street from Folsom Point. Our house is approximately 2 months from completion and I can only imagine what this is going to do to its value and our Family plan of living in this new house. You just can not get back these next 5 years that we are entering into with our boys. These years only come once in a life time and we thought we had a very solid plan ready to be realized in a couple of months.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this plan. [#203-2 PD alternate staging area] Please find another location to stage construction that would cause much less impact for seven years. Many sites come to mind, primarily the look out point on the dam road which is already inaccessible to the public. That is a huge area in close proximity to your project. [#203-3 Recreation mitigation] Even if a temporary boat launch is required for project construction access to the lake it would be a straight shot to the dam and completely accessible from the dam road that is already closed to traffic. To build a boat launch when the lake is low would be a much better idea for all. Financially I am sure it would calculate out as well when compared to the lost revenue of losing Folsom Point for 7 years, and to the lost revenue to the local businesses that rely on the Lake. [#203-4 Traffic] The increased traffic at Folsom Point on Natomas street and loss of property values would be a huge negative impact to the City of Folsom Residents. Also, there is plenty of state land on either end of the dam road that could be utilized for construction staging as well that would create less impact to the City of Folsom. Please provide an impact report for consideration of all of these sites prior to taking the easy one of Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#203-5 Socioeconomic businesses] Please consider the Fiscal Impact to the many Folsom Residents & Local Businesses that have a similar story to mine.]Please understand the additional stress of building a custom home for the last two years right down the street from the lake access that was just announced to be closed for seven years.</p> <p>I throw myself at your mercy and plea with you to find another location more suitable for the community.</p>
204	John and Sandii Dalessi	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#204-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] We strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area and urge you to choose an alternative solution.] Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members in the Folsom and</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		El Dorado Hills area throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. [#204-2 Socioeconomic businesses] The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the local economy and quality of life for those in Folsom.] Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.
205	Anonymous	[#205-1 Recreation mitigation] Folsom Point Park Closure: During the spring, summer and fall months numerous bass fishing tournaments have been held (almost every weekend) at this boat ramp site. Similarly, Granite Bay is crowded. Will accommodations be made to accommodate loss of access to the lake?
206	Thomas E. Leard	<p>January 24, 2007 To: Mayor Andy Morin CC: Shawn Oliver at Bureau of Reclamation & Becky Victorine at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers RE: "PROPOSED' CLOSURE OF FOLSOM POINT STATE PARK (AKA) DYKE 8) by BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS</p> <p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our local state park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. The 100% closure is for a lengthy period of 6 - 7 years. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S.Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers. It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. [#206-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#206-2 Vegetation and Wildlife.] I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. [#206-3 Air quality.] The environmental impact on our air quality could be dangerous for residents. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#206-4. Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern.</p> <p>We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. [#206-5 Public Involvement] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th. 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially " no notice." We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.]</p> <p>We ask you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p>
207	Phil Lugo	<p>My family and I moved to Folsom recently for many reasons but one of the main reason was Folsom Lake. We bought our home in Empire Ranch partly because it was close to Folsom Point boat launch.</p> <p>[#207-1 Recreation lake access closure] The idea of closing this access point would essentially take away a large family activity. My</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>children are currently 6 and 8 which mean if Folsom point was to close for 7+ years then this would prevent us from this enjoyment. Please - DO NOT CLOSE!]</p> <p>[#207-2 Recreation remaining access locations] PS: Brown Ravine is already impacted for many summer weekends as it is - closing Folsom Point would make this situation worse.</p>
208	Ted and Maggie White	<p>This e-mail is in protest of the possibility of closing Folsom Point during the building of the new span across the American River. After 911 the dam road was closed creating a hardship on many people and businesses. Instead of using less fuel for our vehicles we increased gas usage. The reason for the closure was that someone could blow up the dam from the roadway. I'm a retired California Highway Patrolman and I know that anyone that wants to can blow up ANY dam they want to can by filling a boat up with explosives and driving it into the dam itself. This would cause more damage than a vehicle sitting on the road at the top of the dam with explosives. Now, your considering closing Folsom Point for the duration of building the new span.</p> <p>I have a boat and use Folsom Point every week during the summer. The launching areas available now are so busy in the summer that there's a good chance you can't even get in. On the weekends when the weather is exceptional all of the parking facilities for the lake fill up quickly. [#208-1 Recreation remaining lake access] If you close Folsom Point that leaves only one other facility on the east side of the lake, Browns Ravine, to launch. Browns Ravine is very limited in parking. I know for a fact that there are other places on the dam property that could be used, i.e. the parking lot at the east end of the bridge is an ideal place. It would be out of the way and would not affect anybody. Thousands of residents have been affected with the closure of the dam road and now thousands more will be affected.</p> <p>[#208-3 Public Involvement comment period] From the flyer's I've read the public was given notice on January 9, 2007 with with 3,000 flyer's????????????? The city of Folsom has a population of approx 63,000 and then there's El Dorado Hills and other surround cities that use Folsom Lake We were given a deadline to discuss the closure of January 22, 2007. Our elected officials are suppose to look at the overall picture and do what's right for the residents in the area - THIS WHOLE THING SMELLS TO ME.....]</p> <p>Please think of the public when you make your decision as to this issue.</p> <p>PS: We moved to your city to have quick access to Folsom lake. If you close Folsom Point I would consider moving....</p>
209	Mark Rucker	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>[#209-1 Recreation remaining lake access] It seems that you think that all the rest of the launches will handle the extra traffic that closing Folsom point would create do not do this. I pay taxes and fees just like everyone else.</p>
210	Nigel Olding	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver,</p> <p>I am writing to provide feedback to you about the Draft document published recently.</p> <p>[# 210-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternates] As a Folsom resident, I believe that the closure of Folsom Point for up to 7 years will be a disaster for the City and local area, and must be reconsidered immediately. [#210-2 Socioeconomic businesses] The impact on local business and residents will surely equal the other disastrous decision made by agencies out of the local area - namely, the closing of the Folsom Dam road due to 'security threats'. It is plain to me by looking at the condition of the historic area that the road closure has had a profound effect on the City, and the closing of facilities at the dam - Folsom Point - will surely have another negative effect, and hardly can be considered a 'fair' or 'shared' impact on the local community. Any plan that calls for the closing of existing recreational areas for multiple years, or other huge local impact, has to be regarded as flawed, particularly in light of the damage done to the City in the last few years by similar ill-considered closures.</p> <p>What are the other options that were considered and discarded? Why can't a staging area be constructed elsewhere to have a lesser impact on the existing recreational facilities? A project of this magnitude should surely be capable of including the construction of a staging area in an area with less impact. If not, why not?</p> <p>Please amend this draft plan to include staging in an area that will have far less local impact.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#210-3 Public Involvement web access] Also, I would like to point out that the EIS/EIR PDF documents are currently unavailable for review at the www.usbr.gov/mp website - any attempt to access them simply crashes the browser (Internet Explorer, Firefox or Opera). Is there an explanation for this sorry state of affairs?</p>
211	Brady Beckmann	<p>To all concerned, Our family was astonished when we heard of the possibility of Folsom Point closing. We moved to Folsom 6 years ago and access to the Lake was one of our key purchase decisions. We bought a boat because of our vicinity to the lake. We poured a driveway and re-landscaped our yard to store our boat. We have purchased an annual pass every year and we use the lake all of the time!! Our kids are 7 and 10. They both learned to kayak, kneeboard, waterski on doubles then on a single ski and now are venturing into wakeboarding. We go fishing, swimming and sometimes just drive around the lake and meet up with friends to have picnics and enjoy our incredible surroundings. Closing Folsom Point will dramatically effect the quality of our lives. It is not like we can just drive down the road and launch at Brown's Ravine. [#211-1 Recreation remaining lake access] The other launch ramps will NOT be able to keep up with the demand on the lake. Most of us will be turned away on the weekend. [#211-2 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] A seven year closure will mean that our "Family Time" on the boat is gone. Gone until my kids are 14 and 17. High school and college age. In essence, the rest of their childhood. Please do something to STOP THIS!!! Is it possible to stage the work equipment on property closer to the Dam Road or the prison? I just cannot fathom another hit on the residents and businesses of Folsom. Please recognize this decision a complete disaster for the residents of Folsom. I sincerely appreciate your efforts to find another solution to this problem.</p>
212	Brett Heeke	<p>[#212-1 Recreation lake access closure] I am a Folsom Resident living within walking distance to Folsom Point/Dyke 8 and am very opposed to the proposition of closing the Folsom Point.access. This will be heavily destructive to our community and a lifestyle which makes Folsom such a great place to live. Please use all means necessary in finding an alternative for the Folsom Dam retrofit project.</p>
213	Matt Henry	<p>Dear Shawn Oliver, [#213 In support of project] I am sending you this e-mail to voice my opinions about the Folsom Dam Upgrades. I think that upgrading Folsom Dam is an excellent project. My feeling is that it is not a matter of if there is another major flood in the area only a question of when. Post Hurricane Katrina I don't think is responsible to ignore any reasonable opportunity to improve flood control.I am a White Water Guide on the South Fork of the American River and so my initial thoughts regarding dams are usually negative. however, I think this is a very positive project. I'm sure you know the arguments better than I regarding this project so I will not rehash what I know. I am a local Sacramento resident and spend much time around Folsom lake. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
214	Sonia Deauville	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, [#214-1 Recreation lake access closure/alterantives] My e-mail message is in regard to the "proposed" SEVEN" year closure of Folsom Point State Park (AKA Dyke 8), with the purpose being, to use this beautiful state park as a staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway. I just cannot figure out why in the world, the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, would ever make this decision, when there are other properties available, nearby, in which to use as a staging area? Closing a California State Park to thousands and thousands of families, for SEVEN years makes absolutely no sense to me, and I am outraged!!!! What are you thinking? [#214-2 Socioeconomics businesses] - I do not oppose positive improvements to the dam, of course, but there should be more consideration, and thought, given to these many, many families, businesses, and the environment, of which all, will be directly affected by this ridiculous proposal. Closing a very, very utilized state park for SEVEN years is just plain nuts!!!</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>- Please explain to me why our government came up with this particular site, when there are other nearby areas that could be used, with far less impact on the community? Our two daughters, and their families, live in Folsom and are absolutely devastated with this "proposal". Please, Mr. Oliver, look into your heart, and choose an alternate site for this project.</p>
215	Darrell Fullerton Robert Hicks Diane Star Anderson-Hicks	<p>To Bureau of reclamation. [#215-1 Recreation lake access closure] We are very concerned about the potential closure of various recreations area at Folsom Lake. Our family utilizes the Lake at least 2 times a week. [#215-2 Public Involvement] How can we obtain more information about this issue?</p>
216	P McM	<p>[#216-1 Recreation lake access closure] At this idea to close Folsom Pt for 7 years. Why? I find this unacceptable as well. You people are terrible. This is a drought year coming up, we take all our kids there to beat the heat.] This is the LAST open area of Folsom left. F**k off with this!!!! I'm going to the meetings to protest and I live in Carmichael and vote.</p>
217	Susan Patchett	<p>[#217-1 PD alternate staging location] Why not use the Folsom Dam Road recreational area for a staging area? There is a large parking lot that could be used and also there would access to the lake.</p>
218	Mr. Kelley V. Thorn	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, [#218-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] Today I read in the Folsom Telegraph newspaper of intentions to close Folsom Point at Folsom Lake. I am shocked and dismayed that it is the intent of the government to close a recreation area that is so important to so many. Just as the Bureau looked for ways to close the most beautiful scenery (Folsom Dam road) in the area, now you look to take away even more from area residents. I go on record as opposing the closure. Surely there must be a compromise.</p>
219	Barbara	<p>[#219-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] I am writing to ask you PLEASE do not close Folsom Point (Dyke 8) while you retrofit the Folsom Dam. We suffered the loss of our travel trailer spot on Lake Berryessa where we used to launch our boat because of Federal Bureau of Reclamation issues and purposely moved to Folsom to be able to continue our pleasurable boating, fishing, and waterskiing. [#219-2 Recreation remaining lake access] If you close Folsom Point, we will never be able to use Brown's Ravine without the risk of overcrowding because of the closure of Folsom Point. We have our son and his family (an 8 yr. old and 4 yr. old) who love to water-ski and go out on the lake in our boat. Please consider other options for your retrofit project and do not close any of the launching facilities on Folsom Lake. I look forward to your reply.</p>
220	Fernando Gaudy	<p>City Council Members, [#220-1 Recreation lake access closure] I would like to express my disapproval for any plans to close Folsom Point as was suggested by the Fed Govt. The city has already been affected greatly by the quick closure of the Dam Road, and this move would severely impact all of the residents of Folsom and the surrounding areas that use Folsom Lake for recreation.</p>
221	anonymous	<p>Comment: We won't stop fighting this just because the comment period ends....look for our full page add too. Story: Folsom Point closure protested Hundreds attend Saturday's rally in effort to save lake access [# 221-1 Recreation lake access closure] Protesters angry over the Bureau of Reclamation's proposed closure of Folsom Point showed up at the recreation area on Saturday. By 12:15 p.m., approximately 150 people filled the parking lot at the corner of East Natoma Street and Folsom Point and more continued to stream in throughout the afternoon. Many took to the sidewalks to wave signs and</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		encourage drivers to honk in protest. For more of this story, click on or type the URL below: http://folsomtelegraph.com/articles/2007/01/24/news/top_stories/01protest.txt
222	Robert Jeffrey	Shawn and Rebecca, I am writing to voice my displeasure with the proposed closure of Folsom Point. As a husband and father of two, the recreational access afforded by Folsom Point is an integral part of my family's outdoor life. We launch our boat to fish, ski and picnic from Folsom Point year round. [#222-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] It is unacceptable to fully close a major part of our life for convenience and cost savings by construction crews. [#222-2 Recreation remaining lake access] The remaining launch points for Folsom Lake will be shut down with regularity during peak season due to severe overcrowding. As it is, Folsom Point gets overcrowded occasionally. Please re-consider closing Folsom Point and create a floating barge and/or temporary platform system for staging equipment. It is important to all of us, in Folsom, and beyond, that a part of our livelihood remains accessible. Our children's formative years are the most critical, do not deny their opportunities for the sake of convenience. There are more reasons that Folsom Point should remain open, but I feel I have stated the most important one. Thank you for reading this letter and please feel free to respond at any time.
223	Charlie Parrish	To Bureau of Reclamation & Army Corp of Engineers, [#223-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives] I was shocked this morning to open up the Folsom Telegraph and read about the proposed closure of Folsom Point. Along with many of the protestors at Folsom Point last week, I too live in the area and my family spends many summer days at Folsom Point picnicking and boating. The entire Folsom Dam issue including the road closure has been a real sore spot for me and many Folsom residents and my family and adding to that for another seven years is ridiculous. According to the newspaper article, the city has already proposed alternatives which appear to have gone unrecognized by your two organizations. As you continue to restrict access to the lake more and more, we, the residents of Folsom, become more and more angered by your actions. Look for an alternative and keep access to our lake OPEN!!
224	Anonymous	[#224-1 In Support of Project] I've lived in Folsom for 13 years. I have no problem with the closure of the point so that you can do the work you need to do. People in this town are greedy, and selfish. They only care about themselves. Since the closure of the Dam road traffic has increased on Green valley. I say close Dyke 8 and get rid of the drugs, drinking and traffic for the next 7 years. If you go somewhere else in Folsom they will only complain over that spot too.
225	Vicky Walasek	[#225-1 General.] Please keep this place open to boaters!!!
226	Andy Benson	As a long standing member of the community of Folsom, I have seen many changes to our community throughout the years. [#226-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] I know that the City Leaders could care less if Folsom Point is closed for seven years, but the economy is going to be greatly altered for surrounding businesses, not only in Folsom , but also El Dorado Hills . Many locals rely on the Spring, Summer and Fall recreational use of the lake to greatly supplement their income. Closure of Folsom Point could be disastrous for many local businesses. [#226-2 Recreation lake access closure] Folsom Point is not just a boat launch, but also an area for locals to run, walk and bike throughout the year. Seven years (if not longer), is a long time to not be able to enjoy what little of nature we have left. As a concerned, uninformed community, we encourage you to find an alternative area to store your equipment for upcoming projects. Please , help us to save what little open space we have left to enjoy. [#226-3 Recreation remaining lake access.] Think about what affect the closure of Folsom Point will have on other communities, such as El Dorado Hills and Granite Bay. The closure could prove to be an overwhelming blow to an already busy, overcrowded recreational season.
227	Teresa Black	[#227-1 Recreation lake access closure.] To whom it may concern; I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
228	Roy Moore	<p>[#228-1 Socioeconomics.] I take exception to closing the Folsom Point ramp for seven years. You undoubtedly heard much about economic impacts already. I hope someone already mentioned that these impacts constitute quality-of-life issues that would likely be reflected in real estate values, etc.</p> <p>[#228-2 PD alternative staging area.] Please consider another staging site, or if it is the ramp that you need, please build a new ramp at Browns Ravine or nearby then close Folsom Point. I'd even be happy with a good ramp system at Beal's Point.</p> <p>I worked in state government long enough to understand the trouble not-in-my-backyard attitudes can cause. I hope we can avoid such attitudes with the Folsom Lake upgrade.</p>
229	Jim Kinnicutt	<p>I am writing to both of you on this topic, as I was unable to attend a meeting a 6 pm on the 10th at the Folsom Community Center, 52 Natomas Street. I received an email from one of my neighbors that morning. Unfortunately I was on the east coast for meetings, otherwise I would have been able to attend. I was a little taken aback however on the extremely short notice for this meeting.</p> <p>[#229-1 Socioeconomics businesses]. Folsom Lake is an important asset for outdoor recreation enthusiasts and as such has a very big impact on home values and our economy. Closing access to its shorelines and boat ramps will be very detrimental to the people who use those amenities and extremely harmful to the local home values in the region. Some of the local businesses, which depend on their proximity to Folsom Lake for their success, could very likely be forced out of business as well.</p> <p>I myself just purchased a home in Briggs Ranch. It closed in May and I just moved in last July. I paid a premium, even though we were in a "down" market, for the specific purpose of having access to Folsom Point. There were several families at that point competing for homes in this area and it was at a time where there were surplus homes that were, and still are, available in other areas for VERY attractive comparative prices. Now to think of losing this access for up to seven years is, to say it politely, very disappointing. Not only from an access to the lake point of view, but from the perspective of the impact it will have on my investment. All of the sudden, Folsom becomes a bad investment. Is this truly the impact you wish to have on our community?</p> <p>The impact will be enormous, not only to me but our community. [#229-2 PD alternative staging areas.] In the light that there are other alternatives to consider, I hope you will give this further thought. I would suggest considering the sides of the new closed Dam Road as well as the large parking area to the closed vista/picnic area, also closed to the public.</p> <p>[#229-3 Public Involvement meeting announcement.] I find it interesting that the announced time of the meeting came out on the same day of its occurrence.] I would obviously not be alone in being extremely disappointed to lose continued access to the lake and its shoreline before, during, and after any construction takes place.</p>
230	Neva J Cimaroli	<p>[#230-1 Recreation parking.] You are undoubtedly familiar with the location of Pinebrook Plaza and Pinebrook Village because of the proximity to your office. We have two major concerns with the proposed closing of Folsom Point and the raising of the Dam.</p> <p>It is a natural presumption that closing Folsom Point would not impact this side of the river. This is not true. Because Folsom Lake is one of the most popular recreational areas in the State, we often feel the impact from Beal's Point. There is an inclination to stash one or more cars in our parking lot at the Plaza so that a third car is the only one charged a Park entry fee.</p> <p>Beal's Point is also closed a number of times throughout the summer because of overflow crowds. We again find the park users filling our parking lot. Any reduction in access to Folsom Lake, although it may be on the other side of the river, will bring more abuse of our available parking. Fourteen businesses will be adversely influenced. The Plaza is the closest point of entry to Beal's Point where a car</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>can be left when roadside parking is unavailable or the park is closed. Recreational users walk into the lake leaving their vehicles at Pinebrook Plaza. If Folsom Point is not available they will come to this side of the river further aggravating the current problem. [#230-2 Geology and soils.] We also have a continuing concern about the high water table in this area. Because manufactured homes are installed on piers, any loss of stability of the soil is a concern. We feel these items should be considered when authorized changes in the project are under consideration. [#230-3 Recreation lake access closure.] Folsom Point must remain open to meet recreational needs.</p>
231	Paul Moynier	<p>Thank you for discussing the Folsom Lake Flood Control Project with me at the Public Hearing last week. I'm writing you to voice concerns on behalf of the Sacramento Valley Marine Association. The organization I represent has 30 Members who have boat dealerships within the greater Sacramento Metropolitan area and generate in excess of \$100 million dollars in annual sales. I hope to provide information that will help the Bureau of Reclamation better understand the impacts this project will have on the Boat Dealers, Merchants, City of Folsom, Parks and Recreation and the local economy in the Sacramento region.</p> <p>As an organization representing the recreational industry we support properly managed valuable water resources, the flood control upgrade and the bridge crossing at Folsom Lake. It is not our desire to stop this project, but instead help minimize or eliminate the impacts to the business community. As stated in the EIR with interpretation, this project will cause hardship on the local economy. The City of Folsom, El Dorado Hills and the South Placer Communities use Folsom Lake as the barometer for success. The business community is directly tied to lake levels, public access, and water availability at this facility. After reviewing the EIR for this project, it suggests the closure and or partial closure of several major access points on Folsom Lake which include Folsom Point, Beal's Point and Granite Bay. [#231-1 Socioeconomics businesses]. Closure or restriction of any access points to the lake will have significant revenue impacts on the local Boat Dealers and Merchants, the City of Folsom and Parks and Recreation who solely depend on this facility for their revenue.</p> <p>[#231-2 Public Involvement]. We ask that you allow us to provide input and include us in any way possible to help mitigate the lost revenue exposure described in the current plan. [#231-3 PD alternative staging areas.] We submit to you there are alternate options and ways to complete this project that will minimize impacts to lake access and maintain a healthy business environment for the merchants.</p> <p>The following items should be considered as options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify alternate staging areas to eliminate park access point closure. • Minimize or restrict construction during peak summer season time. • [#231-4 Recreation mitigation.] Construct additional lake launching access points and possibly retain after construction is complete. <p>On behalf of the Sacramento Valley Marine Association, we look forward to providing input and working together to make this project business and community friendly. If you wish to contact me for further discussion, I can be reached at 916-988-1704.</p>
232	James H Pope	<p>This letter responds to your December 21, 2006 request for comments on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction (DS/FDR) Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). The Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) provided oral comments at the public hearing on January 9, 2007, and this letter supplements those statements. NCPA supports the flood damage reduction features proposed for this project. In our review of the document, however, we believe more thorough explanations of some of the features and relationships of the project are needed. The following comments address those concerns.</p> <p>[#232-1 Agency responsibility and cost allocation.] We recommend that the EIS/EIR more clearly state in the opening paragraphs the various components of the DS/FDR, which agency has the responsibility for completion of each component, and the proposed cost sharing responsibility. Table ES-1 could be expanded to include the above request, and should include ecosystem restoration and L.L.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Anderson work. The opening paragraphs should clarify that the only joint federal project is the auxiliary spillway. The process to allocate the joint federal project auxiliary spillway costs between safety of dams and flood control should also be discussed, along with opportunity for public input on the proposed allocation. The 2002 Corps of Engineers Chief's Report indicated that approximately 48% of the proposed project cost would be allocated to safety of dams and 52% would be allocated to flood control. The basis for this determination was not disclosed. Later, a computation error was found in the report, and the proposed allocation was changed to 43% for safety of dams and 57% to flood control. Again, the basis of the allocation was not disclosed. We recommend the cost allocation process be made transparent for all of the project features and allow for public input.</p> <p>We believe the separable costs/remaining benefits allocation procedure should be used to allocate the joint federal project costs for the auxiliary spillway. The costs that are specific to the Corps of Engineers should be allocated to flood control, and Reclamation costs specific to safety of dams should be allocated in accordance with the existing safety of dams formula. [#232-2 Alternative costs.] We also believe that the estimated costs of the five alternatives, along with the benefits, should be included in the EIR/EIS. The estimated cost and benefits for the preferred alternative were shown on an informational display at the public hearing, but were not shown in the socioeconomic section of the EIS/IER.</p> <p>[#232-3 Flood control reservation.] We are concerned that a flood control reservation is being set between 400,000 acre-feet and 600-000 acre-feet for Folsom Dam, when a more flexible reservation system would greatly increase the value of the water resource. A flexible reservation should include factors such as the water year type, ability to make earlier releases to increase the flood control reservation as needed, and forecast based operations. Thus, for example, a drier water year would have a smaller reservation for flood control, allowing more water to be kept in Folsom Dam to meet recreation, water temperature, water quality, environmental, irrigation, municipal and industrial, and power needs. Pre-releases could be made if a large storm approaches the area in order to create a larger flood control reservation. A strict acre-foot flood control reservation system may create too large of a hole in a dry water year to allow the reservoir to fill and meet the Folsom Dam water requirements.</p> <p>[#232-4 Folsom reoperation.] We also support the continued utilization and improvement of forecast based operations to predict flood events. We believe it is important for the Corps to incorporate an advanced release methodology based on weather forecasts to reduce the flood exposure in California. A discussion of how the Folsom Reoperations Study ties into this EIS/EIR should be included in the document.</p> <p>[#232-5 Temperature control device.] There is little discussion on the temperature control shutters in the document. We believe this presents a great opportunity to design a more comprehensive temperature control device, similar to that being used for Shasta Dam, where water can be gathered from all levels of the reservoir and put through the generation penstocks. This would greatly enhance the ability to control American River temperatures, and would also eliminate the need to bypass the generators in dry water years, which deprives California of greenhouse gas emissions free power generation.</p> <p>[#232-6 Security.] My last comment relates to the security features, which are only obliquely discussed under the alternatives listed in this EIS/EIR. The document did not provide any details regarding the anticipated cost or how those costs would be allocated to the various project purposes. We believe these issues should also be vetted in a public forum.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of these comments. Please contact Jerry Toenyas at 916-781-4297 or Alan Zepp at 916-781-4238 of NCPA staff if you have any questions regarding these comments.</p>
233	Kristi Cooper	<p>S Oliver,</p> <p>[#233-1 Property value.] I am writing in protest to the proposed closure of Folsom Point. Many people in this area have purchased homes here because of the easy access to the lake. Businesses and residents alike have suffered because of the closure of the dam road. Now we are having to take another blow with the possible closure of our access to the lake. There has got to be another way to accomplish what needs to be done without closing this park.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#233-2 PD alternative staging areas.] The lookout point by the Dam itself sits empty and is already set in an area with easy access to the Dam. The road there is already closed and would put no one out. Please find another way to accomplish your task.</p>
234	Marilyn Daily Alan Daily	<p>[#234-1 Property values.] We live a few blocks from Folsom Point and would be very disappointed to have it closed for any length of time. Closure and storage of construction equipment would have a serious negative impact on this residential area. Please utilize other non-residential and less used areas. Closure would negatively impact locals as well as thousands of others who come to the lake for year round enjoyment. Please remember that the Folsom Dam road has already been closed with a significant negative impact. No more, please.</p>
235	Matt & Emily Brayton	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen, [#235-1 Property values.] We appreciate the hard work you are doing for retrofit the Folsom dam; however another alternative needs to be found that would allow Folsom Point to remain open to the public. The economic impact of closing Folsom Point would hurt businesses and home values in the area. [#235-2 Recreation remaining access points.] The availability of Folsom Lake for people to enjoy would be greatly diminished. Already the lake fills quickly on summer days. With Folsom Point being closed many recreational enthusiasts would not be able to enjoy the lake. Please do not close Folsom Point.</p>
236	Michael G Butler, Jr	<p>Dear Shawn, As a long time River Park resident in Sacramento, I have lived one block from the American River for 45 years. Folsom Dam has provided adequate protection during these years. [#236 Auburn Dam.] If funds are available now, why not complete the unfinished Auburn Dam that would give us added flood protection, ample water storage, clean hydroelectric power and recreation. Wouldn't this be a better safety valve than one added spillway?</p>
237	Sherri McNear	<p>To whom it may concern; [#237-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
238	Sandy Econome	<p>Mr. Oliver, [#238 Recreation lake access closure.] I am writing to express my disappointment regarding the potential closure of Folsom Point. This is the ONLY boat ramp my family used in 2006 because of its proximity to our home, ease of use and overall courtesy of fellow boaters. I have seen the crowds and heard horror stories regarding lengthy wait times and lack of parking at other boat ramp facilities, and do not desire to experience it first-hand. Boating traffic is increasing, not decreasing, thus it seems foolish to consider closing one of the needed facilities. There must be other alternative sites that will not interfere with the recreational aspects of Folsom Lake. Please find a better solution!</p>
239	Gail and Dennis Wierzba	<p>Dear Shawn Oliver, Bureau of Reclamation, we are property owners who live not 6mins. from Lake Folsom launching area. We object severely the proposal to close down Folsom Point recreation area for storing equipment while building a new spillway etc. [#239-1 Dam Road closure.] First off we believe as many others that upping security of the original dam road was a better option than closing it in the first place. Most of which I do believe was politically motivated.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#239-2 PD alternative staging areas.] If dam worked is done there are many other options for storage along the lake edge that would not infringe on the recreation of all Folsom residents and others in the surrounding areas. For starters there is the Folsom Prison on prime real estate that has access to being right on the lake. Lot's of property that could possibly be loaned out to the citizens of this area for your purposes of storing equipment. If not that idea, there are plenty of spaces along the lake edge to be created that will accomplish the same thing without disturbing a beautiful recreation and park area we presently enjoy very much.</p> <p>[#239-3 Recreation lake access closure.] Six to seven years of closing this facility is outrageous and insensitive to the rights of many good families in the area. We bought our home knowing the asset of living near the lake and having direct access to it was a big plus. Our homes in our neighborhood have many boats that use this facility with their family and friends.</p> <p>I'm sure that this can be worked out to where another location can be made workable. It may take a little more effort to be creative but I do believe it is highly possible to do so.</p>
240	Linton A. Brown	<p>Mr. Oliver: [#240-1 Public Involvement information availability.] I am staring at this web page: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=1808. which shows a dozen or so reports, all with the same name (or close to it). How utterly unhelpful! Can you point out a place where an interested party can discover (in two pages or less) the answer to this obvious question? What is it that you propose to build (or modify), and when? The environmental analysis process has reached, indeed gone far beyond, information saturation. It has certainly lost track of the need for clarity and conciseness in governmental reports.</p>
241	Sharlene & Calvin Kasadate	<p>To whom it may concern. [#241-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I have heard about the recent proposal to close Folsom Point State Recreation Area for up to 7 years, and I am strongly opposed to this closure. We live in Briggs Ranch, and often enjoy having convenient access to Folsom Lake. With the proposed closure, we would no longer have this access. Many people who live in Folsom and the surrounding communities use Folsom Point for all sorts of recreational activities (ie-walking, biking, running, boating, etc.). I hope you will consider other alternative solutions, rather than the closure of Folsom Point. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p>
242	Deb and Tony Baratta	<p>To Whom it may concern, [#242-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I object to the closure of Folsom Point. Folsom Point is one of the only access points here in my vicinity to the Lake.] We are new business owners to this town and have lived here for almost 8 years. I like living here and what this town has to offer. With the closure of the Dam road it not only was an inconvenience but had a negative effect on traffic.....I could go on and on.] I'm sure you have heard this many times. I'm sure this is an important phase in revamping the Dam road, I only hope that there are other options to consider.</p>
243	Raymond D. Hart, P.E. G.E	<p>Shawn and Rebecca, this e-mail is to submit comments on the EIS for the Folsom Dam Safety improvements. [#243-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] Specifically, my comments pertain to the multi year closure of Folsom Point recreation area to create a construction staging area. As you know closure of this highly used recreational area will cause millions of dollars in economic impacts to the Folsom community.</p> <p>[#243-2 PD alternative staging areas.] Have you evaluated another and potentially much less costly alternative to closing Folsom Point; which is to lease land from the State of California that is currently used for cattle grazing adjacent to Folsom Prison along Natomas road? With the construction of the new bridge just downstream of the Dam on recently acquired prison property, it would seem that additional land could be leased that would allow for construction operations for both projects. Once the new bridge is ready to open, construction traffic for the dam improvements could be handled via a temporary traffic light on the new road servicing the bridge.]</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to your response.
244	Jason Fanselau	<p>[#244-1 In Support of Project], Please consider this e-mail my formal comment in support of the project evaluated in the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction EIS/EIR.</p> <p>I am in favor of the project and believe that all of the environmental impacts have been sufficiently minimized and mitigated for in your plan. The project is important for the greater metro area of Sacramento and will greatly reduce flood risk to the families and businesses that make this area their home.</p> <p>Thanks to the staff at the US Bureau of Reclamation and the US Army Corps of Engineers for their hard work.</p>
245	Bruce R. Thomas	<p>Shawn Oliver, Bureau of Reclamation, 7794 Folsom Dam Road, Folsom, CA 93630.</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver,</p> <p>[#245-1 In Support of Project], Folsom Dam upgrades are needed to increase protection against flooding in Sacramento. Sacramento currently has the least protection against flooding of any major city in the US. Upgrading of Folsom Dam is cost-effective for taxpayers. It also protects the environment by reducing the need for new water development projects elsewhere.</p>
246	Jim Carlsen	<p>To Whom in May Concern:</p> <p>[#246-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am writing this note to express my displeasure with the suggestion that you may close Folsom Point to use it as a staging area for Folsom Dam repairs. I have lived in Folsom for over 15 years and I use the park EVERY DAY. I was there yesterday and saw at least 20 groups of people out enjoying nature and enjoying the resource. Folsom Point is sacred to our community. I am deeply disturbed that our government would even consider closing a well used, existing park. Are you kidding me? For SEVEN YEARS. Are you nuts? There is a lot of land around and certainly you can find a better alternative.]</p> <p>For the record, you already took away the gateway to our community by closing the Dam Road. Please be assured that most people in Folsom don't believe that the Dam represented a "terrorist threat" and that was just a smoke screen that the Bureau decided to hide behind. I'm sorry that this sounds like an impolite note, but when you come up with something as absurd as closing a jewel park for 7 years, it is hard to be subtle when expressing an opinion. Quite frankly, the Bureau's back to back ideas of closing the Dam Rd and now Folsom Point has caused me to lose all confidence in your organization.</p>
247	Jeff Angeja	<p>[#247-1 Recreation remaining access points.] Please, please, please come up with any alternative that does not close Folsom Point (Dyke 8) while you retrofit the Folsom Dam. I live less than 10 minutes from Folsom Point and use those facilities all year long. I am sure you are aware over 820,000 people use that site. If you close it, all of those people will have to use Brown's Ravine, Beal's Point, or Granite Bay. Those places are already overcrowded, and what will happen is they will fill up and people will be turned away (as it happens to people at all of the locations on holiday weekends even now). In short, if you close this site (one of the largest) it will result in a DENIAL of access to all but the lucky few who get to the remaining sites first. This is a tragedy, and there MUST be another option.</p> <p>On a personal note, closing that site will damage my family life on multiple levels. I have 2 children (8 and 4 years old) who love waterskiing and riding the jet ski with me, and my parents are heavily into fishing. My children have been enjoying quality, wholesome family togetherness while learning these sports, and if you close Folsom Point for 8 years, THEY WILL NOT HAVE ACCESS TO FOLSOM LAKE DURING THEIR CHILDHOOD. They will be well into their teenage years before you reopen it under you current proposal. This is a travesty.</p> <p>There must be other options. You have already closed the Dam road, which includes that moderately-sized vista point parking lot just before the dam and it has easy access to the water's edge. It seems to me that it would not take much to modify that area to use for a staging area for equipment and materials, with the added safety and security of the now-closed Folsom Dam Road being the ONLY access road to this alternative site. It may not be as readily available as Folsom Point, but the cost to fix the vista point area is a VERY REASONABLE option in light of the loss of wholesome family recreational opportunities, not to mention the devastating fiscal impact on</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		local businesses.] I look forward to your response, please.
248	Amber Kennedy	To whom it may concern; [#248-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the local economy and quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.
249	Margaret Wong	To Whom it May Concern: [#249-1 Public Involvement] It has recently come to my attention that there is a possibility that Folsom Point will be closed for the next 7 years. This is the first that I have heard of this and I am wondering why the public was not notified of this earlier.] I am a resident of Folsom and I live very close to the Folsom Point entrance. [#249-2 Noise.] I'm concerned about possible noise of the construction equipment being in such close vicinity to my house, disrupting my quiet neighborhood. [#249-3 Socioeconomics property values.] I'm also concerned about property values going down due to this and also due to the fact that we no longer will live in walking distance to the Folsom Lake entrance, which is a great selling point. [#249-4 Recreation remaining access points]. Also, we will not be able to enjoy boating at Folsom Point. True, Brown's Ravine is only 1 mile away, but is much more crowded and will be even more crowded once Folsom Point is closed. [#249-5 PD alternative staging areas]. Are there any other alternatives for places that can be used as a staging area? What about the big open grassy area off Natoma St. and Folsom Dam Rd? I believe that is part of the prison property. Couldn't that be used instead? Or what about the parking lot of the overlook on Folsom Dam Road, just before crossing over the dam? Please consider other options before using Folsom Point. The Folsom Point entrance is very close to residential neighborhoods and would be a great inconvenience and affect our quality of life, as well as our property values.
250	Ron Wisdom	[#250-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the local economy and quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well.
251	Mark Younger	have been unable to complete my reading of the EIR due to the time allotted and the volume of the document. My initial comments are: 1. [#251-1 Noise.] The road noise currently exceeds noise standards. The City of Folsom has been promising a "rubberized road surface" for the past decade. How is the increase in noise of construction traffic going to be mitigated? (Tire and exhaust) 2. [#251-2 Air quality.] There is an Elementary School within 400 yards of the site. How will you mitigate harmful particulate matter? 3. [#251-3 Transportation.] How and when will the damage to the surrounding roadway be repaired? 4. [#251-4 New Bridge Noise.] The original dam road had a traffic burden of less than 10,000. How is the noise impact from the increase to 40,000 with the new bridge going to be mitigated? 5. [#251-5 Recreation mitigation.] I personally built my home in it's present location for me and my family to utilize the Dyke 8, now Folsom Point, facilities. My understanding is the closure will be so long that my elementary school children will be out high school when and if the facility is reopened. What additional facilities are going to be added to on the south side of the lake to supplement the

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>removal of Folsom Point?</p> <p>6. [#251-6 Recreation.] Will foot traffic to the lake be allowed or will the area from Brown's Ravine to Beal's Point be inaccessible? (approximately 6 miles)</p> <p>7. [#251-7 Transportation.] My primary access is thru Briggs Ranch Drive at either light. How many and how long are road closures expected to be?</p> <p>8. [#251-8 Transportation]. What alternate access to Briggs Ranch will be provided during the closures?</p> <p>9. [#251-9 Noise]. For how long, where and how many noise sampling stations are going to be utilized to provide quantitative noise impact data?</p> <p>10. [#251-10 Air quality.] For how long, where and how many particulate pollution sampling stations are going to be utilized to provide quantitative pollution control?</p> <p>11. [#251-11 General construction]. How is the additional road debris from construction going to be cleaned up?</p>
252	C. Fred Wilcox	<p>I am writing to you as the voice of a concerned citizen and local business man. I have spoken with several business owners and Folsom Lake enthusiasts who are virtually up in arms over the possible closure of Folsom's only lake access point. While it is obvious that there may be sacrifices needed to finally get the new bridge built and the Folsom Dam reinforcement work, it seems like we in Folsom keep getting hammered while Placer and El Dorado counties are business as usual.</p> <p>[#252-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] There are several businesses that have been living on a shoestring since the Dam closed and now you are taking away their last minute shoppers who are planning for a day at the lake. This will likely be a last straw for many of these small businesses. [#252-2 PD alternative staging areas.] It seems to me that there are plenty of access points that may be able to share in this endeavor and thus allow Folsom's citizens their access during these next few years. Let some others share the pain. It is the right thing to do after five years of suffering.</p>
253	Scott and Teri Becker	<p>This letter is in regard to the closing of Folsom Point Recreation Area.</p> <p>[#253-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] I'd like to ask you and the powers that be not to close Folsom Point because since the terrorist attacks, Folsom has been messed up as I'm sure you know. Business has suffered greatly and some have gone out of business.</p> <p>[#253-2 Transportation.] The traffic situation is not good due to the closing of the Dam Road. [#253-3 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] My wife and I as well as many others really enjoyed going up to the parking area on the Dam Road for the views and others went for the great fishing and scuba diving.</p> <p>I really don't want to sound like a whiner and do understand why the Dam Road was closed. However, we and many others love Folsom Point for picnics, fishing, launching boats and the scenery. My wife and I use Folsom Point almost every single weekend during the summer and as long as possible until the water level gets too low. I don't know anything about your business, but I realize that flood control is necessary and that what you are doing is good. However, if there are any other arrangements that could be made that would work just as well without greatly disrupting life in Folsom any further, I hope that you would please consider it. I don't know, but maybe you could still keep Folsom Point open for us and still run your operation from there. The whole idea of closing Folsom Point down for 7 years is a total bummer to us and many others. It always seems like one thing after another is taken from us.</p> <p>That's my selfish point of view but more importantly Folsom businesses don't need another hit like this. They've already been hit hard by the closing of the Dam Road. Please consider all alternatives and don't close Folsom Point because thousands of people depend on it for many different reasons.</p>
254	Stephen Templeton	<p>Have lived in Folsom for 17 years and have experienced many changes, for which the most part have been good.</p> <p>However, am quite concerned about the 7 year project proposed for the new bridge. [#254-1 Transportation.] With the closing of the dam road for 911, and the blocking off of certain streets in Folsom, it has presented a driving nightmare as it relates to the traffic congestion and the flow of traffic trying to get over both bridges. There has to be a well-thought-out plan prior to the beginning of the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		work, to insure that the flow of traffic in and out of Folsom will not be more adversely affected than it is now. With the increase of the population and added traffic on a daily basis, your plan must be appropriate so that the traffic flows better than it does now.
255	Dave Cox California Senator	<p>This is to request that you reconsider using the parking lot and boat launching facilities at Folsom Point State Recreation Area for construction activities associated with the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project currently under the environmental review process.</p> <p>[#255-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] We have heard from many constituents in Folsom and the surrounding areas attesting to the devastating economic impact that closing the Folsom Point facility for the duration of the construction period would have on the local community. After the economic consequences of the closure of Folsom Dam Road nearly three years ago we do not feel that an additional economic impact should be imposed on the City of Folsom and the State of California at this state-owned facility, especially since there are nearby alternatives available. [#255-2 PD alternative staging areas.] We urge the Bureau to meet with the City of Folsom and stakeholders concerned about the impact of this proposed action to seek resolution prior to the publication of the final environmental impact document.</p> <p>More than 100,000 visitors per year use the Folsom Point recreation facility. And surrounding boat ramps cannot handle this level of use. If Folsom Point is closed for seven years or longer due to the actions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the economic damages could be severe and even more permanent than the action taken to close the Folsom Dam Road. This in our minds is not acceptable. Please take our comments, which we make on behalf of our constituents, into consideration as you take comments on the overall Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project. We look forward to your timely response.</p>
256	Rana and Bryan Church	[#256-1 Recreation lake access closure.] We are opposed to closing Folsom Point. Don't you think Folsom residents have been inconvenienced enough. You close the Folsom Dam Road, not Folsom Point. That is the only place we take our boat to launch. We paid for a season pass, we should have that opened to us. Had I known, I would not have bought a pass.
257	Jeanne and Albert Pfaff	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#257-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I am concerned to hear of the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition isn't an equitable and sound solution to the problem. We have been residents of Folsom for 7 years. We moved to Folsom to be near Folsom Lake and all the beautiful amenities the city of Folsom had to offer. Folsom Point is the only boat launch we have ever used and it is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation such as walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking. Since the Folsom Dam Road closed, Folsom Point has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the city of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. [#257-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] The closure of Folsom Dam Road was extremely inconvenient for Folsom residents and devastating to many Folsom businesses. Closing Folsom Point would be an outrage and will detrimentally impact the quality of life for Folsom residents as well as cripple many businesses. This would severely affect the economy in Folsom and adversely change the entire dynamics of the city. If there is work to be done or repairs needed, there are other alternatives to closing Folsom Point. There would be less of an impact to businesses and residents if the work was done during evening hours in the summer and full days in the winter when the weather is cold and there is less desire to use Folsom Point.</p> <p>Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable and not the right thing to do to residents of Folsom.</p>
258	Jeff Hopkins	[#258-1 PD alternative staging areas.] There are other alternatives to Folsom Point for a staging area. Please take the time to do some sort of cost/benefit analysis. Upon hearing of the potential closure, I minimized the impact. After some thought, I realize the negative impact will be greater than most think. Please look at the alternatives.
259	Robert dulinski	Mr. Finnegan

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#259-1 Socioeconomics] The idea to close Folsom point would be a disaster for the Folsom residence and business owners. I am a long term Folsom resident and would like to be noted as opposing this action at Folsom point.</p>
260	Arthur D. Shmarak	<p>Mr. Oliver, [#260-1 Recreation lake access closure.] As a resident of Folsom who is not a boater, but who enjoys taking visitors to Folsom Point to view the lake and dam, I urge the Bureau <u>not</u> to close this delightful spot to the public! . As I recall, there was a large public parking lot along the old Folsom Dam Road (Folsom side) which is much closer to the dam, and, surely, is not getting <u>any</u> use from the public. Why not use that space as a construction staging area since it has already been taken away?</p>
261	Lori Neal	<p>[#261-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I have been informed that there is a possibility that Folsom Point might be closed. I am AGAINST such a closure. There is little outdoor recreation for the citizens of our community in El Dorado Hills. We go to Folsom Point a lot and appreciate the hikes and nature. This is a wonderland in a town of concrete. Please do not let Folsom Point close.</p>
262	Troy and Shari War	<p>[#262-1 Recreation lake access closure.] We are Folsom residence and feel this is a mistake to suggest closing this area.</p>
263	John Dillon	<p>Attached please find my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Control Project. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on this document, and please send me a copy of the Final EIS/EIR when responses to comments are completed.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project (FDSP). I would appreciate their inclusion in the official record for this document, and I look forward to responses to my comments in the Final Environment Impact Statement/Report.</p> <p>I acknowledge the level of effort and professional preparation of the DEIS/EIR, but I do not believe that it is an adequate assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed FDSP which is the topic of the DEIS. In short, I do not believe that the DEIS/EIR is an adequate basis for the adoption of a positive Notice of Determination and environmental approval by the standards of the federal NEPA regulations, nor with the requirements of California's CEQA regulations. My comments are directed at the areas of Project Definition, Scoping of the DEIS/EIR, and the Assessment of Impacts in several categories.</p> <p>The Project Definition and subsequent assessment of Project impacts are deficient. Analyses of the long-term consequences of the Project are not discussed in the DEIS/EIR, and these impacts are deferred to a future Facility Management Plan. This is a segmenting of the Project Description and environmental assessment process which is not consistent with NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the complete disclosure of foreseeable consequences of a Project which will receive federal funds.</p> <p>The Facility Management Plan is critical to the assessment of potential environmental impacts resulting from the higher Folsom Lake surface elevation which is the objective of the FDSP. The DEIS/EIR cannot accurately assess the impacts of the FDSP without consideration of the Facility Management Plan as an integral component of the Project Description. Following are comments on specific topics which illustrate the inadequacy of the DEIS/EIR as a basis for a positive Notice of Determination for the proposed FDSP. Please provide responses to the general comment regarding the segmenting of the Project Description, as well as to the following specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. [#263-1 PD Facility Management Plan.] The DEIS/EIR is not an adequate assessment of potential Project impacts due to a segmented Project Description which does not consider the operations of the expanded Folsom Dam facilities. In the absence of the information which is to be provided in a future Facility Management Plan, it is not possible to accurately assess the impacts of the FDSP in several important issue areas. This segmenting of the Project description, and treatment in separate environmental reviews does not allow sufficient information for the FDSP, and is not consistent with federal and state environmental impact assessment practice and requirements. <li>2. [#263-2 Vegetation and wildlife inundation.] The DEIS/EIR does not provide information regarding the extra days and extent of

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>inundation for areas of the Folsom Lake federal property and surrounding private properties as a consequence of the elevated surface level. This deficiency prevents the accurate assessment of potential impacts to terrestrial plant and animal species which will be displaced for greater periods of time, and forced into smaller habitat areas. This deficiency is an example of the infeasibility of segmenting the Project Description into “construction” and “management”. The environmental consequences of the FDSP are dependent upon the operation of the expanded facility, and cannot be separated in the DEIS/EIR for the proposed Project. Please respond by providing additional information about the impacts of additional days/weeks of inundation on terrestrial plant and animal species within the FLSRA and surrounding private properties.</p> <p>3. [#263-3 Recreation facilities inundation.] The DEIS/EIR does not identify portions of the trail network or other public use areas within the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area which will be inundated for greater periods and to a greater extent than is currently the case. For example, in the Beeks Bight/Doton Point area of the FLSRA, the parking lot and many of the trails in the area are currently inundated after the spring snowmelt. With the greater storage capacity and higher surface elevation of Folsom Lake, what will be the impact of additional days and areas of inundation on specific trails and other public use facilities within the FLSRA? Please respond by providing a detailed map of the expanded inundation area of the raised Folsom Lake, showing which trails and other public facilities would be impacted. Also, please assess the issue of extra days of inundation of areas within and external to the FLSRA in terms of lost availability for public use.</p> <p>4. [#263-4 Recreation impacts to users.] The DEIS/EIR does not adequately or accurately assess the construction and long-term impacts of the Project on all users of the FLSRA. The DEIS/EIR acknowledges that its estimates of FLSRA park usage do not include users who enter on foot, by bicycle or on horseback. Based on empiric observation, many park users access the FLSRA on foot, by bicycle and on horseback. Therefore, the DEIS/EIR significantly underestimates the total number of actual FLSRA park visitors, and specifically excludes any information about trail user groups. Please respond by providing additional information about the levels of FLSRA park usage including the substantial number of visitors who access Folsom Lake on foot, on bicycles and on horseback. Please provide additional information on the number of park users who currently use trails or other facilities which will be rendered unavailable by expanded inundation, and on the resultant impacts to those specific user groups. Please provide specific discussion of the impacts of expanded days/areas of inundation on the Beeks Bight/Doton Point Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) trail on disabled park visitors. Please discuss impacts to the disabled users of the FLSRA in terms of consistency with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p> <p>5. [#263-5 PD alternatives to proposed project.] The DEIS/EIR does not adequately address Alternatives to the Project as proposed. The DEIS/EIR dismisses upstream management of the American River drainage area, as well as any consideration of possible downstream flood control constraints or strategies as beyond the scope of the Project description. This ignores several potential alternatives to the FDSP, for example construction of additional upstream storage capacity. As these are feasible alternative to the Project as proposed, they should be considered within the DEIS.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your consideration of my comments on the DEIS for the Folsom Dam Safety Project, and I look forward to responses to these comments in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Project.</p>
264	Mary Strauss	<p>[#264-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Please do not close Folsom Point. It is our main access to Folsom Lake. I am a Folsom resident and local business owner here for 17 years.</p>
265	Amy Cooke	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>[#265-1 Recreation lake access closure.] In regards to the closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area I must say I am greatly opposed to this idea. Folsom Point is a wonderful recreational area not only for the communities within Folsom but those surrounding it as well. Many people use this area year round for hiking, biking, running, boating, fishing, etc. and to take that away would have a devastating impact on Folsom. Please reconsider using Folsom Point as a storage area for your equipment while working on the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		levee's. Folsom is a wonderful city who boasts at being "family and community friendly". Don't take that away from us. Thank you.
266	Connie Freese	<p>I am writing this email to go on your Official Record that our entire family of seven is completely opposed to the closing of Folsom Point for many reasons. We built our first custom house on 107 Jumper Ct in Briggs ranch 16 years ago. Our family grew to 4 children plus a grandparent and we needed to build a second custom house. This was based on the complete joy of living so close to the beautiful Folsom Pt rec. area and boat launch. This second house is at 106 McDerby Ct. which is very close to the Folsom pt entrance. We constructed a 6 bedroom 5 ½ bath custom home that literally was built by tremendous sweat equity and much financial burden but we considered it all worth while because it would be a future asset to us as our children grew, went to college, married, and we retired. Our children's ages are 16,15,13,and 11. All girls. My husband and I are 53 and 51. As you can see our huge expenses are quickly coming upon us and our major asset is our beautiful custom house that was to be our safety net as means of paying for these financial burdens of the future.</p> <p>[#266-1 Recreation lake access closure.] We have actively used this facility for 16 years and the thought that we could not launch our boat or go for a walk there is unbelievable,. If this facility is closed and used for a staging area for construction, Our family will be directly impacted. [#266-2 Air quality.] My mother is 85, who lives with us and she suffers from weakened lung condition which causes her to cough quite a bit now. With the added air pollution to our location I am very concerned to what this will do to her breathing problems. I also have 2 daughters with asthma like conditions that will be inflamed with the dust and carbon emissions. [#266-3 Noise.] I am very concerned with the increased noise levels that will occur. We have a pool and I feel that will limit our use of it greatly. [#266-4 Socioeconomics property value.] My biggest complaint though is what this 6-7 year closure will do to my property value that we worked so hard on all these years. I have been told that there is something called eminent domain that could allow us to sue the gov. for restitution if in fact this project causes us to lose 100,000's of thousands of dollars on the future sale of this house. The dollars that would make all the difference to our future and that of our children. The quality of all our lives will be severely impacted if this closure project takes place so close to our residence. [#266-5 Public Involvement notification.] I felt that the people of Folsom have had no warning and little knowledge of what your agency's are about to do. I know the majority of the public would be outraged and against to Folsom Point closure. Please find a different plan and place for your construction staging area.</p>
267	Carmella Santos	[#267-1 General.] Opposed to the closing of Folsom Point. I wanted this on record, my opposition.
268	Carrie Cota	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#268-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I completely object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your considering another alternative solution.</p>
269	Aimee Peterson	[#269-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for picnics, walking, biking, running and boating. Its closure would be an outrage. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom. Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.
270	Jody Biaggi	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <p>[#270-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Area. This proposition seems unnecessary and unreasonable due to many other alternatives. My family and I have been residents of Folsom for 16 years. We moved to Folsom to be near Folsom Lake. Folsom Point is the only boat launch we have ever used and it is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation such as walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking. Since the Folsom Dam Road closed, Folsom Point has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the city of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. [#270-2 Socioeconomic businesses.] The closure of Folsom Dam Road was extremely inconvenient for Folsom residents and devastating to many Folsom businesses. Closing Folsom Point would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the quality of life for Folsom residents as well as cripple many businesses. This would severely affect the economy in Folsom and adversely change the entire dynamics of the city. If there is work to be done or repairs needed, there are other alternatives to closing Folsom Point. There would be less of an impact to businesses and residents if the work was done during evening hours in the summer and full days in the winter when the weather is cold and there is less desire to use Folsom Point. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable to all residents of Folsom.] Thank you for your consideration.</p>
271	Bob Grunsky	<p>[#271-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I have been a Folsom resident for nearly 17years. One of the primary reasons I moved here was because of the recreational activities provided by Folsom Lake. Access to the lake at Folsom Point was a huge factor in where I chose to purchase my home. I oppose the closing of this facility and would hope that you would hear the voice of the "recreation community" and if at all possible, select another location for your project.</p>
272	Sandra J. Gallardo and Michele Flores	<p>To whom it may concern: [#272-1 PD alternative staging area.] In regards to the proposed closing of Folsom Point, I want to express my strong opposition to the plan. Please consider an alternate site to be used for the staging area during the dam construction.</p>
273	Christina Flores	<p>[#273-1 PD alternative staging areas.] In regard to the proposed closing of Folsom Point, I want to express my opposition to the plan. Please consider an alternate site to be used for the staging area during the dam construction.</p>
274	Franco Salluce	<p>[#274-1 PD alternative staging areas.] I am writing to ask that alternatives to closing the Folsom Point State Recreation Area be considered during the upcoming construction project at the Folsom Dam. I am an Elk Grove, CA resident and drive nearly an hour several times a year to enjoy the closest recreational lake to me and my family. [#274-2 Recreation mitigation.] If an outright alternative is not viable please consider all the users of this site and restrict access only as necessary. Perhaps a compromise would allow public use during lulls in the project and/or peaks of recreational use. Surely, the success of the Folsom Dam project lies not only in its completion, but also in the Bureau's consideration for the community.</p>
275	Kevin Long	<p>[#275-1 Public Involvement project notification.] The reason we selected the house we live in (Briggs Ranch development) was to be near the Lake and the entrance to the Lake. Currently we are in the process of moving across the street (Natomas) to a new development to be even closer (LA Collina Del Lago) and this was never even noted that they may be closing access to the Lake. [#275-2 Recreation lake access closure]. Folsom Point is the only access we have in the City of Folsom and during the summer on many weekends Folsom Point is filled to capacity. If something needs to be closed it should be an area that has multiple points of access. Please Do Not Close Folsom Point!</p>
276	Judy Henderson	<p>[#276-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternative staging areas.] There must be other places that can serve as a staging area for the repair work scheduled on the dam. I am a senior citizen and some of the entry points, to the lake, are gravel pathways which are slippery for me. This is a wonderful spot for me to walk, exercise my dogs and bring my family. Please don't destroy the quality of life this area brings to so many people by closing it off to the public.</p>
277	Sandra and Lanny Pixler	<p>Please be advised that we are concerned citizens of Folsom, CA. have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for the different work projects on the Dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>[#277-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.] What a shame this would be for our already suffering local businesses, families that enjoy the park , tourism (boaters and fishermen come from far to use our park), to say nothing of the environment. [#277-2 Vegetation and wildlife.] The wild life there would be disturbed and run out of the area. Also this would run rattlesnakes and rodents into our neighborhood. This is a concern for us as we live in Briggs Ranch (that is adjacent to Folsom Point). We realize that improvements need to be done and don't oppose to that. We request a staging area that won't hurt our families, businesses, wildlife and real estate values. [#277-3 Public Involvement project notification.] We have had short notice of this project and not had adequate time to address the issues.</p> <p>We ask that as our voice and representative to PLEASE aid us in this endeavor.</p>
278	Phil Lee	<p>Mr. Shawn Oliver, Thanks for responding and extending the public comment period. I would like to submit the following comments regarding the proposed raise of Folsom Lake Dam: I am in hearty agreement with the raise of the dam and dikes for flood control and seismic strengthening purposes. [#278-1 PD use of Folsom Point as staging.] I am opposed to the flippant decision made to use the Folsom Point State Park for construction access or staging purposes, especially if it closes access to the boat ramp and parking. I know the decision was based on economics and convenience. If this was an economic decision, it is difficult to justify the need to save a few hundred thousand dollars on building a separate access road and staging area when the Federal Govt is spending half a trillion dollars to destroy and rebuild a foreign country, for reasons that defy prudent use of tax dollars (and soldiers' lives). [#278-2 Recreation remaining access points.] I am slightly encouraged to hear from you that the closure is only considered for a few months during the off season, as in-season closure would wreak havoc on the already crowded adjacent ramps: Granite Bay and Brown's Ravine.] But I don't believe the USBR has the fortitude to enforce that "promise", assuming it is even put into the contract. My fear is that as soon as the Folsom Point access is closed for construction, the USBR will allow the contractor to take over and full closure will take effect until job completion. This has been my observations with USBR's construction management record. They tend to succumb to the contractor's whims, and often allow the contractor to run the show. The preferred alternative is to provide construction access and a staging area for Mormon Island from the east end of the dike, assuming that was the reason for this closure. I assume access for the main dam work is not an issue at this location? [#278-3 Recreation mitigation.] At the very least, please consider mitigation of the closure by constructing a separate construction access road, and locating the staging area such that the boat ramp and parking area can be still open and operational. As it is, Folsom Point needs MORE boat ramps and parking, with the exploding area population. Any type of closure or disruption to the facility would be disastrous.</p>
279	Tara Davis	<p>[#279-1 PD alternative staging areas.] With all the vacant land around the Folsom Prison area, why would a spot of recreation in a small town like Folsom be chosen for closure. It makes no sense to take a very popular, convenient spot in Folsom and close it for basically a construction storage area. People have moved to Folsom for the boating, business have moved in due to the high traffic and like I said prior, there is so much land along Natomas street that is unused and would make no impact if it was used. It seems like you could also use a portion of the land near Folsom Pointe and still keep this recreational area open. As a resident of Folsom and living very near to this site, I am very opposed to the closure of Folsom Point.</p>
280	Dan Normoyle	To whom it may concern;

No.	Name	Comment
		<p> [#280-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. [#280-2 Socioeconomics businesses.] The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the local economy and quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
281	Rennie and Norma James	<p>I oppose the 100% full time closure of Folsom Point for seven years! I am writing in response to a report that all the alternatives to the construction of improvements at Folsom Dam and area dykes and dams will require the seven (7) year closure of Folsom Point Recreation area.</p> <p>My wife and I and Punkin visit the Point every day in the winter and twice a day in the summer if we are in town. This is our back yard and the reason for remaining at this residence. We have been at 125 Landrum Circle for 11 years and the best thing about is Location. [#281-1 PD alternative staging areas.] If the Folsom Dam and dykes improvements depend on and the only alternative is to close Folsom Point then I say close Folsom Point and make the necessary improvements. However, I believe that this alternative is probably the most convenient alternative and others may have been eliminated as inconvenient or cost more to accomplish. I concede that I do not have all the information that you who have been working overtime to accelerate this project have acquired. However, I believe that a compromise can and should be considered. I am sure that access control, the existence of a traffic light and existing gate provide considerable cost savings. Also there is considerable space to stage equipment and materials in one place. If that did not require the closure of Folsom Point completely I would agree. The closure of Folsom Point would cost the community more, in my opinion, than the costs of dispersing these equipment and materials over a larger area in the community. For example the flats down stream from Mormon Island Dam on either side of Green Valley Road could be used for materials and equipment. Portions of the Folsom Point Recreation area could be used.</p> <p>The area around Dyke Seven should be considered. Speaking of that, What about the open space around the prison? Sure improved security would be needed, but it would not restrict access to Folsom Point. I believe that you are able to use Folsom Point recreation area or parts of it without closing the park completely. [#281-2 Socioeconomics businesses]. Have you ever paid attention to the financial impact of Folsom Point? Each of those boaters, skiers, fishermen, day campers group picnic's at the Point and leisure boaters needs fuel, food, bait and equipment to make their visit everything they hope it will be. Many of the recreational users finish the day on the way home with refueling and having a quick meal on the way home. While passing through Folsom they see things that they may not have been aware of. The Thursday Night Market, Cappuccino Cruisers night at the Red Robin, Music in the park, the new Library and our Zoo, these are all aspects that passers by notice. Then you have the Sutter Street Grill for breakfast and Hop Sings for dinner on the way home.</p> <p>I am sure you can come up with other options and still complete this project as planned. Please take a moment and consider my suggestions before you throw them in the trash can!</p>
282	Gary Frolich	<p> [#282-1 PD alternative staging areas.] This would be the worse idea I've seen in this whole Folsom Dam/Lake situation in our 17 yrs of residence. I know there is plenty of room around the point closer to the dam.....let the rich people or the developers who are building out that entire point look at some equipment for awhile, instead of forcing thousands of people off the whole lake for years and years!!!!!!!!!!!!!!] We bought here for access to Folsom Lake which has become more trouble than this town is worth. We understand recreation is at the bottom of the list for the lake, but with 12 govt bureaus involved it has become typical govt waste and abuse of the public GOOD. DON'T CLOSE FOLSOM POINT - would be the last straw in a long list of govt missteps since 9/11.....and the good residences of Folsom Town continue to pay the price and suffer the incompetence of our govt!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We know you have a job to do.....please, please consider another alternative.] We weren't planning on moving, but we will and we will take our money with us (and we are not alone). Thanks you for your consideration.</p>
283	Scott Wiemerslage	<p>Upon recently hearing of the possible closure of Folsom Point, park and boat launch for up to seven years, I have been beside myself. [#283-1 Public Involvement project notification.] Understanding the ramifications of this act and pursuing them without diligence is one of the more irresponsible proposals I have heard. This proposal coupled with the complete lack of public knowledge continues the ever widening gap between the "stewards," of the lands and the general public. [#283-2 Recreation lake access closure.] Please consider any other potential alternatives to the proposed current one. The quality of life both for the boaters, park visitors, and neighborhoods is weighing on your decisions. Seven years? What about the kids who will grow up in that time and not to have ever known the beauty of the lake? [#283-3 Socioeconomics property value]. What about homeowner's buying or selling in that time that will either loose tremendous value or never see the potential and look elsewhere? [#283-4 Recreation remaining access points]. What about the already congested launches and park areas that will now have to be absorbed by the other three entrances? [#283-5 Socioeconomics businesses.] What about the loss of potential income and profit from recreationalists looking elsewhere?] What about the environmental impact statements? What about using Folsom Damn Road, already in existence, and not being used to access?] Please reconsider.....</p>
284	Troy Watson	<p>[#284-1 Recreation lake access closure.] We are completely opposed to closing Folsom point. There are too may people that use the park to shut it down. Please find an alternative site.</p>
285	David L Brown	<p>[#285-1 General.] I am OPPOSED to closing Folsom Point.</p>
286	Krista Fisher	<p>[#286-1 Recreation lake access closure.] I strenuously object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. This proposition is unacceptable to me and to the citizens of Folsom and our surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by many thousands of community members throughout the year for outdoor recreation (walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking) and sometimes just contemplation. [#286-2 Socioeconomics.] The closure would be an outrage and detrimentally impact the local economy and quality of life for those in Folsom. Since the Dam Road closed, it has been the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and has been a serious draw for visitors as well. Please choose an alternative solution, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
287	Scott and Viera Weldy	<p>[#287-1 Recreation remaining access points.] I just wanted to go on record to oppose Folsom Point closing. We have lived in Folsom for 10 years and have used Folsom Point to launch our boat for some family time at the lake. We have experienced over crowding and at times were forced to use Brown's Ravine. With Folsom Point closed, all of the day users will be forced to use Brown's Ravine, which will not be able to accommodate all of the overflow.....and what happens when some of the ramps are closed due to low water? Please keep Folsom Point open.</p>
288	Greg Mercurio	<p>Dear Shawn: [#288-1 Public Involvement and EIS process.] As a stakeholder in the outcome of the decision to close/not close Folsom Point, I feel it is only fair to extend the public commentary period to allow the public a fair amount of time to research and comment. According to the newspaper article that I did read, the decision is already made, and the timing and durations are the only outstanding issues. As the owner of tasty Time Ice Cream & Frozen Yogurt, I am in the direct path of the consequences of the decision. I have NOT had enough time to adequately research this topic. I believe that public disclosure of the rationale behind the USBR's decisions should be the first priority, not the rush to close the Point.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
289	Clyde Matson	<p>I have been following the discussion on the levies and dam modifications for quite some time now. To date I have found no recollection in this process of the near flood a few years back. As I recall, after some number of years the management of the dam facilities decided that now was the time to “test” the gates. This was during a period of time when inflows were very high. When they tried to open and close the first gate it broke. Remember this was only one of the existing gates. The gate jammed and broke, leaving it mostly open. This put almost enough water down the river to over top the levies. At the Howe Ave. bridge the river was about a foot from the top of the levee. At Rio Americano High School the situation was the same. My daughter went to that school at that time. As it worked out luck held and the levees did not get over topped.</p> <p>I have looked at the levee plans (not well) and looked at the sketch of the dam modifications. As I see them the thing that concerns me most is the modification to the dam.</p> <p>[#289-1 PD fuseplug Operation.] As I see it more gates are being added and on the south end of the dam a dirt berm is planned. The comment that was made about this berm was that if the water got to the point of over topping the dam this berm would wash out and prevent over topping the dam. The problem that I see is that the Berm is at least as wide as three gates, at a minimum. And once washed out is uncontrollable as to flow. This looks like a REAL problem to me and will be to most of Sacramento. I believe this is asking for another New Orleans levee failure. What do you think?</p>
290	Kasia Turkiewicz	<p>[#290-1 Recreation lake access closure]. I am a long time Folsom resident and take a great pride in our City and our community. I am strongly opposed to closing Folsom Point. Folsom Lake is an important part of our community. Closing it will not only reduce our access to the lake, but will also adversely impact businesses in our community.] [Recreation lake access closure. I especially would like you to consider our senior citizens and our children. Seven years it's a long time in their lives. My younger daughter is now six, by the time you are projecting to open Folsom Point again she will be 13 years old. Some of our elderly friends and neighbors may not live long enough to see it reopen, and for them it is difficult to seek an alternative access.]</p> <p>I would appreciate if you could take my comments into consideration before you make a final decision.</p>
291	Mike Wall	<p>I am a longtime homeowner in the Briggs Ranch development of Folsom and much of the reason I bought my home here was due to the easy access to Folsom Lake and the easy access to Granite Bay via the Folsom Dam Road. Now a little more than 6 years has passed and two of the most logistical benefits of living where I bought my house are in danger of going away. Travel to Roseville is a nightmare and traffic in Folsom is a disaster due to the dam road closure. Now I hear that Folsom Point may close so that I will have to take my boat miles away, through this traffic, to get to the water. [#291-1 Recreation lake access closure]. PLEASE DO NOT RUIN MY ACCESS TO THE LAKE!!! DO NOT CLOSE FOLSOM POINT!!! FIND ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE SO AS TO AVOID FURTHER HARDSHIPS FOR THE RESIDENTS OF FOLSOM.</p>
292	Michael Cann	<p>[#292-1 Recreation lake access closure]. I strongly object to the proposed closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area! This proposition is unacceptable to the citizens of Folsom and surrounding communities. Folsom Point is used by thousands of community members throughout the year for walking, biking, running, boating and picnicking, its closure would be an outrage. Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake in the City of Folsom.</p> <p>Please consider alternative solutions, as closing Folsom Point is absolutely unacceptable.</p>
293	Mark and Kathy Van Saun	<p>To: Shawn Oliver</p> <p>We are contacting you in regards to the proposed closing of the Folsom Point Recreation Area or Dike 8. We are very concerned about this matter and ask that you would not only reconsider this proposal but give us more information. We have been Folsom residents and Briggs Ranch homeowners for over 11 years and we can not imagine what such a closure would do to our community and our neighborhood.</p> <p>[#293-1 Socioeconomics property values]. Like many of our neighbors, we moved here primarily because of the lake access. Our</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>family loves to take walks, run and mountain bike at the lake. We are extremely concerned about the devastating effect such a closure would have on the near by businesses as well as our home values. We personally know of a family that was considering several homes in the area to purchase and said yesterday that they will not buy here due to this issue.</p> <p>[#293-2 PD alternative staging areas.] Why haven't other access points been chosen to help with this matter without closing down an entire recreational area? Folsom Point is Folsom's only access where as Granite Bay has two access areas.</p> <p>[#293-3 Socioeconomics.] We have dealt with the burden of the Dam Road closure and saw the effects of that decision on businesses, commutes and community access. We cannot stomach another blow to our community. We ask you to please reconsider this decision and find an acceptable solution.</p>
294	Keith Faust	<p>As a resident of Folsom I'm against the closure of Folsom Point by the Federal Government to raise Folsom Lake. Do we need to have Folsom Lake raised, yes. Can another staging area be found to accommodate the equipment needed by the Corp of Engineers, yes.</p> <p>[#294-1 PD alternative staging areas.] During the closure of Folsom Dam Road for repairs on the flood gates, the parking lot adjacent to the Dam was used the staging area, why can't this be done again.]</p> <p>[#294-2 Transportation.] Approx. 186,000 people use Folsom Point to either launch their boats, picnic, or dive on a yearly basis. We have enough traffic on the surface streets as the result of the Dam Road closure, now we are going to put an additional 186,000 on the already congested streets?</p> <p>There must be another answer to closing Folsom Point or any access to Folsom lake. Why does the Corp. of Engineers have to close an access road to the lake while they raise the level of the dam? I realize raising Folsom Lake is a huge project, but there must be another solution so that the tax payers and the Corp of Engineers can co-exist during the seven years it will take to complete this project.</p>
295	Dean Deguara	<p>[#295-1 General.] Please don't close Folsom point and inconvenience the residents once again. Inconvenience the contractors and make them park their equipment somewhere else.</p>
296	Shari Warr	<p>[#296-1 General.] Please don't close Folsom Point. Let this count as my opposal.</p>
297	Phil Vaughan	<p>[#297-1 General]. PLEASE DON'T LET ANYTHING HAPPEN TO PREVENT PEOPLE FROM USING THIS WONDERFUL RECREATION AREA. I HAVE USED THIS LAKE FOR LEISURE PURPOSES ON PAST VISITS TO THE UNITED STATES AND IT TRULY WOULD BE A SHAME TO DEPRIVE FOLKS OF SUCH A BEAUTIFUL AND BOUNTIFUL ENJOYMENT AREA. SURELY, IT WOULD BENEFIT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY FINANCIALLY AS WELL, WITH VISITORS RETURNING TO USE THE GREAT FACILITIES YOU HAVE TO OFFER THEM THERE. THEY SUPPORT YOUR COMMUNITY GREATLY WITH FINANCIAL GAINS FROM THE MONEY SPENT BY THE VISITING PUBLIC FROM ELSEWHERE OTHER THAN THE DEAR FOLKS OF THE FOLSOM AREA.</p>
298	George Wyatt	<p>[#298-1 Recreation lake access closure.] Please be advised that I am opposed to the closing of Folsom Point. I use the boat launch ramp quite often, and pay an annual fee to be able to do so! One of the reasons that my family lives in Briggs Ranch is the closeness and availability of this facility. Please do not close it.</p>
299	John and Sharon Sarno	<p>[#299-1 PD alternative staging areas.] I am writing this e mail to show my support AGAINST closing Folsom Point ,This action you are considering is ludicrous at best ! why can you not use the vista point area at the dam cite ? you have closed the dam road and that area is just sitting there, as a Folsom resident for approx 20 years we have put up with every inconvenience you can imagine why are you trying to inflict another?</p>
300	Janelle & Curtis Mau	<p>Dear Mayor Morin,</p> <p>#300-1 Recreation lake access closure/alternatives.We are against the closure of Folsom Point!! Folsom Point is a park used by many people throughout our city. As a resident of a neighborhood near Folsom Point, you probably realize just how many of our neighbors walk over to use this facility on a daily basis. Dog walking, swimming, fishing, nature hikes, running, bicycling, and boating are just</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>some of the activities people enjoy. The second grade classes at Folsom Hills Elementary take a walking field trip to Folsom Point to study nature every year. This is wonderful exercise for all who are able to walk to the lake! Closing Folsom Point would eliminate that option for all residents of Briggs Ranch and nearby neighborhoods. We'd then have to get in our cars and drive to another park at the lake, thereby increasing traffic and pollution in the city. [#300-2 Socioeconomics property value] This closure will adversely affect our property values in these neighborhoods as well, and decrease the desirability of living here. In addition, the noise of heavy equipment, machinery, and increased truck traffic in and out of the area will negatively impact our neighborhood even further.</p> <p>Many other residents and [#300-3 Socioeconomics businesses.]businesses throughout Folsom will also be severely impacted by the closure of Folsom Point, as I'm sure you are already aware. There must be some other options for the location of this construction staging area for the work projects on Folsom Dam. Those other options need to be explored further!!</p> <p>Please speak out on behalf of the residents of Folsom, and work towards finding another location for the construction staging area.]</p>
301	Randy Pike	<p>To all of our honorable representatives: I am going to start this letter on a personal note... I live ONE block from Dyke 8. We bought our home because of the convenience Dyke 8 offered to launch our boat and the beauty that it offered when we wanted to have a picnic or just out for a hike. We walk our dog, from our home, to Dyke 8 for a fun afternoon swim.</p> <p>We've already lost our "easy" connection to other towns using Folsom Dam. Please don't let them take our park away too. This is our life, our children's life... our lifestyle. Please don't take it away!</p> <p>Here's is the letter that we were asked to circulate among the honorable representatives: Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA, have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>[#301-1 Recreation lake access closure.] It is our belief that this closure will have a deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism, and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake, bike swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#301-2 Vegetation and wildlife]. I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation.</p> <p>[#301-3 Public Involvement notification.] We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#301-4 Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and not this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern.</p> <p>[#301-5 PD alternative staging areas.] We do not oppose improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th, 2007 We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially "no notice". We need</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>counsel as to our rights and the rights of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves. We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p>
302	Susan Akin	<p>To our Mayor Andy Morin, [#302-1 Public Involvement project notification.] I live within 5 minutes of Folsom Point State Park. I was not notified about the proposal to close this wonderful park which I, my family use at least 2 time a week in the winter months and 5 days a week in the spring, summer and fall months. I buy the Annual Pass each year. I have not noticed any postings at the park entrance about the plans to close this park for 7 YEARS! I have heard that there were 3,000 notices sent out. Well I and 60,000 others feel that this is of importance to us as well and deserved to be notified. This impacts us as families, businesses, tourists, it also impacts the real-estate values in our area.</p> <p>Lake Point is an important asset for outdoor activities, such as boating, picnicking, hiking, bird watching, fishing, swimming, or just to enjoy nature. I and my children have sat at a park bench and watched a snake eat a frog, watch the deer who frequently graze on the shoreline grass or drink from the lake, we watch the migratory birds that rest on its shores. We have shared many memories at Folsom Point State Park. [#302-2 Socioeconomics property values] Folsom Point is an important asset for outdoor recreation enthusiasts and as such has a very big impact on home values and our economy. [302-3 Socioeconomcis businesses.]Closing access to its shore lines and boat ramps will be very detrimental to the people who use those amenities and extremely harmful to the local home values in the region. Some of the local businesses, which depend on their proximity to Folsom Point for their success, could very likely be forced out of business as well.]</p> <p>[#302-4 PD alternative staging areas]. The impact of this closure would be enormous, not only to me and my family but to our community. In the light that there are other alternatives to consider, I hope you will give this further thought. I would suggest considering the sides of the now closed dam road as well as the large parking area to vista/picnic area which are already closed to the public.</p> <p>I find it disturbing that the announcement of the meeting time came on the same day of its occurrence. I would obviously not be alone in being extremely disappointed to loose continued access to Folsom lake Point during and after any construction takes place. I furthermore believe that ALL Folsom residents and businesses who have already taken a huge hit by the already closure of the Dam Road, the increase in traffic on our private streets would be granted the time necessary to seek counsel as to our rights and the rights of those who can not speak for themselves such as the local wildlife.</p> <p>I am asking you as our Voice in this great City of Folsom and our Mayor (of whom I chose to vote for in our last elections), to stand up and speak for us all, not just the 3,000 people who someone, some where deemed necessary to notify.</p>
303	Nicole Benson	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I received an email notifying me that Folsom Point would be closed for several years to the public. I understand that a place is needed to store equipment but I also understand that there are other storage options. I am writing this letter because Folsom Point is not only important and meaningful to me, but it is crucial to the livelihood of local businesses. I grew up in Folsom and every week my family and I would go for walks along the dyke. We have taken many Christmas photos out there over the years as well as enjoyed family picnics, BBQs' and the Fireman's Eco Challenge. [#303-1 Socioeconomics businesses.] Businesses rely on the families that venture to and from this part of the lake year round, especially in the summer when the boaters are out and about. So many businesses would go under. Can you imagine what a financial nightmare this would create for many of the business owners located around this part of the lake?</p> <p>[#303-2 Recreation lake access closure]. Although I have moved to the Bay Area now and have my own family, I still look forward to Christmas morning walks at the lake and was looking forward to taking my son to picnic at the lake and watch the boats launch at Folsom Point this summer. You may argue that there are other places to go to at Folsom Lake, but none of them are like Folsom Point.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		Please reconsider your plans to close Folsom Point. The City of Folsom has already destroyed or removed many things enjoyed by its' residents, we don't need another!
304	Debbie Sultan	To the Bureau of Reclamation, [#304 PD alternative staging areas] . The proposed closure of Folsom point State Park is of great concern to the residents of Folsom We realize that improvements on the dam and other areas need to take place, but it should not be at the expense of the environment, wildlife, local businesses and our recreational enjoyment. Please seek other options.
305	Lynn & Eric Bonzell	Dear Bureau of Reclamation, [#305 Socioeconomics businesses] . We are opposed to the closure of Folsom Point for the upcoming construction to Folsom Dam. There will be a tremendous negative financial impact to the city of Folsom and it will adversely affect the residents of Folsom as well
306	Aimee Wendell	[#306 General.] I am OPPOSED to closing Folsom Point. Thank you
307	Lynn Derrick	Steve Miklos, As a homeowner of Folsom, and specifically, Briggs Ranch, I wanted to write to you. I understand the City Council will be deciding whether or not to close Folsom Point for the next 7 years while the new bridge is constructed. I wanted to let you know I am very opposed to this idea. One of the reasons we live in the Briggs Ranch area is because it is so close to Folsom Lake and the quick and easy access to the boat launch at Folsom Point. [#307-1 Traffic] I am also very concerned about all the construction trucks that will be disturbing this residential area. [#307-3 Property Values] I am also concerned what this closure and construction will do to property values in the Briggs Ranch area. This closure can only hurt our lake and boating experience as well as tourism to Folsom Lake. Please vote on the side of your fellow residents and the welfare of your community. Voters have good memories about these issues when election day rolls around again!
308	Ann Lindner	City Council Members, I had a very encouraging conversation with Steve Miklos today about fighting the closure of Folsom Point. As we spoke he told me he knew nothing of the rally tomorrow and I wanted to make sure that was not the same case for all of you. [#308-1 General] We are holding a rally in the church parking lot at the entrance of Folsom Point tomorrow to have residents of Folsom sign petitions to stop the closure. I hope we can see all of you there to support our community in this protest.
309	Ken & Susan Doherty	We are outraged that you, our elected officials, have basically stuck your heads in the sand regarding the closure of Folsom Point. It really upsets us and our neighbors that you haven't represented the fine citizens of our city in a diligent manner. We literally found out about this issue on January 15, 2007. Why was this never mentioned in any literature from the city? Why were we and everyone we encountered shocked to hear about this at the 11th hour? I went Folsom City Hall on Tuesday the 16th with my neighbors to express our objections and concerns and to find out detailed information regarding this matter. We left completely frustrated as if we were nothing but an imposition. We were left to take matters into our own hands when this clearly should be the City's responsibility to take care of us and the resources of this city that we moved here to enjoy. We can only wonder what the impact will be on property values, businesses and the community as a whole. [#309-1 Recreation lake access closure] We believe it is YOUR RESPONSIBILITY to address this significant issue and make sure that the closure of Folsom Point does not happen. Surely you can come up with several alternatives that would not impact the lives of all that use this facility.
310	Steven D Hust El Dorado County	January 26, 2007 Mr. Shawn Oliver Bureau of Reclamation 7794 Folsom Dam Road

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Folsom CA 95630</p> <p>Re: Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft EIS/EIR</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver;</p> <p>EI Dorado County appreciates the opportunity to review and respond to the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction (DS/FDR) Draft EIS/EIR. This letter is in response to actions which may affect terrestrial vegetation and wildlife, specifically oak woodlands.</p> <p>As noted in Section 3.12, Land Use, Planning and Zoning, page 3.12-3, the EI Dorado County Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 – Forest and Oak Woodland Resources (Public Review Draft) was reviewed by the Draft EIS/EIR authors for information. As an update, the Interim Interpretive Guidelines were finalized and adopted by the Planning Commission on November 9, 2006. EI Dorado County is currently conducting an intensive study of oak woodlands in the County which will result in an Oak Woodland Management Plan in spring/summer 2007, which will replace the interim guidelines. Ongoing documentation is posted on our oak woodlands website, available at: http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanOakWoodlands.html .]</p> <p>Table 3.5-4, Summary Comparison of Impact of Alternatives of Section 3.5, Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife, indicates that Alternatives 1 through 5 will have a Significant but Mitigatable Impact (CEQA) and an Adverse Impact (NEPA) to protected oak woodlands. We have reviewed the DEIS/DEIR, and the USFWS Coordination Act Report, and offer the following comments:</p> <p><i>DEIS/DEIR comments:</i></p> <p>#310-1 Habitat Inundation 1. Section 3.5.1.2, Regulatory Setting, State: Although the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) PRC §21000 et.seq. is noted, in particular, CEQA PRC §21083.4 is not identified, which has a direct bearing on allowable mitigation for oak woodlands.</p> <p>2. Section 3.5.1.2, Regulatory Setting, Local, Local Native Tree Protection Ordinance: At present, in EI Dorado County, protection of native trees and oak woodlands is set by general plan policies and interim interpretive guidelines.1</p> <p>3. Section 3.5.1.3, Existing Conditions, Vegetation, Upland Plant Communities, Interior Live Oak Woodland, Blue Oak Woodland and Savanna, pages 3.5-4 to 3.5-5: There do not appear to be any maps which spatially approximate the potential future inundation zone (1,323 acres) and the construction area (81 acres) which will affect oak woodlands. It would be helpful to see where the affected oak woodland areas lie, as well as noting the amount of acreage for each county/city affected.</p> <p>4. Section 3.5.4, Mitigation Measures, pages 3.5-51 to 3.5-52: EI Dorado County’s Interim Biological Resource Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Program Guidelines, adopted by the Planning Commission on November 9, 2006, and available at our oak woodlands website noted above, contains detailed recommendations regarding safeguarding trees during construction.]</p> <p>#310-2 Coordintaion Act Report mitigation <i>Appendix B, Federal Biological Compliance, Draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report</i></p> <p><i>CAR) comments:</i></p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>5. Draft CAR – Table 7, Evaluation Species, Resource Categories, and Compensation Planning Goals selected for cover-types impacted by the Folsom DS/FDR Project, California, page 34: We acknowledge the value of the Mitigation Planning Goals of “No net loss of in-kind habitat value” for Oak-grey pine woodland and Oak savannah.</p> <p>6. Draft CAR – Table 8, Oak Woodland – Grey Pine Woodland Mitigation Site Development Criteria, Folsom DS/FDR Project, California, page 39: Mitigation exceeds El Dorado County’s replanting requirements (of 200 trees/acre)², matches the management intensity (moderate to intensive)³, but falls below the County’s standard for monitoring (of 10 years for seedlings, 15 years for acorns) . Mitigation does not address the success rate of replanting, for which the County standard is 90 percent⁴.</p> <p>7. Draft CAR – Recommendations, General, page 40: El Dorado County agrees that avoidance of impacts to woodlands and wetlands is a primary mitigation action.</p> <p>8. Draft CAR – Recommendations, General, page 41: “Compensate for unavoidable impacts to oak-grey pine woodland habitat by acquiring suitable lands and developing oak woodland habitat using the assumptions contained in Appendix A...” El Dorado County notes that CEQA PRC §21083.4 only allows 50 percent of mitigation of impacts to oak woodlands to be in the form of replanting. Other mitigation options include conservation easements and contribution of funds to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund or other trusts to purchase oak woodland conservation easements in perpetuity.</p> <p>Recent studies by Giusti et al. (2005)⁵ states, “...it is becoming apparent that replacement seedlings as a mitigation measure for removal of older stands of trees cannot meet the immediate habitat needs of forest-dependent animal species. This realization has expanded the discussion beyond simple replanting schemes as a means of mitigating impacts.”</p> <p>The limited effectiveness of plantings for mitigation were demonstrated in a study that used data from 10-year-old planting to model the development of blue oak stand structure attributes over 50 years (Standiford et al., 2002). The model showed that a 10 percent canopy cover of oak woodland could be achieved in 10 years if trees were planted at a density of 200 trees per acre and maintained at high management intensity. After 50 years, trees in planted stands were still small (1-6 inch diameter at breast height) and wildlife habitat quality was not equivalent to that of mature oak woodland. Species composition shifted from wildlife species that utilize acorns, cavities and downed wood to those that utilize open areas. This study emphasizes the need for a comprehensive approach to mitigation and not to rely solely on replacement planting of oak woodlands.</p> <p>9. Draft CAR – Table 10, Summary of Cover-Types, Acres Impacted, and Compensation Needed by Alternative Proposed for the Construction of Folsom DS/FRD Project, California, page 60: El Dorado County acknowledges that the mitigation acreage ratio exceeds the County maximum requirement of 2:1.]</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment upon the Draft EIS/EIR. If you have any questions, please contact me at (530) 621-5355, or by email at SHust@co.el-dorado.ca.us .</p> <p>Sincerely, Steven D. Hust Principal Planner El Dorado County Development Services 2850 Fairlane Court Placerville CA 95667</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>1 The El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan and Oak Tree Protection Ordinance are pending but not yet adopted.</p> <p>2 McCreary DD. 2001. <i>Regenerating rangeland oaks in California</i>. Berkeley (CA): University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources. Communication Services Publication #21601. 62 p.</p> <p>3 Management intensity assumes that 10 years after planting 1 year old saplings that trees that have been nurtured with high management intensity will be on average 2 inches DBH with 90 percent survival; moderate management intensity will result in trees that are on average 1.5 inches DBH with 85 percent survival. From: Standiford, R.B., D. McCreary, and W. Frost. 2002. Modeling the effectiveness of tree planting to mitigate habitat loss in blue oak woodlands. In: Standiford, R.B., D. McCreary, and K.L. Purcell (tech. cords.), Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Oak Woodlands: Oaks in California's Changing Landscape. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-184. Pacific Southwest Research Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.</p> <p>4 Refer to El Dorado County Interim Interpretive Guidelines for General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 (Option A), adopted November 9, 2006, Definitions, page 2, 1:1 Woodland Replacement.</p> <p>5 Giusti, G.A., A. Leider, J. Vilms, and J. Fetherstone. 2005. Planning options for oak conservation. In: Giusti, G.A., D.D. McCreary, and R.B. Standiford (eds.), A Planner's Guide for Oak Woodlands. University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources Publication 3491.</p>
311	Bruce and Rosemary Beck	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>RE: Folsom Point/Folsom Lake Controversy:</p> <p>We have received/read about disturbing information about the proposed closure of Folsom Point (Dyke 8) and/or Granite Bay as a staging area for equipment for the upcoming construction at Folsom Lake.</p> <p>We live in Rocklin, very close to Folsom Lake. We are opposed to any closure of all current boating access to Folsom Lake for use of equipment parking. We have been boating on Folsom Lake for more than 25 years. [#311-1 Socioeconomics businesses] Any closing of any boating access and public picnicking would not be in the best interest of the local economy, local boating area and the overall boating industry in general.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [#311-2 PD alternative staging areas] Why the equipment parking area can't be established along Folsom-Auburn Road near the closed road to the Dam? 2. Close some of Beal's Point as boaters can not use that area for launching? 3. What about the parking area that is closed to the public next to the Dam? 4. There are large fields near the Dam Road in the Folsom area, use them? 5. Otherwise the expansion and creation of Beal's point for boat launching would help IF the closure of Folsom Point (Dyke 8) were to happen. <p>[#311-3 Recreation remaining access locations] There are a large number of boaters in the Sacramento area. Requiring boaters to travel to other locations would not only crowd those other locations more than usual but cause other environmental issues with more traveling, using more gas to travel to other lakes, causing more environmental issues at those locations, etc. Please establish other sites to use for staging. There are a lot of other areas that can be considered.</p>
312	Jim Micheaels CDPR	Gold Fields District 7806 Folsom-Auburn Road

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Folsom, CA 95630</p> <p>January 26, 2007</p> <p>Michael Finnegan, Area Manager U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Central California Area Office 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 95630</p> <p>Re: Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction DEIS/DEIR</p> <p>This letter is to express the concerns and recommendations of the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/DEIR) regarding the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project. DPR has previously provided extensive comment and recommendations regarding this project including an April 6, 2006 letter and several rounds of comments regarding administrative drafts of this DEIS/DEIR.</p> <p>DPR is supportive of the twin goals of this project, improving public safety relative to the dams and dikes and providing additional flood protection for the region. As Reclamation's managing partner for recreation, natural and cultural resources at Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA), DPR is also concerned about the impacts of the project on these resources and uses. About 1.5 million visitors recreate at Folsom Lake SRA annually. Obviously this project will have some significant impacts on this recreation use and the facilities supporting this use. To date, DPR does not believe the project impacts to recreation use and facilities at Folsom Lake SRA have been adequately mitigated. We look forward to continuing to work with the lead agencies to find ways to avoid impacts to recreation use and facilities and to mitigate these impacts. Please see the enclosed Attachment with our specific comments for each of the recreation use areas within the SRA that may be impacted by the proposed project.</p> <p>If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please contact either myself or Folsom Sector Superintendent Michael Gross at (916) 988-0205 or the Gold Fields District Planner Jim Micheaels at (916) 988-0513. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Scott Nakaji Gold Fields District Superintendent</p> <p>CC Stein Buer, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency Colonel Ronald N. Light, Sacramento District, Army Corps of Engineers Shawn Oliver, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Becky Victorine, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Joe Lucchi, City of Folsom, Economic Development Director</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Joe Gagliardi, President and CEO, Folsom Chamber of Commerce and Folsom Tourism Bureau Paul Romero, California State Parks, Chief Deputy Director Ted Jackson, California State Parks, Deputy Director Park Operations Tony Perez, California State Parks, Chief Southern Field Division</p> <p>Attachment: DPR Comments and Recommendations Regarding Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft EIS/EIR</p> <p><u>Chapter 2 - Project Elements and Alternatives</u></p> <p>2.2.4.1 Auxiliary Spillway On page 2-37 of the Auxiliary Spillway description the following statement is made in reference to spoil material excavated for the approach channel to the spillway gates which will be deposited on the shoreline:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“It is anticipated that the material excavated from the approach channel would be put to beneficial use.”</p> <p>#312-1 PD beneficial use of excess material Without any explanation of how this spoil material would be used it seems premature to conclude it would be put to beneficial use, the material could just as well impact the native vegetation on the existing shoreline. DPR is interested to know how this spoil material would be used.</p> <p>2.2.4.7 Embankment Raises (Dikes and Wing Dams) The Alternatives in the document propose three options for raising the height of the dikes and dams: less than 4 feet for both dam safety and flood damage reduction purposes; 7 feet to provide additional surcharge capacity for flood damage reduction purposes; and 17 feet as an alternative to meet flood damage reduction objectives without any increased discharge capacity.</p> <p>DPR has previously commented regarding our concerns about the method used to achieve the dam and dike raise. The top of MIAD and Dikes 4, 5 and 6 are currently all utilized as part of the trail system within Folsom Lake SRA. The trails at Folsom Lake SRA are an important recreation amenity for the local neighborhoods, communities and Sacramento region. The trails along the tops of these dikes and dams provide vital connections to other trails downstream of the dikes and dams. The unobstructed views of Folsom Lake are an important part of the experience of recreation visitors using these trails. DPR is specifically concerned about the impact of options utilizing a concrete parapet wall on recreation trail users. This includes both the visual impact of obstructed views and also the impacts the concrete parapet wall and concrete retaining wall may have on access to the trails across the top of these dikes and dams. We believe the concrete parapet wall options will be an attractive nuisance (graffiti) and barrier for recreation use. DPR would not be responsible for any repair or maintenance of such a concrete wall, including graffiti removal.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> #312-2 PD raise type DPR believes the conventional earthfill raise option provides the best opportunity for continued unfettered access to the trails across the dams and dikes and unobstructed views. A reinforced earth wall would be a second</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>preference.</p> <p>2.2.4.10 New Embankment Construction The document indicates that depending upon the Alternative selected, up to 45 new embankments may be constructed if a 7-foot raise of the dikes and dams was selected. The number of new embankments required for a 17-foot raise has not been determined. It does not appear that the document specifically identifies where these new embankments would be constructed and that no environmental analysis is provided for these new embankments.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-3 Analysis of new embankments] DPR believes the environmental analysis for this aspect of the project is inadequate and that if any alternative is selected which requires additional embankment raises which are not specifically identified in this document, additional environmental analysis is required.</p> <p>2.2.4.11 Miscellaneous Construction</p> <p><u>Construction Staging, Materials Processing and Contractor Work Areas</u> The project includes development of construction staging areas, material processing and contractor work areas which will close or impact recreation areas within Folsom Lake SRA including Folsom Point, Beal's Point, Granite Bay and trails within the SRA. California State Parks believes there are some "win/win" possibilities with regards to mitigation for the impacts to and loss of recreation use which the lead agencies for the project are not taking advantage. In previous discussions with Reclamation we have explored the idea of rehabilitating some of the staging areas, once construction activities are complete, into improved recreation sites. DPR believes it is reasonable for the lead agencies to provide for these finished facilities as mitigation for the loss of recreation use at these sites.</p> <p><u>Folsom Point</u> The document indicates Folsom Point would be a main staging area for the Project including contractor's offices, parking, material staging and processing, and borrow stockpiling. The DEIS/DEIR indicates Folsom Point would be closed to all recreation use from 6 to 7 years. Anywhere from 670,000 to 816,000 recreation visits would be lost due to construction.</p> <p>Recreation facilities at Folsom Point include a boat ramp with parking for 125 vehicles and a picnic area with parking for 77 vehicles. Annual use at Folsom Point is about 112,000 visitors, which generates about \$127,000 in user fees annually.</p> <p>DPR understands that based on concerns expressed by the City of Folsom, the Folsom Chamber of Commerce, local community members and others, that options are being explored to reduce or avoid the complete closure of Folsom Point during the construction period. DPR is supportive of these efforts and we need to be part of these discussions.</p> <p>In past discussions with Reclamation, DPR understood that Reclamation was considering filling a shallow portion of the Reservoir on the east side of Folsom Point to create additional areas for staging and material processing. DPR has suggested that following construction activities, Reclamation could contour and convert this proposed material processing and construction staging area into a new boat ramp, parking and additional picnic sites, including group picnic sites. DPR believes that the provision of additional new recreation facilities could serve to help mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-4 Recreation mitigation] To the extent that Folsom Point is utilized as a construction staging or materials processing area which results in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use. One option to provide such mitigation is to enhance the existing facilities or convert staging areas into additional recreation facilities following construction. This might include extending the existing boat ramp, rehabilitating the existing picnic facilities and/or creating a second boat ramp and additional picnic facilities.</p> <p><u>Beal's Point</u> Beal's Point would also be utilized as a primary staging area for contractor offices, parking, material processing and staging, stockpiling of borrow material and concrete production. The document indicates that portions of Beal's Point would be occupied by construction staging activities from 3 to 6 years and would result in approximately 40,000 to 673,000 lost recreation visits.</p> <p>About 220,000 visitors recreate at Beal's Point annually which generates about \$447,000 in user fees annually. Recreation use of Beal's Point may be less desirable because of construction activity, traffic and noise.</p> <p>Similar to the situation at Folsom Point, based on previous discussions with Reclamation, DPR understood that Reclamation was considering filling a shallow portion of the Reservoir on the south side of Beal's Point to create additional area for staging and material processing.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-5 Beal's Point Site Use Consultation] DPR would like to be consulted regarding the exact location of the staging areas. To the extent that Beal's Point is utilized as a construction staging or materials processing area which results in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use. DPR has recommends that following construction activities, Reclamation should contour and convert this proposed material processing and construction staging area into additional parking, picnic sites and other day use recreation facilities. DPR believes that the provision of additional new recreation facilities could serve to help mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p><u>Granite Bay</u> Construction staging areas at Granite Bay to support a variety of activities depending upon the Alternative including: contractor offices; parking; borrow site excavation; construction at Dikes 1, 2, 3; material processing, stock piling and storage. From the document it is difficult to determine exactly where the staging areas are planned.</p> <p>Granite Bay is the most heavily used recreation use area within the SRA. Annual use at Granite Bay is approximately 508,000 visitors which generates \$1.6 million in revenues from user fees annually.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-6 Granite Bay Recreation mitigation] Locate construction staging areas so they avoid or minimize impacts to recreation access or use. DPR would like to be consulted regarding the exact location of the staging areas. To the extent that Granite Bay is utilized as a construction staging, borrow site or materials processing area which results in a loss of recreation access</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p><u>Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (MIAD)</u> The entire area around MIAD is proposed as a construction zone, construction staging area or potential borrow site. The top of MIAD is utilized as a trail connecting Folsom Point to the trail to Browns Ravine. There is an existing parking area on the eastern side of MIAD for trail users which accommodates about 30 vehicles. This parking lot is regularly used by trail users. It appears that the construction or staging area will encompass the parking lot.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-7 MIAD Recreation mitigation] If the parking lot and trail connections are obliterated due to construction or staging activities, this parking lot will need to be replaced. DPR would like to consult with the lead agencies regarding the replacement of this parking lot. To the extent construction activities result in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p><u>Right Wing Dam</u> DPR has a maintenance yard, storage buildings, State Park Ranger offices and other facilities adjacent to the right wing dam. It is also possible that activities in this area may impact the paved bike path which crosses this area and connects from Lake Natoma to Beal's Point.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-8 RWD Recreation mitigation] Avoid impacts to the above DPR facilities or mitigate any impacts by replacing these facilities as needed.</p> <p>The proposed staging area just south of Hinkle Reservoir appears to occupy an area that is proposed for the new entrance to Reclamation/DPR administrative offices and facilities as part of the new Folsom Dam Bridge Project. This area is also the locations where the American River Water Education Center (ARWEC) and DPR's public contact station are proposed to be relocated as part of the Bridge project.</p> <p><u>Left Wing Dam</u> Activities at the left wing dam do not appear to conflict with existing public use. However, at one time Observation Point (paved parking area on the east side of the left wing dam) was a popular public day use facility. This facility has been closed due to security concerns. The project will occupy this site for many years, if not permanently. Observation Point has perhaps the most dramatic view of Folsom Lake.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-9 LWD Recreation mitigation] Reclamation and the Corps should mitigate the loss of Observation Point to future public use.</p> <p><u>Borrow Sites</u></p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p><u>Folsom Point</u> Borrow material would be excavated from the along the shoreline all around Folsom Point.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-10 Folsom Point mitigation] DPR believes that borrow site excavation could be conducted in a manner that improved some recreation facilities. This might include extending existing boat ramps, developing an additional boat ramp, or contouring shoreline areas for use as a beach area. In order for these types of benefits to be realized, DPR believes the contouring needs to be coordinated with the mitigation ideas proposed for Folsom Point in 2.2.4.11 above. We believe, as partial mitigation for the loss of recreation use, the lead agencies could complete improvements to recreation facilities at Folsom Point.</p> <p><u>Granite Bay</u> In Alternatives 4 and 5 it appears borrow excavation would occur in the north portion of this recreation area. It appears that the excavation may include the area of Main Granite Beach, which is a primary attraction and one of the most heavily used portions of Granite Bay.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-11 Granite Bay mitigation] DPR would like to avoid or minimize impacts to Main Granite Beach and the other primary recreation use facilities at Granite Bay during the summer use season. To the extent construction activities result in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use. One opportunity to partially mitigate this impact is to contour the area along main Granite Beach in a manner which will improve the beach area and water access at a variety of lake levels. DPR would like to consult with the lead agencies on opportunities to contour this area following excavation activities.</p> <p><u>Beal's Point</u> Borrow material would be excavated from the along the shoreline on the north side of Beal's Point. The area along the north side of Beal's Point is utilized as a beach and swim area.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-12 Beal's Point mitigation] To the extent construction activities result in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use. One opportunity to partially mitigate this impact is to contour the area on the north side of the Beal's Point in a manner which will improve the beach use area and potentially import sand. DPR would like to consult with the lead agencies on opportunities to contour the area around Beal's Point following excavation activities.</p> <p><u>MIAD (Left Abutment)</u> In Alternatives 4 and 5 it appears borrow excavation would occur in the area between the northeast end of MIAD and Brown's Ravine. Brown's Ravine is the location of the Folsom Lake Marina and one of the most heavily used recreation use areas within the SRA. The marina is operated by a concessionaire. It is possible that borrow excavation could benefit the marina operation by increasing the depth of the marina basin. However, this would need to be coordinated with DPR and the marina operator. From the figures in the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>document it appears that the excavation would be focused on the shoreline along the south side of Browns Ravine and may well not benefit marina operations. The point of land between Brown's Ravine and MIAD is an undeveloped portion of the SRA with excellent habitat values due to the State land adjacent to the federal lands in this area. DPR is concerned about impacts to upland vegetation and habitat from the borrow excavation.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-13 MIAD mitigation] Keep borrow excavation activities, including hauling materials, below the 466' elevation, to avoid impacts to upland native vegetation, habitat and wildlife. To the extent construction activities result in a loss of recreation access and use, DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p><u>Disposal of Excess Materials and In-reservoir Fill</u> The document indicates between 1 million and 2.5 million cubic yards of excess material could be permanently disposed of at several locations including, Dike 7, Folsom Point and Beal's Point. Alternative 3 proposes permanent disposal of up to 500,000 cubic yards of material at Dike 7 alone. DPR has already provided ideas on how this excess material could be located, contoured and rehabilitated to provide improved or new finished recreation facilities at Beal's Point and Folsom Point to help mitigate the loss of recreation use and impacts to recreation use in these areas.</p> <p>With the exception of a trail discussed immediately below, DPR is not interested in creating additional recreation facilities in the vicinity of Dike 7 at this time.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-14 Dike 7 mitigation] At Dike 7, other than the provision for the trail, DPR recommends that any excess spoil material be contoured to match the existing natural upland areas and re-vegetated and restored as blue oak woodland or oak savanna or some similar native plant community. Contouring the shoreline and finishing the new shoreline with material suitable for informal beach use would also be useful.</p> <p><u>Development of Internal Roadways</u> Internal haul roads are proposed for several locations within the project area, including between Dike 7 and Folsom Point. DPR presumes this haul route would be above the 466' elevation. The new draft General Plan/Resource Management Plan for Folsom Lake SRA provides direction for the development of a paved multi-use trail between Dike 7 and Folsom Point (and continuing across MIAD to the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway). This same paved bike route is identified in the City of Folsom Bikeway Master Plan as it connects to City bike trails.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-15 Dike 7 to Folsom Point mitigation] For all internal haul routes, to the extent feasible, avoid removal of native oak trees. DPR recommends that following construction activities, the lead agencies convert the proposed haul route between Dike 7 and Folsom Point into a paved bike path that would continue across MIAD to the intersection of Green Valley Road and Sophia Parkway. DPR believes the federal agencies have an obligation to mitigate the loss of recreation use at Folsom Point and that providing a finished paved multi-use trail from Dike 7 to Folsom Point would serve as partial mitigation for the project impacts to recreation use and access.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>2.2.4.13 Security Features</p> <p><u>Security Cameras</u> Security cameras installed on 30-foot steel towers are proposed at each end of Dikes 4, 5, 6, 7, MIAD and at Beal's Point. Specific locations of these camera towers are not indicated in the document. DPR is concerned about the potential impact of the towers and bases on the trails across the top of the dams and dikes and the connections to other trails. DPR is also concerned about the visual impact of the towers on recreation use and on views within Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p>Prior to these security measures being included in this Dam Safety/Flood Damage Reduction DEIS/DEIR, DPR staff made site visits with Reclamation staff to provide input on the specific locations of these towers. This includes the tower location at Beal's Point, for which DPR has provided specific recommendations regarding the location of this tower to minimize the visual impact on recreation visitors at the Beal's Point day use facilities. DPR hopes this information has not been lost in the process.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-16 Security mitigation] Site the camera towers so they do not interfere with the trails across MIAD and Dikes 4, 5, 6 and connections to these trails. Site the camera towers so the impact to the visual resources and views of the Folsom Lake and the SRA are avoided or minimized. Consult with DPR staff regarding the specific location of camera towers.</p> <p><u>Vehicle Barriers and Gates</u> Various types of vehicle barriers and gates are proposed for MIAD and the various dikes. Because system trails within the SRA utilize the top of MIAD and the dikes DPR requests that adequate pass-through openings are provided for trail users, including pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists towing trailers. The existing bollard system installed over the past several years was installed without providing adequate pass-through openings for trail users. This lack of adequate pass through openings with the existing bollards has caused numerous complaints from trail users.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-17 Security mitigation] Ensure that a 60-inch wide opening, with even tread, is provided at the location of all vehicle barriers and gates on dikes and dams that are utilized as trails.</p> <p><u>Power for Security Components</u> Power lines are proposed for all security feature locations needing power including the vehicle barriers and cameras. DPR believes that installing power lines on towers or poles along the top of the dikes and dams would be a significant impact to visual resources within Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-18 Security mitigation] DPR recommendation is that power lines be installed underground. If that is not possible our second preference is for power lines to be installed on poles along the downstream toe of the dikes and dams, out of the way of any trails or other recreation facilities, to minimize the visual impact.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p><u>Project Lighting</u> The project proposes lighting to be installed to support monitoring of the barrier system. DPR presumes this is permanent lighting. No further detail is provided regarding this lighting. DPR is concerned that such lighting will be a visual impact, could further impact the night sky and might affect the nocturnal habitat of wildlife. The details and potential impacts of this lighting are not adequately discussed or analyzed in the environmental document.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-19 Security mitigation] Any permanent lighting should be of the minimum intensity required, should be hooded and downward directed to prevent impacts to the night sky and nocturnal wildlife.</p> <p>Alternatives [#312-20 PD alternatives] DPR supports the project objectives of increasing dam safety and reducing flood damage. DPR request that the lead agencies select project alternatives which achieve project objectives while minimizing the impacts to recreation use and facilities, natural and cultural resources at Folsom Lake SRA. DPR believes the alternatives which include raising the dams and dikes, particularly the 7-foot and 17-foot raises, will greatly increase the impacts to the recreation use and resources within the SRA.</p> <p><u>Chapter 3 - Affected Environment, Impacts Analyses, and Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>[#312-21 Veg and Wildlife mitigation for inundation] 3.5 Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife The document identifies impacts to vegetation and wildlife from both construction related activities and from inundation caused by emergency flood retention. With regards to the latter, it appears the approach (BIO-8, page 3.5-52) is to wait until an inundation occurs, then to survey the damage and determine the appropriate mitigation at that time. DPR has concerns with this approach. Temporary inundation may not kill oak trees outright immediately, but could cause root damage which causes oak trees to deteriorate over time and may make trees more susceptible to wind fall or insect damage. A single survey, or even a survey over several years, may not adequately capture the damage caused by a temporary inundation.</p> <p><u>3.5.4 Mitigation Measures</u> DPR has suggested to the lead agencies and to the USFWS that our preference for mitigation of oak woodlands and other habitat requiring mitigation, whether from construction related impacts or inundation, is to purchase of lands contiguous to Folsom Lake SRA which contain suitable quantity and quality of habitat value to meet the mitigation requirements. DPR understands that regulatory agency preference may be to create additional habitat through planting versus the purchase of mature habitat, such as the properties with mature blue oak woodlands that DPR has previously informally identified. DPR does not understand the logic of the lead or regulatory agencies in this matter. It would seem that mature oak woodlands would have a much higher habitat value than newly planted oak trees or other vegetation. The document acknowledges that development within the vicinity of Folsom Reservoir has created barriers to animal movement and migration. Purchasing lands contiguous to the SRA with high quality habitat which have the potential for development would not only add habitat value to the SRA it would also serve to help retain the habitat value of existing public lands within the SRA by preventing further barriers to animal movement and migration</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#312-22 Veg and Wildlife mitigation oak woodlands] Purchase lands contiguous to Folsom Lake SRA which contain suitable quantity and quality of habitat value to meet the mitigation requirements. DPR has specifically identified for the lead and regulatory agencies potential properties which might meet some of these mitigations needs.</p> <p>The document identifies mitigation measures for replacement of a variety of habitat types that will be impacted by the project, including riparian vegetation, oak woodlands and wetlands (BIO 10 and VEG-1-4). The document does not specify where this mitigation will occur and DPR is concerned about the specific location. DPR has two concerns, first that the mitigation does not impact or replace an existing viable habitat, with a mitigation habitat. DPR does not believe that this necessarily results in a net benefit to the natural environment, but merely results in the loss of one habitat for the sake of another. Secondly, DPR is generally concerned that locations for habitat mitigation do not conflict with existing or proposed future recreation facilities and uses within the SRA. Future recreation facilities and uses are described in the Draft General Plan/Resource Management Plan for Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>[#312-23 Wildlife habitat mitigation] DPR requests that the federal agencies avoid implementing habitat mitigation sites in areas which have existing viable native habitat (even though it may be compromised by exotics or other impacts) such as blue oak woodlands and savanna, areas with remnants of native grasslands and riparian areas. DPR also requests that the federal agencies specifically avoid mitigation sites in areas where existing recreation use and facilities exist or locations where future recreation use and facilities might be located (as identified in the updated General Plan/Resource Management Plan). DPR would like to be consulted on any proposed mitigation sites within Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p><u>INV-1b – 1e (page 3.5-53)</u></p> <p>These mitigation measures refer to conservation areas where transplanting or planting of elderberry shrubs and associated plant species will occur. The document does not specify where these conservations are located.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <p>[#312-24 Veg and Wildlife elderberry mitigation] DPR requests that the federal agencies specifically avoid creating elderberry mitigation sites in areas within Folsom Lake SRA which might conflict with existing recreation use and facilities exist or locations where future recreation use or facilities might be located (as identified in the updated Draft General Plan/Resource Management Plan). Focus any habitat mitigation on heavily disturbed areas which do not provide any valuable existing native habitat. DPR would like to be consulted on any proposed mitigation sites within Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p>3.7 Visual Resources</p> <p>[#312-25 Visual parapet walls graffiti] Construction of parapet walls – Alternatives 2, 3 (pages 3.7-21&22)</p> <p>DPR has previously expressed that the concrete parapet wall will be a visual impediment to views of the Lake, may impede recreation access to trails on the tops of the dikes and dams and will likely be a target for graffiti. The DEIS/DEIR does not analyze the potential a parapet wall creates for graffiti or the visual impact of this eventuality. The DEIS/DEIR claims the visual impact of the parapet wall is a significant but unavoidable impact. DPR believes this is incorrect. This impact can be avoided by selecting the conventional earthfill raise as the option to increase the height of the dams and dikes.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p><u>Implementation of Security Measures</u> The document contends that the implementation of the security measures, including 30-foot camera towers, permanent lighting and power poles and lines at Dikes 4, 5, 6, 7, Folsom Point and MIAD would result in less than significant impacts to visual resources. There is no substantive evidence or analysis provided in the environmental analysis regarding the permanent visual impact of the towers, lights and lines. The document does not even identify specifically where towers would be located or if the lines would be underground, at the toe of the dams and dikes or on top of the dams and dikes. The specific location of these facilities has everything to do with the level of impact they will have on the visual resources of Folsom Lake SRA.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-26 Security impacts analysis] DPR believes the environmental analysis for this aspect of the project is entirely inadequate and that once the specific location of these facilities is determined, supplemental environmental analysis should be conducted.</p> <p>Unlike Chapter 3.5, the Visual Resources Chapter (3.7) does not analyze the potential impacts of inundation caused by emergency flood retention, only construction related impacts. DPR does not understand why this aspect of the project is analyzed for some resource areas and not others. DPR believes that the potential impact on visual quality of an emergency inundation could be substantial. Inundation could result in a band of dead or dying vegetation for many years following inundation.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-27 Inundation Impacts Analysis] DPR believes the potential impact of an emergency inundation on visual resources should be analyzed and that the environmental analysis is insufficient without it.</p> <p>3.9 Transportation and Circulation DPR believes that displaced recreation use from Folsom Point could increase traffic and circulation impacts at Beal's Point and Granite Bay which already experience in congestion and back ups on adjacent roadways during peak use periods. Additionally, construction related traffic will exacerbate congestion at these locations.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-28 Recreation Traffic mitigation] DPR believes that widening the entrance roads into Beal's Point and Granite Bay and adding lanes for both entering and exiting these entrance stations will help mitigate these impacts. Adding an improved turn around to keep traffic circulating when these recreation areas reach capacity and gates are closed, should also be part of the entrance improvements. DPR would like to work with the lead agencies to determine how to re-configure and improve the entrances to both Beal's Point and Granite Bay to help mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>3.10 Noise</p> <p><u>Sensitive Receptors – Figure 3.10-2</u> Six locations are identified as sensitive receptors for construction related noise impacts. All of these six sensitive receptors are located outside of the Folsom Lake SRA boundary. DPR understands the concern with noise impacts on adjacent residential areas.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>#312-29 Noise campgrounds] However, DPR does not understand why the campground at Beal's Point, both the family (tent) campground and the RV campground, were not considered as sensitive receptors for noise impacts. Several large construction staging areas and material processing operations are proposed to be located immediately adjacent to these campgrounds. Blasting, trucks, rock crushing, excavation and other construction activities will occur in close proximity to these campgrounds. Campgrounds can be legally occupied for overnight use by recreation visitors for up to 30 days per calendar year.</p> <p>These same construction activities and noise impacts will also occur immediately adjacent to many day use recreation facilities and activities. It does not appear that the environmental analysis considers the impacts of construction related noise on any of these recreation uses or facilities. DPR believes construction related noise will significantly impact recreation use at the Beal's Point Campground and result in a substantial loss of use at the Campground.</p> <p>3.13 Recreation</p> <p>#312-30 Recreation Use Mitigation] DPR believes the document identifies many of the construction-related impacts to recreation use and facilities but does not adequately mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p>3.13.1.2 Regulatory Setting</p> <p>#312-31 Recreation existing conditions] DPR does not believe the document (page 3.13-1) accurately describes the land ownership or management situation at Folsom Lake SRA. While Reclamation does own the lands immediately adjacent to Folsom Reservoir and Lake Natoma, the State of California owns 2243 acres of land contiguous to the federal land and this State-owned land is also part of Folsom Lake SRA. This includes lands around portions of both reservoirs and is not limited to lands associated with the Jedediah Smith Memorial Bike Trail. The State owns substantial acreage in the Granite Bay area, the Peninsula, between Mormon Island Cove and Brown's Ravine, the Rattlesnake Bar area, near Old Salmon Falls and at various locations around Lake Natoma.</p> <p>The purpose of the long-term lease agreement is much broader than solely managing recreation, the lease agreement states that the purpose of the agreement is for developing, administering and maintaining the area as a State park. This involves more than managing recreation and DPR management activities include natural and cultural resource management and protection, public health and safety, law enforcement and a variety of other activities. The existing 50-year lease expired in the spring of 2006. DPR and Reclamation have extended this lease by mutual agreement on a month to month basis. Both agencies are working on developing a new long-term agreement.</p> <p>3.13.4 Mitigation Measures</p> <p>#312- 32 Recreation mitigation] DPR does not believe the proposed mitigation measures adequately mitigate the loss of recreation use and access which is documented for the various alternatives in this chapter. DPR believes the lead agencies have a responsibility to mitigate the loss of recreation use. DPR has previously recommended and the lead agencies have chosen to ignore a variety of additional measures which the lead agencies could take to help mitigate the loss of recreation use. DPR would like to work with the lead agencies to identify and develop specific mitigation measures to help mitigate the loss of recreation use.</p> <p><u>RC-1</u></p> <p>It appears that the existing parking lot near the left abutment of MIAD will need to be replaced following project construction. Improvements could be made to this lot to help mitigate impacts to and the loss of recreation use including: paving the parking area</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>and access road to the parking area, installing a pre-cast concrete CXT-type restroom, installing trailhead information kiosk/signboard.</p> <p><u>RC-3</u> DPR understands that based on public input to date, the lead agencies are considering options to minimize or avoid closure of Folsom Point to the extent feasible. DPR is supportive of these efforts and would like to work with the lead agencies on these options.</p> <p>DPR has already described above how construction staging areas and material processing areas could be contoured and rehabilitated to provide additional or improved recreation facilities and opportunities at Folsom Point and Beal's Point. DPR believes it is appropriate for the lead agencies to provide these finished recreation facilities as part of the mitigation for the loss of recreation use and access caused by the project. In the past the lead agencies have claimed there are legal constraints which prevent them from providing improved recreation facilities as part of the mitigation for the project. These legal limitations have never been specifically identified or articulated. DPR believes there are a variety of ways which these recreation facility improvements could be achieved by the lead agencies. These potential mitigation measures, most of which could be completed at the end of project construction activities, are highlighted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Folsom Point extend the boat ramp, pave and finish the upgraded boat ramp. Repair and re-surface the existing parking lot for the boat ramp. • Rehabilitate the existing picnic area at Folsom Point. • Convert the proposed haul route between Dike 7 and Folsom Point into a paved bike path when construction was completed. • Convert the proposed construction staging and material processing area on the east side of Folsom Point into an additional boat ramp, parking, group picnic and beach area. Provide paving, parking, sand and other facilities needed to complete this work. • Convert the construction staging and material processing area to be developed on the south side of Beal's Point into additional parking, picnic sites and day use facilities. • To mitigate the loss of the boat launching facility at Folsom Point and to accommodate potential increased use of the Granite Bay boat launch, reconfigure the boat ramp complex at Granite Bay to better serve all lake levels, pave and upgrade the boat ramp facilities as needed. • Rehabilitate the picnic area and facilities at Granite Bay. • Many trails will be impacted by the project and the project will result in a loss of use on these trails. In addition to repairing trails impacted by the project, the loss of recreation use on trails should be mitigated by providing improvements to the trail system following construction. <p><u>RC-4</u> DPR has already described above how construction excavation areas could be contoured and rehabilitated to provide additional or</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>improved recreation facilities and opportunities. DPR believes it is appropriate for the lead agencies to provide these finished recreation facilities as part of the mitigation for the loss of recreation use and access caused by the project. These potential mitigation measures, most of which could be completed at the end of project construction activities, are highlighted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation which widened and extended the existing boat ramp at Folsom Point could provide benefits for recreation. • Re-contour the beach area on the north side of Beal's Point beach to improve recreation access at a variety of lake levels. Provide sand and other facilities as needed to complete this work. • Excavation at Granite Bay could help lower and extend boat ramps to improve boating access at this site in the long term. • Re-contour the beach profile at Granite Bay main beach to improve recreation access at a variety of lake levels. Provide sand and other facilities as needed to complete this work. • Excavation which lowered the marina basin at Browns Ravine would benefit recreation. Additionally, construction of a new breakwater on the west side of the entrance to marina area to help protect the marina basin from the prevailing winds. <p><u>RC-6</u> This mitigation measure does not commit to making improvements to the entrance of Beal's Point and Granite Bay to mitigate the impacts of the project. DPR believes the closure of Folsom Point could result in displaced users seeking recreation access at Beal's Point (picnic facilities) and Granite Bay (boat launch and picnic facilities). The environmental document accurately states that these areas reach capacity during peak season periods. During these times traffic backs up onto Douglas Boulevard and Auburn Folsom Road. Additional recreation users displaced from Folsom Point would exacerbate this traffic impact, as will the additional construction traffic. DPR is also concerned about the additional air quality impacts of trucks and other construction equipment entering and exiting these entrance stations and the potential health impacts on employees working at the entrance booths.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> [#312-33 Recreation Mitigation] DPR believes that widening the entrance roads into Beal's Point and Granite Bay and adding lanes for both entering and exiting the entrance station will help mitigate these impacts. Adding an improved turn-around, in order to keep traffic circulating when these recreation areas reach capacity and gates close, should also be part of the entrance improvements. DPR would like to work with the lead agencies to determine how to re-configure and improve the entrances to both Beal's Point and Granite Bay to help mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>Unlike Chapter 3.5, the Recreation Chapter (3.13) does not analyze the potential impacts of inundation caused by emergency flood retention, only construction related impacts. DPR does not understand why this aspect of the project is analyzed for some resources and uses and not others. DPR believes that the potential impact on recreation use and facilities due to an emergency inundation could be substantial.</p> <p>Any raise of Folsom Dam for flood control purposes and subsequent reservoir operations utilizing the additional surcharge space, have the potential to impact recreation facilities at Folsom Lake SRA. The recreation facilities around Folsom Lake have been developed by</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>DPR with the full knowledge and consent of Reclamation over the course of fifty years. Presumably recreation planners assumed that 466' was the effective high pool for the reservoir and developed facilities accordingly. As a result many of the recreation facilities around Folsom Lake are located between elevations 466' and 474' elevation.</p> <p>To the extent that the operation of the reservoir at higher Lake levels (above 466') results in impacts to recreational facilities, DPR believes the lead agencies should mitigate the impacts to these facilities. This may include the need to move selected facilities, to "flood proof" other facilities and to develop a plan and funding source for the clean-up and repair of facilities following an inundation. DPR would like to see the federal agencies take responsibility for developing (in consultation with DPR) a proactive planning effort to identify which facilities may need to be moved or retro-fitted to withstand inundation and then to provide funding to complete the recommendations of this plan. DPR does not want to wait until an emergency inundation occurs and then address the impacts. The emergency use of the additional surcharge space from a dam raise is an event that can be planned for and in large part mitigated before the emergency occurs.</p> <p>One example would be the Granite Bay Activity Center. This facility would get inundated if Folsom Dam is raised seven feet and a flood occurred in which it was necessary to utilize the surcharge storage. Inundation would likely render this facility unusable and the facility would need to be re-constructed. DPR does not have funding to replace this facility and even if funding were provided by the flood control agencies, it would take several years to re-build the facility. This is a very popular facility that is used at least several night and days a week year round. These users would be displaced during the protracted time period it would take to re-build the structure.</p> <p>The federal agencies also need to consider that the loss of recreation facilities due to the utilization of the increased surcharge space would also result in the loss of recreation use and user fee revenues which would need to be mitigated.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-34 Recreation inundation and operation impacts] DPR believes the potential impact of an emergency inundation on recreation use and facilities should be analyzed and that the environmental analysis is insufficient without it.</p> <p><u>Chapter 4 - Socioeconomics</u> This Chapter documents the impacts to State revenues due to the loss of user fees resulting from project impacts. However, the document does not indicate how these impacts will be addressed, if at all.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-35 Socioeconomics State Parks revenue] DPR believes that any loss of recreation use resulting from the project which results in a loss of user fee revenues to the State within Folsom Lake SRA should be compensated.</p> <p>The document also discussing the loss of revenues to concessionaires operating at Beal's Point and Granite Bay which may occur due to project impacts. DPR has previously provided the lead agencies with specific information for each concessionaire, the revenues they generate and the fees these concessionaires pay to the State.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> [#312-36 Socioeconomics concessionaires] DPR believes that any loss of recreation use resulting from the project which</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		results in a loss of revenues to the concessionaires operating within Folsom Lake SRA should be compensated, including the portion of these revenues which would be paid as fees to the State.
313	Robert H. Miller III	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver and Mrs. Victorine On behalf of the Folsom Economic Development Corporation, please find below comments to the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction EIS/EIR.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. #313-1 Public Involvement notification <u>Public Notice.</u> Given the massive size of this project, the length of the construction period and negative impacts on the City of Folsom and surrounding area, the public notice for this lengthy environmental document was inadequate. Until the Folsom Telegraph, the Sacramento Bee and KCRA Channel 3 ran stories January 10, 2007, the public was not aware of the closure of Folsom Point which would result in the loss of over 800,000 visitor trips and substantial economic loss to the local economy. Since the media coverage was the same day of the Folsom public meeting held January 10 and a day after the only other public meeting held in Sacramento on January 9, it was too late for most citizens to attend and impossible to review the environmental document in advance of that meeting. In addition, property owners who are located immediately adjacent to the work areas were not notified by mail of the EIS/EIR.] 2. #313-2 Public Involvement hearing format <u>Public Meeting.</u> Especially in light of the lack of insufficient notice, the ‘open house’ public meeting format did not provide the attendees an adequate presentation of the project, the project’s impacts and/or the proposed mitigation measures. It did not allow attendees to benefit from each other’s public testimony or public questions and answers from the project proponent. Public input was either transcribed by someone who was unable to answer any questions or attendees were given comment cards to fill out. Based on the insufficient notice, lack of public presentation and lack of public testimony, it appeared that the project proponent was not interested in notifying the public of the project specifics or the impacts but rather the proponent was only “going through the motions”. The lack of sufficient notice and the public meeting format did not provide full disclosure given the scope of the project and did not meet the intent of the environmental review process. 3. #313-3 Socioeconomics <u>Economic Analysis.</u> The economic impact of the loss of over 800,000 visitor trips to the City of Folsom, Folsom area businesses, property owners and residents is not adequately addressed in the economic model presented in the EIS/EIR. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The economic model does not take into account the impact on the sale of large ticket items including motor boats, jet skis, sailboats, tow vehicles, sports equipment, homes, residential and commercial property etc. The model only considers the loss of “picnic basket” type items. Given the extended life of the project and the lack of access to Folsom Lake or other alternative outdoor recreation facilities, the sale of these large ticket items will decline. The analysis should be revised to adequately inform the public of the true economic loss including these large ticket items. b. The economic impact from the loss of visitors from outside the tri-county region is underestimated. The economic analysis assumes that only those users who stay at the campground facilities at Folsom Lake are from outside the tri-county region. The analysis fails to consider those users who are staying with friends or family or choose to stay at area hotels, motels, or RV parks. Based on the assumptions of the analysis, a large and more accurate number of visitors from outside the region will increase the economic loss to both the local economy and the region. The analysis should be revised to reflect a more accurate percentage of visitors from outside the region. c. The economic analysis does not adequately disclose the economic loss to the local (Folsom Lake) economy. Instead, the analysis mixes the regional benefit from monies spent on the project with the economic loss experienced by the local (Folsom Lake) economy. The analysis should separately disclose the loss to the local economy and any potential gain to the regional (tri-county) economy. The regional trucking company that may benefit from increase hauling fees does not compensate for the

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>loss of the local business who sells recreational equipment to the lake users.</p> <p>d. Close proximity and access to Folsom Lake are quality of life amenities that attract businesses and employees to our region. Without access to this amenity for an extended period of time, it will be less attractive to locate here. The economic analysis should be revised to include this negative impact to businesses and employee recruitment.</p> <p>e. Property values in close proximity to Folsom Lake are higher because of better access to this recreational amenity. No consideration was given to the loss in value that will occur when access is substantially limited as indicated in the project alternatives. The economic analysis should estimate the potential loss in property values during the construction period when access is limited.</p> <p>f. The total loss of Folsom Lake user fees to the State of California over the length of the construction period is not clearly indicated. Please provide a total number.</p> <p>4. #313-4 PD Alternative Staging <u>Recreational Impacts</u>. The EIS/EIR is inadequate because it did not analyze any alternatives to closing Folsom Point but simply concluded that the recreational impacts are unavoidable and displaced visitors may consider indoor recreation alternatives.</p> <p><u>a.</u> The haul route between the proposed spillway and MIAD could easily be located to avoid the boat ramp, parking lot and picnic areas of Folsom Point (see attached Exhibit A). The route could run on top of or in front of Dike 8 and continue east between the launch ramp parking lot and the Folsom Point access road. The haul route could then cross under the Folsom Point access road between the gate house and the location where the Folsom Point access road splits (left to boat launch area and to the right of the picnic area). The haul route could then continue east (south of Folsom Point) to MIAD. This suggested route appears to cover a shorter distance than following the waters edge around Folsom Point. Given the number of truck trips (37,500 to 75,000 depending on truck capacity) necessary to move 1.5 million cubic yards of dirt from the spillway to MIAD, this proposed shorter haul route is likely to also be more cost effective. Please analyze the cost of this alternative haul route in comparison to the user fee revenue loss to the State of California and the local economic loss resulting from a Folsom Point closure.</p> <p><u>b.</u> The processing facility that is proposed to be located at Folsom Point in each of the project alternatives could be moved south and east of Folsom Point between the Folsom Point access road and MIAD (see attached Exhibit A). Based on the aerial maps shown in Section 2, Part 2 of the EIS/EIR, it appears that this property is currently designated to be used for this project. It also appears that the impacts to the environment (oak woodlands and wetlands) appear to be less at this suggested location. The impacts to existing homes located on Elvies Lane uphill from the Folsom Point processing facility would also be reduced if the facility was relocated to this suggested location. The existing topography and size of this suggested alternative location could accommodate large buffers and berms to mitigate the construction impacts. Please analyze and compare the local economic and environmental impacts of the location designated in the EIS/EIR to the location suggested here. In addition, please analyze the specific impacts (noise, dust, lighting etc) to the properties located on Elvies Lane or Mountain View Drive that are located uphill from the proposed processing facility at Folsom Point. What specific mitigation measures could be implemented at this suggested location to reduce the impacts to the surrounding community (ie. Berms, buffers, hours of operation, etc).</p> <p>Based on this one suggested alternative haul route and processing facility re-location, it appears that there may be many more alternatives available to meet the needs of the project and keep access to Folsom Point open and other FLSRA facilities less impacted. Until the environmental document analyzes this and other alternatives, the EIS/EIR is flawed in its conclusion that the recreational impacts and the resulting economic loss are unavoidable. Please analyze all alternatives that may reduce recreational impacts at the affected FLSRA facilities.]</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>5. [#313-4 Recreation mitigation] <u>Alternative Recreational Facilities.</u> The EIS/EIR is inadequate because no alternative sites were studied where temporary facilities could be added to accommodate visitors that would be displaced because of the construction activity. Again, the EIS/EIR simply states that the impact to recreation is unavoidable.</p> <p>a. Temporary facilities could be added at existing FLSRA facilities to relieve congestion that will be caused from this extended construction activity. For example, additional launch, day use or campground facilities could be added at Browns Ravine, Granite Bay, Beal's Point, the former Monte Vista campground, Old Salmon Falls or other existing facilities (see attached Exhibit B). Please analyze the cost of the temporary expansion of all potential recreational facilities at FLSRA to accommodate the displaced visitors that would result from the impacted facilities. Please compare the cost of these temporary facilities to the user fee revenue loss to the State of California and the local economic loss resulting from visitors not having access to the impacted facilities.</p> <p>1. <u>Brown's Ravine.</u> This existing facility could be temporarily expanded across the inlet from the marina on property owned by the Bureau (see Exhibit C). Sufficient land area is available to accommodate launch facilities, campgrounds and/or day use areas. In addition, the facilities at Hobie Cove could be temporarily expanded to accommodate displaced visitors from other impacted facilities.</p> <p>2. <u>Monte Vista Campground.</u> The former private Monte Vista campground encompassing several hundred acres (located three miles north of Green Valley Road on Salmon Falls Road) could be put back into use to accommodate displaced visitors (see Exhibit D). There are existing roads (which would need improvement), water, telephone, electricity, and even BBQ pits available at this site. A boat launch and small parking lot could be located on the eastern tip of this site.</p> <p>3. <u>Old Salmon Falls Road.</u> For years, this facility (see Exhibit D) has provided an alternative launch location for small fishing boats and jet skis. Once the water level reached 435', the lower gate was opened and small craft launched here during the peak season (May through September). Once water receded below 435', the lower gate was closed to prevent vehicles from impacting the shoreline. With minor improvements to the road and parking lot and the return of portable restrooms, this facility could accommodate displaced visitors with small water craft during the peak season. The launch access was closed a few years ago, because FLSRA staffing hours were not available to adequately monitor this location. Given the potential restriction to alternative launch facilities, additional staffing hours may be required if this launch facility was reopened. This appears to be a very low cost alternative to provide some additional access.</p> <p>4. <u>Beals Point.</u> This existing facility could be temporarily expanded. Sufficient land area is available to accommodate new launch facilities, campgrounds and/or day use areas.</p> <p>5. <u>Granite Bay.</u> This existing facility could be temporarily expanded. Sufficient land area is available to accommodate new launch facilities, campgrounds, and/or day use areas.</p> <p>With over 18,000 acres and 18 existing facilities identified in the EIS, there appear to be many alternative locations that could be expanded to accommodate displaced recreation users in the FLSRA. The EIS/EIR did not study even one alternative. The recreational impacts can be mitigated and they are avoidable.</p> <p>Folsom Economic Development Corporation understands that flood control improvements are extremely important and we do not want to see them delayed. However, the draft EIS/EIR, which came into public awareness on January 10 has numerous fundamental flaws and is likely to face legal challenges. The EIS/EIR fails to consider reasonable alternatives that would dramatically reduce the local negative economic effects. The EIS/EIR also significantly underestimates the magnitude of these local losses.] We request that the Bureau of Reclamation work with all flood control stakeholders to keep the project on course while a solution is identified that minimizes the hardship placed on the local community. We look forward to a revised document that includes this analysis and includes mitigation measures that will be implemented to achieve this goal.</p>



No.	Name	Comment
		Sincerely, Robert H Miller III
314	Greg Cook	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am writing to state my concern about the seemingly misguided idea of closing Folsom Point so that it can be used as a staging area for construction equipment in the planned upgrade of Folsom Dam. [#314-1 Recreation lake access closure] While I understand the need to have effective flood control for the area, it seems that there has to be a better alternative than using a highly popular recreation site for staging equipment.] From the standpoint of a local resident, it appears that the Bureau of Reclamation provides little significance on the local impact of its actions. First, Folsom Dam road was closed due to a perceived terrorist threat—an obvious sledge hammer approach to a potential problem that caused serious harm to businesses and quality of life in the Folsom area. [#314-2 Recreation remaining lake access locations] Now, it appears that the USBR is taking a similar approach to finding a convenient staging area for its equipment. This does not appear to be a well thought out plan and highlights the Bureau’s lack of sensitivity to local quality of life issues. Closing Folsom point would require local residents to access Folsom lake from either Browns Ravine Marina, which is already over crowded, or cross through downtown Folsom which is a nightmare due to the Folsom Dam road closure and would further congestion problems in the area with boater and beachgoer traffic on its way to Beals or Granite Bay lake access areas.]There have got to be better options. The obvious one would be to use some of the vast Folsom Prison land next to the dam that is unused by anything other than a few cows. I would hope that the environmental impact of these issues is thoroughly and fairly assessed before closing Folsom Point.</p>
315	Jeremy G. Bernau	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver and Mrs. Victorine,</p> <p>Bernau Development Corporation is the owner of a subdivision named “Morning Walk” currently under construction located at Elvies Lane and E. Natoma Street immediately adjacent to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area south of Dike 8 (see Exhibit A). Unfortunately, I was not notified directly by the Bureau of Reclamation of the EIS/EIR that is currently circulating even though the impacts from the proposed project to my property are substantial. [#315-1 Public Involvement notification] I do not feel that the notice was sufficient] or the potential impacts clearly defined so that I am able to evaluate what measures are adequate to mitigate the impacts of this massive project.</p> <p>Below I have listed a few comments and questions. However, I would like to meet with Bureau staff to find out exactly what will be the impacts to my current project and how the Bureau intends to mitigate these impacts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [#315-2 Traffic] Please indicate the volume of truck traffic that is projected on E. Natoma Street and on the property immediately north of my subdivision. 2. [#315-3 Noise] Please provide projected noise levels that will reach my property boundary from the processing facility, truck traffic or other construction work. 3. [#315-4 Air Quality fugitive dust] How much fugitive dust is expected to be generated? How will that dust be controlled? 4. [#315-5 Geo and Soils asbestos] Has soils sampling been done to determine if naturally occurring asbestos is present in the excavated material? What mitigation measures will be implemented to control this potential hazard? 5. [#315-6 Impacts and Mitigation to specific property] Based on the information presented in the EIS/EIR, I cannot determine the impacts to my property because there is not enough detail regarding the specific construction work or the processing facility proposed. Please provide this detail and specific mitigation measures, so I can evaluate the impacts. 6. [#315-7 PD alternate location for processing] Can the processing facility be moved to the Bureau’s property to the southeast of Folsom Point? There appears to be plenty of room for the facility, storage staging and even reasonable buffers.

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>7. [#315-8 Recreation lake access closure and PD alternate location for haul route] I am unsure why Folsom Point needs to be closed during construction. It appears that a haul route could be located on the lakeside of dike 8 and continue between the boat ramp parking lot and the Folsom Point access road. The road could cross or go under the Folsom Point access road to reach the processing facility (recommended location in #5 above) and MIAD.</p> <p>8. [#315-9 Visual] Several of the lots at Morning Walk have a view over dike 8 of Folsom Lake. The homes on these lots will command a premium because of this view. How will this project impact the view shed of these lots?</p> <p>9. [#315-10 Recreation lake access closure] Lake access is an important factor in the buying decision of my potential homeowners. Not having access to Folsom Point will negatively impact the marketability and value of these homes. What measures can be implemented so that Folsom Point can remain open?</p> <p>10. [#315-11 Recreation Mitigation] There appears to be no consideration given in the EIS/EIR to finding alternative locations for visitors that may be turned away from FLSRA facilities that are impacted by this project. Please evaluate increasing capacity at other existing facilities so visitors can still have access to the FLSRA.</p> <p>11. [#315-12 Socioeconomics] The economic model seriously under estimates the impact to the local community. The model does not include the reduction in sales of big ticket items that will result because over 815,000 visitors will not be able access the lake. There is no reason to buy a home by the lake if you can't access the lake. There is no reason to buy a boat if you won't be able to use it. The model should accurately reflect the true economic loss to the community.] While I understand the importance of this flood control project, I am very surprised at the lack of notice and the failure of the project sponsor to mitigate any of the recreational impacts that left unmitigated will result in a substantial economic loss to Bernau Development Corporation and the surrounding community. Since the EIS/EIR incorrectly states that the recreational impacts are unavoidable after failing to consider <u>any</u> alternatives that could maintain recreational access to Folsom Point and other FLSRA facilities, it is likely that this project will be delayed as a result of a legal challenge. I would ask the project sponsor to study all reasonable alternatives to the closure of Folsom Point and/or provide temporary launch, day use and campground facilities at other FLSRA locations for visitors that are impacted because of this project. I also look forward to a detailed description of how the project will impact my property and the specific mitigation measures proposed to ensure that those impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance.</p>
316	Catherine Vestito	<p>[#316-1 Recreation lake access closure] Please reconsider on closing Folsom Point boat launch. With a population of 60,000 and growing, it would be far too dangerous trying to use Brown's Ravine for boat launching this summer as well as congesting traffic on Green Valley more than it already is. Please find another alternative.</p>
317	Jeff Kirsten	<p>Hello Mr. Oliver and Ms. Victorine,</p> <p>[#317-1 PD alternate staging areas] Please explore alternatives with Sacramento area communities and governments to closing park and lake access points during dam retrofit. I believe people would understand if there were simply no other way to get the job done, but it is not clear how hard alternatives have been pushed. Folsom lake boat launch and park access fills to closure on many summer weekends as it stands. Restricting access further will create tension instead of a relaxing and positive atmosphere among the many people in the area who try to visit the lake.</p>
318	Jeff Mittner	<p>Dear Shawn Oliver/Becky Victorine:</p> <p>[#318-1 PD alternate staging areas] I urge you to review and consider City of Folsom's alternatives to this closure.] My wife and I purchased a home here in Folsom 4 years ago, and a major determining factor in our decision to move here was the accessibility to</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Folsom Lake and all its wonders. Folsom Point is a 10 minute jog from our house. I know six people personally, friends and family alike, who use Folsom Point's boat launch religiously. Four members of this group continue to use the launch even in late autumn and winter, not just the summer months.</p> <p>I would agree there are other access sites relatively nearby. [#318-2 Socioeconomics businesses] However, I would like you to consider the economic impact as well. My wife works for a small business located at the corner of Natoma St. and Blue Ravine Rd. They rely significantly on revenues generated from visitors to Folsom Point. You need to be aware that a number of locally owned businesses located in proximity to Folsom Point are in exactly the same boat.</p> <p>A seven-year closure would tear a chunk out of the heart of this community. Again, I implore you to reconsider such a potentially grave decision.</p>
319	Brian Joder	<p>Hello Bureau of Reclamation,</p> <p>[#319-1 Public Involvement notification] I am flabbergasted that the first I heard of this impending closure of our largest natural local resource was on the last day of comments accepted about this proposal. It seems to me that the public should have a little more input for this project and a bit more advanced notice about these activities.</p> <p>Closing the Folsom point area would be a huge blow to the area. The recreation from Folsom Lake is why I moved here! On average I am at the Folsom Point area three times a week. This would seriously curtail my and many other peoples outdoor activities. Please consider public input and a way to keep Folsom Point open during this period.</p>
320	David and Karen Delparte	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>[#320-1 Recreation lake access closure] I we are totally against Folsom Point being closed for any length of time. We bought a boat last year and use the Folsom Point Launch almost exclusively. [#320-2 Recreation remaining lake access] There are no real alternatives! Brown's is often crowded and could not handle the increased use that closing Folsom Point would cause. Granite Bay is quite a-bit further and is often full.] We want to be able to use our boat in a convenient manner. This is part of the reason we moved to Folsom. Please consider other options. I should be possible to keep Folsom Point open for most of the construction of the new bridge with just a little thought and consideration.</p>
321	Kelly Beninga	<p>Dear Shawn and Becky -</p> <p>[#321-1 Purpose and Need] I read with dismay about your plans to close facilities at Folsom Lake for dam construction. I am wondering if this construction is really necessary, or is this another government boondogle. Is the safety need here really based on sound engineering practices? The Lake is only half full now and hasn't been full in years. Because of increased water usage and reduced snow pack due to global warming, this trend is likely to continue. Have you considered these factors in your analysis, or are your calculations based on antiquated data? To disrupt an entire community and spend millions of dollars over an extremely unlikely failure scenario is ridiculous. The way this project has been handled is another example of why Americans mistrust our government.</p>
322	Peg Coverdale	<p>Why does Fulsome always have to take the hit??????</p> <p>We going along just fine until the Dam Road was closed and backed up traffic (80% of it from El Dorado and Placer Counties) onto our streets and into our small town creating havoc. Now they are going to start a Two or three year project to build a new bridge for these same out of town cars, and with this construction we will have air pollution, noise pollution and large construction trucks running up and down our already crowded streets.</p> <p>[#321-1 Recreation lake access closure and PD alternate staging areas] And now you want to close Floss's only access to the lake - Fulsome Point...where Fulsome residents spend most of their summers, swimming, boating, picnicking and having reunions. You are going to tear up this lovely spot and demolish it for a staging area for dam repair. Can't an undeveloped site be found????? With this (for seven years!!!!!!) comes air pollution, noise pollution and large truck traffic to our already crowed streets. Most cities and towns</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>would give anything to have a park like this and you are going to destroy this one. I don't know whose decision this was, but it was a really stupid one. I think its time El Dorado and Placer Counties come up with a spot on their portion of the lake that could to used for this staging area, since its their people who benefit the most.Fulsome residents(especially on the North side) have done enough, now its someone else's turn.... Enough is enough.....</p> <p>If this e-mail is a little disjointed, its because I'm a 78 year old grandma and computers are a Mystery to me. I hope you get this....</p>
323	Maureen Snyder	<p>Hello, [#323-1 Recreation lake access closure] I am writing to express my concern over the plan to close Dyke 8 during the construction of the new Dam. We are residents of El Dorado Hills and use Dyke 8 regularly for lake access with our jet skis. [#323-2 Recreation remaining lake access] During the summer Browns Ravine is closed/full on a regular basis with launching of water craft directed to Dyke 8 or Beal's Point. My honest feeling is that my annual pass will be of no value because me access to the lake will be so limited, unrealizable and extremely inconvenient. Please make a better choice during the construction process and do not close Dyke 8.</p>
324	Chris Wagner	<p>To Whom it may concern, [#324-1 Recreation lake access closure] I am emailing to say that I am firmly against the closing of the Folsom, Beal and Granite Bay point. This would severely hinder recreational activities and revenue from boaters.</p>
325	Kristin and Robert Jeffrey	<p>[#325-1 Recreation lake access closure] I am writing this letter to protest the closure of Folsom Point. This access is one of the main entries into the Lake and allows for parking of boat and trailer. It is the only immediate Lake access to Folsom residents that can accommodate the large volume of boats put in and taken out of the water. [#325-2 Recreation remaining lake access] Brown's Ravine certainly isn't equipped for this, thus leaving Beale's point and Granite Bay entrances as the only remote access. We moved to Folsom because of the easy access to the lake and had just purchased a boat this Fall so we could be on and off the lake in 5 minutes. Closure of Folsom Point is unacceptable especially for 7 years. [#325-3 Socioeconomics] Not only does it limit the use of the Lake, but the amount of lost revenue to the City of Folsom will be enormous. Please find an alternative place to house the equipment.</p>
326	Don Hendricks	<p>I am a resident of Folsom of 8 years. The closure of the Dam Road has diminished our quality of life enough. [#326-1 Recreation lake access closure] The thought that closing our access off to the only feasible access by bike or walking to lake is outrageous. I realize the dam needs to be raised to hold more water. The idea is a total disregard for us residents of Folsom. I live two blocks from the lake and we are not boaters, but I have children and a dog that frequent Folsom Point. There must other alternatives for your staging area. Please reconsider you position. It almost appears to be a personal issue vendetta against us.</p>
327	Cheryl Walters	<p>Dear Interested Parties: [#327-1 Recreation lake access closure] Please don't close Folsom Point! Like most nearby residents, we were attracted to this area by the easy access to Folsom Point, where activities like hiking, biking, fishing swimming, waterskiing and boating are close to us. We did not move to Folsom and don't have grandchildren and our grown children visit to they can go to the newest McDonald's or Starbucks. They like to walk or take their bikes up to the lake where they can enjoy the natural beauty surrounding the reservoir and participate in the many activities that go along with it. We share the area with many of nature's inhabitants as well, seeing bluebirds and owls, red tailed hawks and turkey vultures, even an occasional rattler or a coyote running through the grass. [#327-2 Socioeconomics] This loss would be a sad occasion for Folsom, and the surrounding boaters and fishermen who frequent our lake and drop some change in Folsom while they are here. Please consider the negative impact on our community before you close this natural gem.] Cheryl Walters, Folsom resident for 9 years.</p>
328	Sharon Kindel	<p>[#328-1 Genera]I Please understand that 7 years is a lifetime to many of us. Do not close Folsom Point for a lifetime.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
	Rosalie Barton	
329	Obie Miller	[#329-1 Recreation lake access closure] 7 years is too long to leave this key recreational access point closed to the public. Our family uses is 2-3 times per month, all year long.
330	Clint Claassen	To whom it may concern, [#330-1 Recreation lake access closure] I heard today that you are considering closing the Folsom Recreation Area for seven years. I understand the reasoning for this, and as a Sacramento resident I would benified from the increased flood protection. However, I think there has to be a better way. I am a mountain biker and I use the area at least once a week with the local mountain bike club the Folsom Breakouts. This would devistate our team. We have been riding the area trails every Tuesday for 26 years! I can also imagine what the closure would do to the local economy and I would think it would be devastating. Especially in the summer and fall! Please do not proceed with this proposal.
331	Jennifer Claassen	To Whom It May Concern: [#331-1 Recreation lake access closure] Please, please, please don't close the Folsom Point Recreation Area! All year round, my husband is an avid mountain biker and goes to the area at least a couple times a week to blow off steam after work or enjoy his weekend riding with friends. He would be devastated if you closed it off, and so would I!! I'm not about to deal with him if he can't ride around... he'd drive me crazy! For the sake of my sanity... please keep it open!
332	Russ Fay	[#332-1 Recreation lake access closure] I would strongly oppose Folsom Point. There has to be another option. I live here because of the easy access I have to the trails around Folsom Lake. I am planning to retire here soon. It seems like a bypass trail around the point could be built so that there would be no impact to the daily users.
333	Anonymous	[#333-1 General] DO NOT CLOSE DYKE 8 THAT WOULD BE A BIG MISTAKE. I HAVE BEEN GOING THERE FOR 40 YEARS, STORE YOUR EQUIPMENT SOMEPLACE ELSE.
334	Matthew R. Mahood,	<p>January 26, 2007</p> <p>Bureau of Reclamation Mr. Shawn Oliver 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 95630</p> <p>Re: Sacramento Metro Chamber Comments on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver</p> <p>The Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce represents over 2,500 member businesses and business organizations in the six-county Sacramento region. The Metro Chamber serves as the "Voice of Business" in the six-county Sacramento region and is the leading proponent of regional cooperation, encouraging local elected officials to cooperate across jurisdictional lines to address important public policy issues that impact jobs and the economy. We are writing to request that the Bureau of Reclamation provided additional consideration to avoiding and/or mitigating the economic damage of restricting recreation at the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, specifically in regards to Folsom Point recreation area, and portions of Beal's Point and Granite Bay recreation facilities.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Since its founding in 1895, the Sacramento Metro Chamber has been a leading force in supporting the construction of critical infrastructure to improve the economy, improve flood control and enhance the quality of life in the greater Sacramento region.</p> <p>The Metro Chamber endorses the Folsom Dam Raise Project to provide greater flood protection for Sacramento. [#334-1 PD alternate haul and staging] We respectfully ask that the Bureau amend its' plans to include inexpensive engineering solutions, such as rerouting their haul road and relocating their staging areas so that public entry to Folsom Lake will remain open during their extended construction period.</p> <p>This much needed project will increase flood protection for the Sacramento Region to the 1 in 200 year level. However, during the seven year construction period, public access to Folsom Lake will be drastically curtailed. Granite Bay and Beal's Point entries will be partially closed, Folsom Point will be closed completely and Brown's Ravine will be impacted by overuse due to the other closures. [#334-2 Socioeconomics] It is estimated by the Bureau that 816,000 visitors will be turned away with an economic loss to our communities of \$50,000,000. These statistics are troubling. We respectfully request that you provide additional consideration before moving forward with this project.</p> <p>There appears to be inexpensive engineering solutions to the Folsom Point closure that were not considered in the EIR/EIS. Specifically we believe that during the different stages of the overall project, <u>material processing</u> could potentially be sited at the old observation point, which is closed to the public, and in Section 29 near the Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (MIAD) which does not have public access. We think it is of note that both of these alternatives are actually closer to the work sites. In regards to the <u>disposal site</u> we suggest Dike 7 and 8 areas could be utilized as disposal sites and leave Folsom Point free or designate it as a low priority disposal site. And, we suggest a slight alteration of the <u>haul road route</u> from that contemplated along the shoreline to slightly inland through Folsom Point passing through a culvert under the present public right-of-way.</p> <p>We ask that alternative solutions be given serious consideration and adopted so that our community will not suffer unnecessary economic disturbance and does not dramatically downgrade the quality of life activities people from the greater Sacramento region have when using the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-end;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Matthew R. Mahood, President & CEO</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>John A. Lambert Chair, Board of Directors</p> </div> </div> <p>Cc: Governor Schwarzenegger</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		United States Corps of Engineers Sacramento Region Congressional Delegation Sacramento Region State Legislative Delegation Sacramento County Supervisors El Dorado County Supervisors City of Folsom City Council
335	Laura Hudak	[#335-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am writing to voice my concern of the closure of Folsom Point / Dike 8. This is a great recreational area for people in the Folsom community. With all of the different closures, there will no longer be convenient access to Folsom Lake. This area is used by so many different people (boaters, family picnics, scuba classes/training) and it would be a shame to see it closed.
336	Kay Ann Markham	[#336-1 Recreational Access Closure] My family has lived right down the street from Folsom Point (formerly known as Dyke 8) for fifteen years and we have thoroughly enjoyed and have taken advantage of the recreational opportunities that go along with such close proximity/access to Folsom Lake (boating, fishing, jogging, walking, etc.). Close access to the lake was one of the primary reasons we purchased our home. Closure of Folsom Point would be a loss not only for my family and the surrounding neighborhood but for the entire city. Folsom Point is the closest access to the lake for many, if not most, of the citizens in Folsom. It would be a travesty if the citizens of Folsom were denied access to the lake on top of being forced to endure seven years of traffic impacts due to the project itself (impacts that are in addition to the existing traffic problems caused by closure of the dam road). Additionally, the loss of recreational visitors would have a negative impact on the city economically. Folsom Point needs to remain completely accessible to the public during the entire duration of the safety and flood control project.
337	Jodi Wright	[#337-1 Recreational Access Closure] As a resident of the Parkway and a boat owner, I am vehemently against the closure of Folsom Point. The Granite Bay boat launch fills up fast and many times during the summer you cannot even launch your boat from that boat launch. We usually launch our boat from Folsom Point because it is less crowded and only 1.5 miles from our house. As a Folsom resident, I am greatly concerned about the loss of income this would cause my community. There has to be another location. Seven years to be closed is much too long, and that is assuming everything would go as planned. The closure would more than likely go longer if deadlines were not met. The BLM must find another alternative. Closing Folsom Point for seven years is unacceptable!
338	Anonymous	[#338-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am certain there is another answer than closing Family point, we are a Folsom resident and use this picnic and launch facility several times a week in the boating months. The lake is why we live in this area and Family point is the launch facility we along with hundreds of other visitors use. Seven years is along time to close anything and as with most time estimates is probably well short of the actual date. You should look for an alternative access for the duration of this construction project and maintain the value of this lake access to all residents and visitors. Please, Please, Please DO NOT close our community access to the lake!!!!!!!
339	Kevin A. Miller	Dear Shawn Oliver, [#339-1 Recreational Access Closure] We are appalled at the decision to close Folsom Point access. We have lived in Folsom since 1991 and have enjoyed the use of the access since then. In the fall, we fish and summer, boat camp and ski. We have a \$14,000 boat with accessories. We just finished building a RV access for the boat that cost \$5,000. In the summer months the access is always crowded in the mid-day hours. Where will these boaters go? Think how additional crowding will create unsafe launching elsewhere. We try to get on the lake early day to keep from waiting for long access. Even the wait makes more sense then to drive all the way around, (since the dam is closed) to Beal Point. In addition to the extra gasoline, the extra congestion on Riley, Rainbow Bridge and Folsom Auburn Rd. Beal Point can be crowded and unsafe too. I can only imagine what

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>the additional demand will create. Why are there no options? Why can't the project include creating an access? I am sure the Core of Engineers can figure something. First it's Folsom Dam closure, now our favorite and almost only launch access. If I had known this was happening, I would have sold our boat and saved the \$5,000 boat access we just built. (I finished the gate yesterday)</p>
340	Dianna Bowling	<p>[#340-1 Recreational Access Closure] I oppose the closure of the Folsom Point Recreation Area. Find another place, don't take away our communities access to this area.</p>
341	Kim Carrasco	<p>Shawn Oliver: [#341-1 Public Invovlement] The manner in which this proposed closure was presented to residents is ridiculous. Closure by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation of seven years is even more ridiculous. Seven months would be too long. Count me as a resident who is opposed to staging, storage or ANY closure of this treasure.</p>
342	Richard A. Shaw	<p>Dear M Finnegan, I am usually in total agreement with the work and plans of the Bureau of Reclamation in providing the flood protection, power and recreation that we need. I agree that providing flood protection for the Sacramento Valley is necessary and vital to the well being of the residents, but I don't agree that closing Folsom Point is the only option for achieving that goal.</p> <p>[#342-1 Recreational Access Closure] Folsom Lake is a publicly owned lake but it only has a few access points for the public. Most of the remaining shore access is privately owned. When the dam road overlook was closed it affected traffic flow, but did not impact recreation much. However, the closing of Folsom Point restricts the access for recreational use to only one access point on the south side of the lake. Since the ramps already close early in the day because of high usage, we will have to tow our boats through town on busy afternoons to launch at one of the three access points on the north side of the lake. Folsom streets cannot accomodate this impact, which will happen.</p> <p>[#342-2 Wildlife] I am a biologist and hiker and I regularly hike through the open areas around Folsom Point. I have directly observed a great horned owl and a bald eagle. I believe that they are attempting to rehabilitate Folsom Point. Your biologists should be consulted on this for verification.</p> <p>I also serve on the school board for the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District. We adults are all concerned about the health and fitness of our children. Folsom Point is used by children for recreation for many months of the year, adding an incentive to get out and play with their families.</p> <p>I ask you to consider other options for staging the work on the spillway. We would be willing to work out some compromises that will accomodate the needs and desires of the Bureau of Reclamation and the residents of the area as well.</p> <p>Again, I support your efforts and hope that we can reach an agreeable solution.</p>
343	Denise Hackett	<p>Mr. Oliver, [#343-1 Recreational Access Closure] Please add my families name to the list of those in Folsom outraged by the proposed closing of Folsom Point until 2013. Folsom lake is one of the most attractive features of life in Folsom and this closure would require residents to find alternate sources to enter the lake such as Eldorado Hills and Granite Bay. The traffic through Folsom due to the dam closure is already very extreme. If Folsom Point is closed, all summer, people will be driving through town to get to alternate sites for access. Please reconsider this decision as it will have a great negative impact on our fine ciy.</p> <p>I do not believe that the bureau of reclamation has considered all options as there must be a better alternative.</p>
344	Debra Rose	<p>[#344-1 General] am a frequent user of Lake Folsom, and I subscribe to an annual pass, I am opposed to closing the boat ramp and</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		Dike 8 for launching and other recreational uses.
345	Chris Jennings	<p>Shawn, [#345-1 Geology/Soils/Asbestos] Thanks for the info. I've briefly looked at a draft already on line. The potential risks associated with naturally occurring asbestos - a big deal around here given the additional millions spent to mitigate the risk at the new local high school - is given remarkably little attention (no sampling, no risk assessment studies, etc.) in the document and should be revisited. [#345-2 Recreational Mitigation] With regards to the loss of recreational opportunity with the proposed closure of Folsom Point, the EIR states that an "RC-1" mitigation measure will be instituted ("All construction related damages to recreation facilities will be replaced in kind by the appropriate agency..."). What exactly is being proposed to replace in kind seven years of lost utility for a major nearby recreational outlet? Especially since all other similar outlets will also be negatively affected? [#345-3 Wildlife] With regards to the burrowing owls, have any walking surveys been performed at the affected areas?</p>
346	Leslie Grayson	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver and Ms. Victorine, [#346-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am writing to express my dismay at the proposal to close Folsom Point for an extended period while the damn is retrofitted. Given the extremely high level of use of this facility/area, the corresponding public impact and the economic impact (both for business and for individuals that have made significant financial investments based upon this public access), other locations should be identified to serve as construction staging areas. I recognize the importance of the retrofitting project. I believe that there are other alternatives for staging that don't have such a significant impact on the local population. We're not just talking about recreation. There are always alternatives. It is my hope that you will find them.</p>
347	Ronald Stork Friends of the River	<p>Shawn Oliver January 26, 2007 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 95630 Annalena Bronsen Reclamation Board/Department of Water Resources 3310 El Camino Avenue, Rm. 140 Sacramento, CA 95821 Becky Victorine U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento District 1325 J. Street Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Re: Comments on the U.S.A.C.E. Folsom Dam Modifications and Folsom Dam Raise Draft post Authorization Change (PAC) Report and the U.S.B.R./California Reclamation Board Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. Friends of the River offers the following comments and its support for alternatives or refined alternatives that feature a Folsom Dam auxiliary spillway capable of making objective-release flood releases (in combination with Folsom Dam's existing outlets) from the bottom of Folsom Reservoir's flood pool, minor raises of Folsom Dam to increase the size of the available flood pool, and environmental features such as the improvements to Folsom Dam powerhouse inlets and environmental restoration and recreational improvements in the Lower American River Parkway and Folsom State Recreation Area.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We also support operational refinements to take advantage of new capabilities of the proposed project and look forward to working with Federal agencies, DWR, and SAFCA to develop them. Comments on Specific Sections:</p> <p>PAC pp. ES-1 & 1-2: The background discussion could benefit from greater precision. We quote the following section of the PAC report:</p> <p>In February 1986, major storms in Northern California caused record flood flows in the American River basin. Unprecedented high outflows from Folsom Dam and Reservoir, together with high flows in the Sacramento River, caused water levels to rise above the design freeboard of levees protecting the Sacramento River area.</p> <p>And in the draft EIS and EIR, the following statement consistent with the above was made: Dam operators at Folsom and Nimbus Dams were required to release approximately 130,000 cfs, 15,000 cfs more than the downstream levees were designed to accommodate as a sustained rate. Water levels rose well above the designated freeboard of downstream levees... p. 1-5.</p> <p>Readers might conclude from this discussion the following: 1) The 1986 American River flows were <i>record</i> inflows, 2) these record flood flows <i>required</i> the release of "unprecedented" high flows from Folsom Dam, and 3) there was <i>widespread</i> encroachment of design freeboard of Sacramento Area levees. There are problems with each of these statements that may mislead the reader.</p> <p>Record flows: The 1986 166,000 cfs 3-day mean volume unregulated inflows did exceed the previous 1964 3-day volume record inflow of 140,339 cfs. However, 1986 unregulated inflows did not exceed 1964 record mean 1-day unregulated inflows (171,000 cfs versus 183,240 cfs)¹ or peak unregulated inflows (220,000² or 255,000³ cfs versus 260,000 cfs).</p> <p>In addition and more importantly, in its official rain-flood analysis for the American River Basin, the Corps has concluded the following: Based on descriptions of the 1862 event, the Corps supports the position that the estimated volume of the 1862 event should not be less than that of the 1997 event because the 1862 event resembles both the point precipitation and antecedent conditions which occurred during the 1997 event.</p> <p>4) The 1997 3-day volume was 164,000 cfs (essentially the same as 1986) with a much larger mean 1-day volume of 248,000 cfs than experienced in 1986 (ACE 1998 Rainflood analysis). Thus it appears that the Corps believes that the 1862 flood was also larger than the 1986 event—this unrecorded 19th century but still observed and estimated event prior to 1986 that served as the beginning foundation of the design considerations for Folsom Dam.</p> <p>5) Implication that unprecedented high outflows were required by high inflows: In a review of 1986 operations Folsom Dam, the National Research Council concluded that operations based on then existing operational rules would not have resulted in releases above the objective release from Folsom Dam.⁶ The NRC described this as follows:</p> <p>On February 13 and 14 the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) began preparations for a full flood fight, given computer projections of a[n] extraordinary storm approaching the state from across the Pacific (CDWR, 1986). The American River flood flows began in earnest on February 15, with inflows rising to over 60,000 cfs early the next day, but Figure 2.1 shows that Folsom operators did not begin to evacuate the flood control storage volume, nor did releases from Folsom match the inflows to the lake.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Operators expressed a major concern for the effect of large Folsom releases on recreational facilities in the lower American River floodway; releases were held to 20,000 cfs for 36 hours. This is inconsistent with the 1977 USACE flood control diagram in force at the time; the diagram states that when Folsom storage is in the flood control reservation the water "shall be released as rapidly as possible" subject to ramping limits.</p> <p>Even after increased releases from Folsom began on February 16, and before they reached the 115,000-cfs limit, Folsom releases continued to lag behind inflows into Folsom Lake by 30,000 cfs or more. USACE-prescribed ramping limits of "15,000 cfs during any 2-hour period" do not appear to have limited the rate of increase of Folsom releases during the 1986 flood, nor were physical release rate limits at Folsom Dam a constraint given the initial elevation of the reservoir.</p> <p>If the Bureau of Reclamation had been able to more closely match outflow to inflows while inflows were less than 115,000 cfs, then releases into the American River would not have exceeded 115,000 cfs during the 1986 flood using the nominal storage capacity of the reservoir, even without anticipation of the Auburn cofferdam failure. Fortunately, disaster was averted by the use of extra surcharge storage in Folsom and by the ability of the downstream channel and levee system to handle releases of 130,000 cfs.</p> <p>7) In a partial response to this 1986 operational history that would be reviewed by the NRC, the Flood Management Plan developed by the Sacramento District A.C.E. and Reclamation in 1995 incorporated policies to avoid excessive delays in making required flood releases from an encroached reservoir flood pool.</p> <p>8) The NRC's subsequent conclusion is not inconsistent with Folsom Dam's design criteria. As you know, the original reservoir inflow design flood for Folsom Dam had a peak inflow of 340,000 cfs, well above the unregulated peak flow experienced at the dam in 1986.</p> <p>Encroachment of design freeboard: While the 1986 event did cause significant encroachments into the design freeboard of some Sacramento area levees, the Natomas East Main Drain (Steelhead Creek) being the principal example (a circumstance that resulted in the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency's [SAFCA] North Area Local Project), the high water in 1986 did not result in general encroachment into the design freeboard of Sacramento area levees. A description of design freeboard of American River levees and the 1986 flows was made published in the January 1995 Proceedings of Phase Two, The Lower American River Task Force. The Proceedings assessed existing levee freeboard conditions at various flows along the American river and concluded the following:</p> <p>For a release of 115,000 cfs, the existing minimum is the same for both left and right bank levees (about 6 feet). The 130,000 cfs release condition also has about the same freeboard at the lowest point (interpolated to about 5.5 feet). p. L-2, L-3.</p> <p>As described in more detail in the Proceedings, the original (before Folsom Dam and the accompanying levees) design freeboard of the then existing American River levees was three feet. Presently, the design freeboard varies by river reach between three or five feet of freeboard (at 180,000 cfs) or three feet of freeboard (at 152,000 cfs). Thus, with the important exception of some of the levees that conveyed flows from creeks upstream of Natomas, the 1986 event did not result in flows that would be necessary for encroachments into the design freeboard of Sacramento area levees.</p> <p>[#347-1 Hydrology Existing Conditions] In light of these comments, the final documents should be revised to provide the reader with a</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>more accurate, complete, and useful description of the background circumstances that resulted in the last two decades of flood-control planning in the Sacramento area.</p> <p>PAC Report, p. 3-2: The PAC report asserts the following: To date, and based on current technology, no reliable forecast-based operation has been identified that could be implemented without the potential for both induced flooding in other areas of the Central Valley and major impacts to other water resources outputs from Folsom Reservoir.</p> <p>This statement makes inferences as to facts and law that both appear to be both premature and in error. The draft EIS/EIR appears to provide a more careful and satisfactory explanation of the process and considerations that may result in operational (including forecast-based) changes to Folsom Reservoir operations once construction is complete:</p> <p>The Corps and Reclamation as directed by, and/or authorized by Congress, and under the appropriate agency authorities and agreements would update the existing Water Control Manual of 1987 or develop a new water plan and control manual. Upon selection of either preferred joint Folsom DS/FDR alternative or stand-alone dam safety hydrologic risk reduction or flood damage reduction alternatives, the Corps as the lead agency, in cooperation with Reclamation, would determine the basis for the updated/new plan. Decisions would be based on existing authorizations or reauthorizations, or new authorizations.</p> <p>The updated/new plan would analyze weather, basin wetness, precipitation, upstream reservoir storage, and reservoir inflow forecasts to help determine appropriate comprehensive flood control operations procedures. The environmental impacts on all pertinent aspects of the human environment, and the natural environment, and the natural environment would be evaluated in a separate environmental compliance document. The Water Control Manual would likely go through multiple revisions as the various structural modifications are completed at the Folsom Facility, but it is expected that a Final Updated Flood Management Plan and Flood Control Manual would be completed before construction on the Folsom DS/FDR project is completed.</p> <p>This Folsom DS/FDR EIS/EIR generally considers operations affected by proposed structural modifications; however, a detailed analysis of operational impacts cannot be determined at this time. Upon the selection of a preferred alternative(s), Reclamation, the Corps, SAFCA, and the DWR/Reclamation Board would fully coordinate and address relevant congressional directives to evaluate the existing requirements related to operations and consider possible changes as appropriate. The environmental impacts associated with proposed changes and operational impacts required for supplemental environmental compliance documentation [sic]. The required compliance documentation shall be completed in parallel with a Final Updated Flood Management Plan and Water Control Manual, and is anticipated to be completed in 2010. pp. 2-69, 2-70.</p> <p>Other similar discussions concerning revisions to the Water Control Manual can be found throughout the draft EIS/EIR (pp. 1-8, 1-9, 1-43, for example) Although the draft EIS/EIR language would argue that a critique of the PAC report's conclusionary statements regarding forecast-based operations is premature, comments and a responsive revision to the final documents are probably warranted. Therefore, the following observations are offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Central Valley areas that might experience (slightly earlier) induced flooding from advanced releases in very large floods are part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project river and bypass system. The rights to make operational flood releases into these areas already exist and are routinely exercised.

No.	Name	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forecast-based operations during very large floods (such as advanced releases before reservoir flood-reservation encroachment, and pre-emptive releases [releases in excess of objective-release constraints to avoid making leveebreaking larger releases])—and during more routine situations (conditional storage into reservoir flood pools)—were operational requirements in the ACE Folsom Reservoir Regulation Manual from 1956 to 1987. Congress directed the Corps to resume such operations in 1993 and again directed the Corps to update these operations in 1999 when it authorized outlet improvements at Folsom Dam in the Water Resources Development Act of that year. Forecast-based operations were also part of the Folsom Dam raise project described in project documents authorized by Congress in 2004. • The Sacramento District A.C.E. developed a Spring forecast-based operations plan, with analysis and rationale, for implementation on a trial basis and presented the plan to the California Weather Symposium at the 2003 Lower American River Science Conference.¹⁰ • Technical experts at the many annual presentations of the California Weather Symposium, including Corps, DWR, and National Weather Service staff have generally shown considerable confidence about their ability to predict very large floods in the American River Basin. • Any multipurpose reservoir operation involves a balance of risks between flood-control and water conservation/power interests. Forecast-based operations preserve that balance of risks but enhance the multipurpose benefits of the dam with operations that benefit both interests—with both early flood-control releases (for very large events) and conditional storage (during most years when very large floods do not appear). <p>If language in the PAC Report cannot be constructed to provide the reader with a clearer grasp of the opportunities and considerations involved in developing a revised Water Control Manual that resumes forecast-based operations, the misleading PAC report language should be deleted and the draft EIS/EIR language can stand alone.</p> <p>#347-2 PMF Risk Calculation] We noted with some interest the depiction of the calculated annual risk or recurrence interval associated with the Corps of Engineers' or Reclamation's estimated PMF(s). The draft EIS/EIR notes the following:</p> <p>Recent estimates indicate that a frequency of flood approximately the same size as a PMF would have a recurrence interval somewhere between 1 in 7,100 and 1 in 22,000 years. (p. 1-10)</p> <p>The draft EIS/EIR also notes the following:</p> <p>There is a high probability of a series of large storm events occurring within the American River Drainage Basin above Folsom Dam. Due to the limited capacity of the reservoir to safely contain these inflow volumes and the Dam to control releases within the safe carrying capacity of the downstream levees, structural modifications are required to reduce the probability of overtopping during a PMF event. Structural modifications are also required to improve the current level of flood protection during lesser flood events. (p. 1-5)</p> <p>By their very conception and purpose, PMFs are not high probability events. Indeed, they are created by modelers to size dam-safety features such as spillways so that an exceedance never occurs. The preceding paragraph could be read to imply otherwise.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>It is, of course, interesting to have some idea of the <i>calculated</i> annual risk probability of experiencing the estimated PMF. However, the draft EIS/EIR fails to provide sufficient cautions to the reader about the reliability of such frequency extrapolations of a 100-year stream-flow record and estimates on the volume of the historically experienced 1862 flood. The Bureau's Flood Hydrology Manual¹¹ provides important insights that should be reflected in the EIS/EIR: In fact, there are not enough data to extend frequency curves to anywhere near this limit [the PMF]. (p. 195)</p> <p>Practical rule-of-thumb knowledge, which is supported by statistical calculations, indicates that frequency curves are reasonably reliable out to return periods of about the sample record length. The current Bureau practice is to limit the extrapolation of the curves to twice the length of record, or 100 years, whichever is longer. In cases where catastrophic loss, loss of life, or dam safety are involved, further extrapolations can be used as justified on a case-by-case basis. (p. 204)</p> <p>The American River rain flood frequency analysis by the Corps of Engineers prepared with the advice of the National Research Council's Committee on American River Flood Frequencies does not extrapolate the frequency curve beyond 1 in 200.¹² This seems consistent with Reclamation's manual guidance as well, although both documents acknowledge that some uses may require cautious additional extrapolation.</p> <p>We suggest that the draft EIS/EIR contain a more accurate description of the purposes for which PMFs are created and their highly improbable nature. Also, when describing the annual risk or recurrence intervals of such a high-flow event, it would be helpful to explain that these are <i>calculated extrapolation</i> estimates and that the actual probability distribution of the American River PMF, or any PMF, is not known. Nevertheless, regardless of calculated frequency estimates, it is Reclamation's policy and a general dam-safety standard to construct spillways adequate to convey PMF estimated flows where the consequences of failure are significant.</p> <p>#347-3 Design Flood Calculation Finally, we request that project performance also be portrayed in terms of the reservoir design flood—that is, the volume of the design hydrograph in terms of peak, 1-day mean, and 3-day mean, or perhaps 5-day mean flows in cfs that can be accommodated before some critical design constraint such a design freeboard at the dam, dike, or levee is encroached. These operational constraints should, of course, be documented as well.</p> <p>The purpose for such documentation is to permit comparison of historic and modeled floods with contemporary performance estimates as well as those that are available in historical flood-damage-reduction planning documents before the adoption of level-of-protection or risk-and-uncertainty-based performance descriptions. We are not alone in requesting such estimates. We believe that such supplementary descriptions are supported by SAFCA. Also, the National Research Council's Committee on Flood Control Alternatives in the American River Basin suggested the use of design flood volume comparisons with known flood flows to assess relative project performance.¹³</p>
348	Duran Quick	#348-1 General I object to limiting access to Folsom Lake for 7 years to accommodate construction equipment.
349	Bonnie Amoruso	<p>First, the Bureau of Reclamation closes Folsom Dam Road which caused financial hardship on many small businesses in Folsom, as well as huge traffic congestion and now you want to close Folsom Point recreation area for up to seven years? #349-1 Socioeconomics Does the Bureau have any idea what this will do financially to the businesses in that area? #349-2 Recreational Access Closure There is plenty of vacant land around Folsom that I'm sure could be used for the staging area for this project, instead of closing down a major summertime recreation area. Why doesn't the Bureau come up with a few different locations for their staging area and then let those choices be reviewed by the City of Folsom for a final decision.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
350	Jerry Boyd	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As I know there is a need to increase the flood protection, there much be other avenues to the staging area for the equipment. Causing such a impact to a community financially as well as to the citizens that live within and around that community is just unacceptable. I have live in Folsom for nearly 13yrs. One reason that drew me to this city was the recreation activities and access to Folsom Lake for my three kids. [#350-1 Recreational Access Closure] Closing one of the main recreational areas for seven year, again I believe is unacceptable especially during the formable years of my kids lives.</p>
351	Dave Buck	<p>[#351-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am writing to you about the conflict with Folsom Point. I am amazed that there are no more alternatives other than to screw the people of Folsom once again. Why don't you rename the lake "Granite Bay Lake" or "El Dorado Hills Lake". The people of Folsom are tired of being pushed around by the bureaucratic process. First, Came the closure of the Dam road and now the closure of a very popular recreation area. Mr. Oliver I am sure the people of Folsom can come up with an ancient burial ground or Spotted Owl habitat that would shut this program down for several years. Thank you for your time and remember "DON'T CLOSE FOLSOM POINT".</p>
352	Daylene Buck	<p>Mr. Oliver: [#352-1 Recreational Access Closure] I'm still in shock that anyone thought this suggestion to close Folsom Point for seven years was a good idea. A staging site for construction equipment??? Entire shopping centers are remodeled and rebuilt and not one place of business ever closes to the public to make this happen. Yes, I expect some sort of inconvenience, but I can still shop.</p> <p>I have lived in Folsom since 1983--I bought a boat in 1984 and I have owned one ever since. I have launched my boat at Folsom Point (we still call it Dyke 8) at least 2-3 time a week since then. We can have a family (and friends) vacation any day of the week. We don't have to make long term plans and drive for miles to make some lasting memories. My friends and I take our walks there, we walk our dogs there, we take school children on hikes and nature studies there, we enjoy the sunset there. I live in Folsom and this is FOLSOM LAKE--why should I have to drive to another town to see it???enjoy it???use it??</p> <p>I'm sure there are other solutions to this construction problem that would not shut out 60,000 citizens from Folsom Lake and all that it has to offer .</p> <p>Thank you for your time and your careful consideration</p>
353	Neil Pearl	<p>Hello,</p> <p>[#353-1 General] Just a note to let you know how my family and I feel about the proposal to close Folsom Point... Easy Lake Access is why we moved here, and Folsom Point is our favorite family recreation spot. If it closes, we will move out of the County, and look for another place to live. I don't think you realize the impact to business and families....</p>
354	James D. Sprenger	<p>My name is James Sprenger. I am not satisfied with the statement that you would close several public access areas in order to stage construction equipment, supplies & debris.</p> <p>[#354-1 Recreational Access Closure] The idea that you can not find enough area in which to store construction equipment is with out merit. Why not build into construction cost an area to be built up just north of the dam that can be turned into another public access area at the completion of construction? Will it cost a bit more yes but it will also keep the other areas open for the public and as an added bonus it will create more public access area for the Sacramento areas continuing growth. Remember the Sacramento area population should be around 2.6 million in the year 2010. We are growing fast. If I, a layman, can come up with this solution I'm sure you can make something work. Something, that really works for everyone.</p>
355	Maria Noori	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>[#355-1 Socioeconomics] As a former resident of Folsom I was informed of the possible 7yr closure of Folsom Point. This is an outrage for the people who live there in Folsom and also for the many who visit Folsom Point to enjoy all the beauties of nature. also agree that this will damage the economic situation as all the people who would normally spend their time and money at Folsom Point will be going elsewhere. We used Folsom Point for taking the dog for a walk, for family picnics and to take our boat out. I really do</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		think this is a grave mistake and should be thought over and some other decision made.
356	Julia Fox	Hello, [#356-1 General] Closing Folsom Point for seven years would have a negative impact on the area. Folsom Point is one of the factors that make Folsom so attractive for visitors and residents.
357	Linden 'Chip' Lim	[#357-1 Recreational Access Closure] Please find an alternative to closing Folsom Point.
358	Jim Donnell	To whom it may concern: [#358-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am opposed to the current plan to close Folsom Point and other parts of Folsom Lake to recreation to enhance the flood protection. I recognize the need to improve our flood protection and water storage capacity and ask that the Bureau look at other alternatives that will not affect the public use of Folsom Lake.
359	Barbara Zawadzki	[#359-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am against the closure of Folsom Point. I live in Folsom and have seen the dam road and the small park closed. I used both of those facilities until the closure. Now, the point is to be closed. I also use it. There has to be another alternative. I'm tired of my recreational areas being closed.
360	Jane Cook	[#360-1 Recreational Access Closure] I am so upset that you are now considering closing Folsom point for the construction of the new crossing. I live in Briggs Ranch. We bought our house for two reasons – access over the river and access to the lake. I worked in Roseville and my husband works in Folsom and one of had to cross the river so the Damn crossing made our neighborhood perfect for my commute. After the damn was closed my commute went from 40 minutes a day to well over 1 hour and 45 minutes. I have 2 small children and that was unacceptable. I quit a job I loved because of the closure. Now I hear that you are going to destroy the other reason we bought our house which is the great access to the lake. You have the entire look-out point to work with as well as all the top of the damn and the other side of the damn road at Folsom Blvd, not to mention the State prison land. Leave our State Park alone. Honestly, you have hurt our neighborhood enough. You have hurt our town enough. I'm disgusted at even the careless thought of doing this. We are people. We pay a ton in taxes. We pay for the right to use our state park every time we enter it. It brings money into our town but it also is something that the families of Folsom use together. It is at the heart of our town. Please don't do this.
361	Bruce R. Thomas	Dear Ms. Victorine, [#361-1 In Support of Project] Upgrades at Folsom Dam are needed for protection against flooding in Sacramento. Sacramento currently has the least protection against flooding of any major city in the US. Upgrading of Folsom Dam is cost-effective for taxpayers and will rapidly provide the enhanced flood control so desperately needed for Sacramento.
362	Barry Fowler	Hi, I'm a long time resident of Placer County and typically use Folsom Point (Dyke 8) frequently. I'm pretty familiar with the area. Folsom Point is a unique venue of Folsom Lake in it is a wonderful family place where one can drive in to and meet people who have boats or in other situations, experience a simple nice day in a beautiful cove and play in the water. It has may old oak trees, shade, a gentle slope to the water and is generally a very safe place for family picnicking as well as combining "non aggressive boating" with a beautiful beach environment. I don't have a photo of the situation but perhaps I can point it with words. One time (well before my 8 yr. old son was born) I idled to the shore there and ate a sandwich while the sun warmed us up. It's a soft bottom (no rocks to hurt one's feet). We got out and sat on the edge of my little boat's deck and watched some children playing in the water's edge. I remember hearing a little 3 (or so) old girl shrieking with amazement that she's found a large frog. Her brother also found one and her's got away. It was so priceless to hear her say "he's got a frog but I don't have one." Sort of silly and they didn't really torture the frogs too much bug it was such an innocent experience. After my son was born, it was the first place we visited on the lake because I *knew* it was a family-friendly place on the lake. Frankly, the best.

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>[#362-1 Recreational Access Closure] There are many places to stage a construction crew on the lake. To the East of Folsom Dam, there is a large parking lot that is no longer used (thanks to 9-11). There is a very good road leading to the site. That could be one such staging area. There are others downlill to Natomas Road. There are so many other possibilities and I realize you folks are dealing with constraints of many types but there is so much room to deal with that is available. Please take Folsom Point in to consideration when making your choices. It is frankly *the* best launch ramp and family picnic area on Folsom Lake and I've been using it since 1980. It's a healthy respite to the likes of Granite Bay.</p>
363	David Pate	<p>Hi, [#363-1 Alternatives Formulation] I don't know much about the situation with Folsom dam. I just had a thought I wanted to pass on. If the big problem is raising the dam to increase flood control, why not build a 2nd dam just downstream that is taller? You would only need to close the gates in case of an emergency situation. Folsom dam as it is could still be used. Plus you could open the road since a terrorist blowing up the dam would lose any real impact. Just a thought. Thanks for your time.</p>
364	Casey Keller	<p>Mrs. Victorine, [#364-1 Recreational Access Closure] I strongly object to the closure of Folsom Point ! I do realize work needs to be done to improve and enhance the dykes and dam. For this, I commend your efforts. However, Folsom Point is the only access to Folsom Lake within the City of Folsom and thousands of residents and visitors use this access. I myself use it almost every day. Wether I am walking my dog, running, cycling, kayaking, picnicing, boating, playing with my children, catching a moonrise or sunset, this access is invaluable to Folsom residents and visitors. I strongly oppose the closure of Folsom Point State Recreation Area. Please find other alternatives to this proposal, as closing this gem is unacceptable.</p>
365	Jeff Onderko	<p>[#365-1 Recreational Access Closure] As a frequent user of Folsom lake and the beaches and trails, i would like to voice my opinion on the proposed Folsom Dam Project. I frequently use the Beales Point Recreation Area and multiple other recreation areas on the lake for personal pleasure and excersise. I would be greatly disapointed in seeing the closure of this great recreation area, as so many others would. However, if the closure of the recreation area means a safer dam, building a new spill way and reinforcing Mormon Island than i support the closure for the use of storing equipment. Having said that, i will expect the area to re-open ASAP.</p>
366	Robert Simpson	<p>[#366-1 General] As a resident of Folsom, I request you intervene to prevent the closing of Folsom Point on Folsom Lake related to potential federal construction.</p>
367	James A Cost	<p>I would like to voice my very strong objections to closing the Folsom Point recreation area for dam re-fitting. I am a medically retired, 30-year veteran police officer with congestive heart failure and throat cancer. I relocated to Folsom for it's therapeutic environment. I have wild turkeys in my yard, I can hear coyotes at night, and I see Canada geese overhead. There is an overall quiet in the air, traffic flows freely and people are friendly. This is a stress free environment that helps keep me alive. One of my few remaining recreations is going to Folsom Point with my family or occasionally alone to enjoy the unique beauty of the natural surroundings, which intertwine with the splendor of a man-made lake. From hiking, boating, picnicking or just sitting with a cup of coffee, Folsom Point truly a treasure. Having worked in government all my life I know there are others options available for the re-fit staging. They may cost a little more, may be a little less convenient, but most certainly are less destructive to the quality of life we have here than closing Folsom Point. [#367-1 Recreational Access Closure] As a fully disabled person who depends on Folsom Point, I urge you to do the right thing and keep Folsom Point recreation area open.</p>
368	Steve Canova	<p>To whom it may concern, After living in the Bay Area for 46 years, I moved my family to Folsom 3 years ago for many reasons. One of the most important being</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>the lake. We are boaters, live 5 minutes from the ramp and have been in absolute heaven ever since we moved. We paid a premium for our house and were glad to do so to be able to get on the lake so quickly and easily. We invite friends and family from all over to come and visit and we take them out on the lake. If you close the ramps you would be taking all this away from us, not to mention destroy our property value. It was one heck of a difficult effort to sell our last house, buy our current one, find new jobs and pull my son out of his old school and send him to a new one. But, we did it and we are all thriving here. The lake is a major reason why. We ski, wakeboard, tube, kayak, fish and more.</p> <p>[#368-1 Recreational Access Closure] My story is certainly not unique. I would guess there are hundreds if not thousands with the same reason for being here. Closure of the ramps would negatively affect us all. Just as closure of the Dam Road did. I realize the work is necessary but, surely there are other areas to stage from. I implore you not to take away our jewel while the work is being done.</p>
369	Barry Calfee	<p>[#369-1 Recreational Access Closure] I live in Folsom and use the Folsom Point Recreation area on average 15 times per year. I do not want to see it closed.</p> <p>Please figure out another alternative so that it remains open. Move some dirt to the side of the parking lot at Folsom Point and you will have plenty of room, there are acres of land and use that as the staging area.</p>
370	Richard Reid	<p>[#370-1 Recreational Access Closure] SURELY WITH ALL THE LAND THAT THE BUREAU OWNS AROUND FOLSOM DAM, A LESS DISRUPTIVE STAGING AREA CAN BE FOUND AND LEAVE FOLSOM PT. TO BE ENJOYED BY THE CITIZENS. DON'T PULL THE GOV'T HEAVEY HAND ROUTINE WITHOUT DOING YOUR DO DILIGENCE TO FIND A MORE SUITABLE SITE. rreid</p>
371	Scott T. Davis	<p>[#371-1 Socioeconomics] I would like to register my objection to the proposed closing of the Folsom Point Recreation Area as a staging area for the Folsom Lake Bridge Project. Closing this area for several years will severely impact area businesses and negatively effect quality of life for all residents of Folsom.</p>
372	James A. Roberts	<p>[#372-1 PI Extension Request] An extension of the time for review of the reference EIS/EIR is requested.</p> <p>This request is made both (1) as a member of the Facilities, Transportation, and Finance Committee of the San Juan Unified School District and (2) as a resident in an area which would potentially be adversely impacted by the potential adoption of the project. In neither case (the District or the residences in the potentially affected area) did we receive notice of the availability of the subject EIS/EIR for review. At a meeting last Wednesday, January 24th, to review draft materials on another Bureau project, I was asked what my opinion was of the referenced project. I had no idea that it was even being proposed! After reading a copy of the Executive Summary, which was given to me that day, I realize that careful and full review of the document is critical. Today, at another meeting I was told that the comment period was to close today.</p> <p>As a professional in the field of environmental assessment, I understand what pressure you are going through to prepare the documentation and to act upon the project. However as a citizen of the community which may be adversely affected, I also understand that we must do whatever we can to ensure that the document is fully vetted by all stakeholders. Needless to say, without a full review by all stakeholders, the Bureau's process is considerably flawed.</p>
373	James A. Roberts	<p>[#373-1 Climate Change] How are you handling the effects of climate change on the project and the effects of the project on climate change? The text that I have seen is silent on these issues.</p>
374	Dan and Dalisa Sanford	<p>My family resides in El Dorado Hills and we are enthusiastic boaters who regularly use the Brown's Ravine boat launch. As I'm sure you are aware, this facility is extremely busy during the warmer months and we find that boating on the weekends is very difficult. The facility is essentially impacted. With the expected growth of El Dorado Hills in the next few years, it is logical the pressure on Brown's Ravine will become even greater. I was very surprised to learn of the Bureau's plans to close down one of the few access areas (Folsom Point) for 7 years. I was even more surprised to read that the City of Folsom was just as surprised at your plan. It seems</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>incomprehensible that The City which your plan so dramatically affects would not be part of the process and consulted for alternatives.</p> <p>[#374-1 Recreational Access Closure] I would strongly urge the decision makers to look for other options for the construction yard. Many people in this region would be adversely affected by your proposed plan and closing one of the few access points would make an already difficult situation even worse. A City of Folsom Official was quoted as saying they are offering alternative sites for your consideration. I sincerely hope the Bureau makes every effort to keep Folsom Point open.</p>
375		<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>[#375-1 General] We live at 209 Briggs Ranch Drive in Folsom and my family and friends have enjoyed having close walking distance access to the Folsom Point park and recreation area. The highest selling point when buying our house 3 years ago was that we were so close to the lake. Please include me on the record as being Opposed to the Closing of Folsom Point.</p>
376	Martin Kiff	<p>[#376-1 Recreational Access Closure] As regular users of Folsom Point, It would be very difficult to go to a different location for the years this would be closed and unavailable to the public. We strongly recommend a staging location that is not used by such a large segment of the public.</p>
377	Michelle Schelgel	<p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA, have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>[#377-1 Recreational Access Closure] It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#377-2 Wildlife] I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#377-3 Socioeconomics] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern.</p> <p>We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife and real estate values. In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially "no notice". We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p>
378	Emily Daniels	<p>Dear government people,</p> <p>[#378-1 General] My name is Emily and I am 7 years old. I live by Folsom Point in Folsom, CA. Please do not close Folsom Point because I love driving mom's jeep there. I love having picnics there. If I can't go there for 5 years I might not have a lot of fun. I am doing a report about it in Mrs. Thompson's 2nd grade class at Empire Oaks Elementary. Empire Oaks Elementary is really close to Folsom Point. P.S. Folsom Point was the first place that I went in the world when I was just a little baby.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
379	Veronica Thompson	<p>[#379-1 Recreational Access Closure] I would like to express my opposition to the closure of Folsom Point for any length of time as a staging area for the construction of a new bridge. I feel our community has suffered enough with the Dam Rd. closure and to now take away our only access to the Lake would be wrong. If Folsom Point is closed then those of us (on the east side Lake Natoma and the majority of Folsom residents) who enjoy the picnic grounds and launch access will suffer. Other launch access includes Brown's Ravine, which is already over crowded and many times is closed because there is no parking available or Granite Bay, which would mean traveling with trailers on Riley Street through "Old Town", an already overly-congested street to get out to Granite Bay.</p> <p>[#379-2 Alternative Staging] I urge the Bureau of Reclamation to search for other areas which could be used. How about the old vista point parking area on Dam Rd. which is now closed to the public? Finding a site that is not being used by the public makes much more sense.</p>
380	Kathi Hamburg	<p>[#380-1 General] I have been a resident of Folsom for over 13 years. I believe our community has suffered enough. I am very much against the closure of Folsom Point. There are other options. Do not take anymore away from our community.</p>
381	Vickie	<p>[#381-1 General] My family and I spend many hours during the summer together at Folsom Point. Please do not close as it will affect a huge community of people in the Folsom area.</p>
382	Marty and Judy Boyea	<p>[#382-1 General] Please include me in the fight to not close Folsom Point. Thank You. Marty and Judy Boyea.</p>
383	Annette Manz	<p>I am very disappointed to hear that there is talk about closing Folsom Point. This is the one boat launch, recreation area close for Folsom residents. If this area is closed we will be forced to drive to either Folsom Auburn Road (Seal Beach I believe it what it's called) or to Brown's Ravine in EDH. [#383-1 Alternative Staging] There must be another area that can be used as a staging point for the new bridge. Please consider other options.</p>
384	Jean Peterson	<p>I am opposed to the closure of Folsom Point during the construction of the new bridge south of the dam. I think the people of Folsom have been "punished" enough since the closure of the dam road! [#384-1 Alternative Staging] Please seek an alternative site that would not have such a big impact on recreation and businesses.</p>
385	Fred Tombo	<p>I am writing to both of you on this topic, as I was unable to attend a meeting at 6pm on the 10th at the Folsom Community Center, 52 Natomas Street. I received an email from one of my neighbors this morning. Unfortunately I was on the east coast for business meetings; otherwise I would have been able to attend. [#385-1 Public Involvement] I was a little taken aback however on the extremely short notice for this meeting.</p> <p>Folsom Lake is an important asset for outdoor recreation enthusiasts and as such has a very big impact on home values and our economy. Closing access to its shorelines and boat ramps will be very detrimental to the people who those amenities and extremely harmful to the local home values in the region. Some of the local businesses, which depend on their proximity to Folsom Lake for their success, could very likely be forced out of business as well.</p> <p>I myself just purchased a home in Briggs Ranch. It closed in May and I just moved in last July. I paid a premium, even though we were in a "down" market, for the specific purpose of having access to Folsom Point. There were several families at that point competing for homes in this area and it was a t a time when there were surplus homes that were, and still are, available in other areas for VERY attractive comparative prices. Now to think of losing this access for up to seven years is, to say it politely, very disappointing. Not only form an access to the lake point of view, but also from the perspective impact it will have on my investment. All of the sudden, Folsom becomes a bad investment. Is this truly the impact you wish to have on our community?</p> <p>The impact will be enormous, not only to me but our community. In the light that there are other alternatives to consider, I hope you will give this further thought. I would suggest considering the sides of the now closed Dam road as well as the large parking area to vista/picnic area, also already closed to the public.</p> <p>I find it interesting that the announced time of the meeting came out on the same day of its occurrence. I would obviously not be alone</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		in being extremely disappointed to loose continued access to the lake and its shoreline before, during and after any construction takes place.
386	Pam Langbehn	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver: The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR [#386-1 Alternative Staging]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1 – April 1. 3) If Folsom point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown’s Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal’s Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5) Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>[#386-2 Socioeconomics] Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p> <p>[#386-3 Public Involvement]Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future, please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at he entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
387	Taira Byrne	<p>Dear Bureau of Reclamation, [#387-1 General] Please do not close Folsom Point! Enough damage has been done to the citizens of this community by the closing of the dam road! My life has been impacted in a very negative fashion by the dam road closure—my business-real estate—has been highly impacted in terms of property value decreases, time, energy and money (gas)! If you also close the recreation area, we will all see a further decline in property values, beauty, enjoyment of the area and the facilities you do leave alone will see even further crowding and people getting alone on the launch ramps in particular!</p> <p>I am very concerned—hence this letter! However, if there is anything else I can do to voice my opinion—meetings I may be able to attend, etc., please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
388	Thomas E Martin	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, [#388-1 General] Please take a moment to review my concerns as well as many of my associates and Folsom neighbors regarding your consideration of closing Folsom Point Recreation Area. I am a property owner as well as developer in Folsom. I own the Briggs Ranch Shopping Center at the corner of Natoma Street and Blue Ravine Road. The closure of Folsom Dam Road had serious negative impact for the owners of businesses at the Briggs Ranch Shopping Center. Closing Folsom Point would close these businesses no doubt.</p> <p>I and my partner Sid Dunmore Jr. own and are currently developing the 16 acres on the lakeside of Natoma Street that is adjacent to Folsom Point. We are developing this property to include 79 single family homes plus neighborhood amenities. We began this project approximately 4 years ago, have many Folsom residents on a long time waiting list to purchase a home. The ramifications of closing</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Folsom Point are too numerable to list in this letter.</p> <p>Please carefully read, review and re-review all of the letters that you will be receiving form the residents of Folsom as well as the lovers of the recreation area at Folsom Point. The idea of closing this facility to the recreation lovers is heartbreaking. The thought of the lost revenue to the businesses that are already suffering due to the Dam Road closure in incomprehensible.</p>
389	Joseph P Gagliardi	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>This letter presents the Folsom Chamber of Commerce's comments on the above-referenced EIR/EIR. In short, the Chamber fully supports the intended results of the proposed project, increased flood protection for the Sacramento Region. However, we feel that additional consideration should be given to avoiding and/or mitigating the economic damage of restricting recreation at the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, especially Folsom Point.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The situation is partially encapsulated in the Executive Summary (page 21) accompanying the EIS/EIR: "The establishment of staging areas and borrow sites within existing recreational use areas coupled with construction work at Folsom facilities and haul truck traffic would have significant and unavoidable adverse impacts to recreation at Folsom State Parks, the entity managing the recreation aspects of Folsom, would be impacted by losing all public access at the Folsom Point recreation area, and portions of Beal's Point and Granite Bay recreation facilities. This would result in a significant loss of recreation revenue to the State."</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>[#389-1 Socioeconomics] Not included in this statement is the sales and sales tax revenue lost by communities bordering the lake by having an estimated 816,000 fewer visitors pass through those communities on their way home from the lake. The EIR/EIS estimates these fewer visitors equal an economic loss of \$50,000,000 to out area. Unfortunately, this analysis only considers the loss of "picnic" type use. It does not analyze the loss of "big ticket" type items, i.e. residential lots and homes, recreational vehicles, boats, water sports vehicles and toys, and tow vehicles, etc. We feel the true economic impacts to this area could be \$250 - \$500,000,000.</p> <p>To ameliorate this situation we ask that alternatives to those activities proscribed in the EIR/EIS be used in order that construction not require Folsom Point be closed. Table 2-10 (Summary of Folsom DR/FDR EIS/EIR Alternatives) lists for the preferred alternative, Alternative 3, the following for Folsom Point.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Material Processing – Disposal Site 2. Haul road construction <p>Material processing and Disposal Site</p> <p>[#389-2 Alternative Staging] We suggest that construction, staging, and processing areas proposed for Folsom Point be located on either: presently unused, unimproved areas within Folsom Point; unused, unimproved area adjacent to MIAD; undeveloped vacant private property adjacent to Folsom Point and LIAD; or a combination of these alternative sites. After the need ceases for the processing and construction areas in or near Folsom Point, these sites should be converted to addition parking or picnic cites.</p> <p>Haul road construction</p> <p>We support the concept of using rock from the spillway construction at the MIAD and save bringing more rock from outside the work area through transport over city streets. We suggest a slight alteration of the haul road route from that contemplated along the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>shoreline to slightly inland through Folsom Point passing through a culvert under the present public right-of-way, so as to minimize disruption of recreation uses of the area.</p> <p>Conclusion There appears to be inexpensive engineering solutions to the Folsom Point closure that were not considered in the EIR/EIS. We ask that these solutions be given serious consideration and adopted so that our community will not suffer unnecessary economic dislocations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joseph P. Gagliardi CEO/President Folsom Chamber of Commerce</p>
390	Mary Ann McAlea	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, Ms. Victorine and Ms. Bronson:</p> <p>This letter represents the position of the Folsom Tourism Bureau on the above-references EIS/EIR. The Folsom Tourism Bureau recognizes the need for increased flood protection; clearly these results cannot be achieved without some accommodations from the surrounding community. The proposed closure of Folsom Point as an integral part of the Bureau's work plan, however, will have immediate consequences for the viability of the tourism program and long term consequences for the marketing and promotion efforts that are essential to the growth of tourism.</p> <p>[#390-1 Socioeconomics] In specific, we are concerned that the document does not provide an analysis of the financial impacts of the closure of Folsom Point related to the loss of tourist/visitor dollars. While the document studies the effect of the loss of visitors on the State Park's budget, it does not address any other financial impact. We feel the financial impact on the city's businesses and tourism will be significant and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The Tourism Bureau has identified Folsom Point as one of its key assets in attracting visitors and events to the Folsom area. The accessibility and multi-use features of Folsom Point make it a very marketable attraction. Significant effort has been put forth in the recruiting of athletic and recreational events utilizing Folsom Lake that will produce overnight stays in Folsom hotels (the key factor in generating tourism revenue). The resources of Folsom Point are equally attractive to the leisure tourist and with the closure of Folsom Dam Road, the last boating access area to engage in water recreation within the city limits.</p> <p>The closure of Folsom Point will require the end of all proposed and potential visitor and event activities that are outlines in the Folsom Tourism Bureau's strategic plans for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Over the last two years, the Folsom Tourism Bureau has implemented a \$190,000 print and electronic media promotional program. Establishing Folsom as a destination for recreational, cultural and event-based tourism has required significant budget, staff time and community resources. The proposed closure of Folsom Point is devastating to the tourism effort both due to its elimination of a key asset and the proposed duration of the closure. In short order, the very positive message that has bee created around promoting Folsom will quickly transition to a sound bit: "Avoid Folsom at all Costs." Over a period of years, the message will become synonymous with the public's perception of this area and could be intractable. When the resources of Folsom Point are fully accessible at some future date, it will be very costly to re-educate the potential visitor.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We believe the EIR/EIS document does not adequately address the impact of closing Folsom Point in particular, the financial impact resulting from both the loss of visitors to the area and the fact that it severely undermines the marketing efforts of the Folsom Tourism Bureau.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Ann McAlea Vice President</p>
391	Anonymous	<p style="text-align: center;">Citizens of Folsom statement of position On Possible closure of Folsom Point (previously known as Dike 8)</p> <p>As tax paying business people, citizens and home owners, we consider the choice of closing Folsom Point for the use as a staging area / construction site for the bureau of reclamation to do the necessary retrofits to the existing dam and to build the needed new spillway to be a significant threat the our livelihoods, health & quality of life. This threat is in the form of the bureau stated excessive pollution, traffic, noise, that will result from the dynamiting and large equipment movement. We are very concerned that there will also be structural damage to existing homes, pools, buildings from as well as significant drop in the value of our homes as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>[#391-1 Alternative Staging] This impact can an should be avoided by the use of the look out point located just south of the dam itself on the dam road that has already been closed to all Folsom traffic, which in itself caused a drastic reduction in area business revenues as well as an enormous traffic issues. We have already taken a large hit with the closure of the dam road, and we feel that the bureau can use that area with far less destruction and disturbance to our lives.</p> <p>In addition, this proposed 6-7 year closure, with all of its hazardous issues, was not publicized near well enough for us to respond.</p>
392	Kerry L Miller	<p>Dear Mt. Oliver, Mr. Victorine, and Ms. Bronson:</p> <p>The City of Folsom (City) is providing this written response to the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft Environmental impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). The City understands the proposed project includes the construction of a gated auxiliary spillway and also, may include improvements and enhancements to the associated dams, dikes, and embankments around Folsom Lake. The purpose of the project is to improve the safety of Folsom Dam as well as reduce the risk of damage to the dam and these other flood-control facilities due to overtopping, seismic events, and seepage. In addition, this project will also improve the temporary storage capacity of the reservoir for flood control. The City fully recognizes the importance of this project and supports the goals of improved dam safety and flood damage reduction at Folsom Lake.</p> <p>[#392-1 NEPA/CEQA Significance Conclusion] However, after reviewing the DEIS/EIR, the City is concerned with the potential of significant negative impacts on Folsom due to the project. The DEIS/EIR examined five action alternatives and identified Alternative 3 as the “preferred alternative.” This alternative considers the closure of Folsom Point for six years. Under both CEQA and NEPA, the lead agencies have a legal obligation to identify and analyze the significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. (See Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21081; CEQA Guidelines 15092; 40 C.F.R. 1502.14, 1502.16). In fact, CEQA precludes the approval or carrying out of a project that would result in significant effects on the environment unless mitigation measures are imposed to reduce the impacts to less than significant, or unless, after through study of potential mitigation measures, the approving agency determines</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>the significant impacts are unavoidable and adopts a statement of overriding consideration, or determines that the mitigation measures are feasible, but outside the jurisdiction of the approving agency. (See Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21081; see also 40 C.F.R. 1502.16 [federal lead agency must identify significant impacts that cannot be avoided through mitigation measures]). The City has concluded that the mitigation measures described in the DEIS/EIR do not adequately address the significant impacts of the project to this community that further study and imposition of addition mitigation measures is necessary; and, the scope of the project will have significant impacts on a variety of resources that are critical and of vital importance to the City. These comments are based on input from City staff and departments within their respective areas of expertise.</p> <p>The City's concerns center around seven major potential environmental impacts these are: Water Supply, Aquatic Resources, Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife, visual Resource, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Recreation Resources. Provided below, organized under each of these potential impacts, are brief narratives and comments including, in certain circumstances, recommended addition mitigation measures. The City respectfully requests that these comments be addressed and included in the final environmental document; and, that further mitigation measures be imposed to mitigate the significant impacts described below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.2 Water Supply</u></p> <p><u>Issue:</u> Folsom Lake is the sole water source for the majority of the City. This water is conveyed to Folsom via the 42-inch above-ground Natomas raw water pipeline. (According to the DEIS/EIR, the California Department of Corrections, the U.S. Corps of Engineers' (USCOE Resident Office fire protection system, and San Juan Water district (SJWD) also receive their respective water supply from this same pipeline). The proposed auxiliary spillway crosses a portion of the Natomas pipeline requiring replacement of about 300 feet of the pipeline. The DEIS/EIR indicates this portion would be replaced by an above-ground pipeline, construction of which would result in temporary interruptions of water delivery to the City and SJWD. As described in the DEIS/EIR, the interruptions would be for less than one working day. Disruption of service from this pipeline to the City for any extended period of time would jeopardize the City's ability to provide water service to its customers. Temporary planned water outages can only be achieved during low water demand months (January and February). When outages are performed, an alternative supply or bypass system is required.</p> <p>#392-2 Water Supply Line Relocation Section 3.2 of the DEIS/EIR does not provide any information on the exact location of the portion of pipeline that is to be replaced, not does it discuss the issue of maintaining an ongoing supply of water to the City during construction of the new section of pipe. Additionally, it is not clear how the new replacement pipeline will "bridge" the auxiliary spillway. Also, there is not mention in the DEIS/EIR of a below-ground alternative for the pipeline. If located above the spillway, it is unclear regarding what measures will be taken to ensure that the pipeline will not be impacted by the spillway operation or other outside threats. Further detail is needed to explain how these issues will be addressed as well as an explanation of why a below-ground alternative for the pipeline alignment is not considered.</p> <p>In addition to the impacts from this project, a portion of the Natoma raw water pipeline is being realigned and replaced to accommodate a new bridge. The DEIS/EIR does not provide any information on how changes to the pipeline included as part of the bridge project may affect the replacement of the section of the pipeline affected by Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project. Further explanation of these impacts is needed.</p> <p>In addition to the above comments, the city recommends that Mitigation Measure WS-1 be revised to include the following</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>language: "any plans for temporary, schedule disruptions of water supplies associated with replacement of the Natomas raw water pipeline will be coordinated with the City. City concurrence is required for scheduling of any temporary disruptions in water supply deliveries."</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.4 Aquatic Resources</u></p> <p>[#392-3 Folsom Point Borrow/] The DEIS/EIR on pages ES9 and 10 identified Folsom Point as a potential "borrow" site. While the scope of the "borrow" operations at this location is unclear, the City is concerned about how the borrowing would impact the use of Folsom Point and the potential impact to this area as a local fishing resource. Pages 3.4-15, 3.4-20, and 3.4-24 describe significant impacts to fisheries, particularly bass, due to deepening of the lake bottom near the shoreline. These areas are popular fishing spots; and, as the City understands it, efforts have been made in the past to improve the bass habitat at these locations. The impact of the "borrowing" operation on the fish habitat, particularly bass, adjacent to Folsom Point should be explained further. Additionally, mitigation measures should be imposed if found feasible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.5 Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife</u></p> <p><u>Issue:</u> the city specifically recognizes the biological values of wetlands, riparian habitat, and native oaks. Folsom Point, areas surrounding it, and the land all the way to the Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (MIAD) have significant oak trees and considerable wildlife including birds and deer. Section 3.5.2.2 includes local policies and ordinances for biological resources as a criteria of significance; but the DEIS/EIR does not specifically acknowledge the <u>Folsom Municipal Code (FMC)</u> Chapter 17.98 Wetland and Riparian Habitat Management and Chapter 12.16 Tree Preservation. The significance criteria includes: "conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy of ordinance." Accordingly, the DEIS/EIR should evaluate the significance of impacts of oak tree loss and effects on riparian and wetland resources within the City 9chapters 12.16 and 17.98 respectively of the <u>FMC</u>). Both ordinances stress preservation of resources, and if impacted, rely on mitigation within the limits of the City (or, in the case of wetland or riparian habitat, it can be mitigated also within its Sphere of Influence).</p> <p>[#392-4 Folsom Oak Mitigation] The City recommends that Mitigation Measure BIO-10 be modified to include language requiring that the oak tree adjacent to active construction zones be protected and securely fenced and that qualified arborists be available throughout the construction period to ensure that all construction activities are conducted in a manner to minimize impacts to protected trees, including the tree's root zones.</p> <p>The City is concerned about the impacts on wildlife in the area of this project, particularly with night operations, lights, and noise. The city believes additional mitigation measures should address these potentially significant impacts.</p> <p>In addition, the city recommends that mitigation measures be included that requires coordination with the city Community Development Department to implement a mitigation plan for the loss of oak trees, wetlands and riparian habitat within the city consistent with Chapters 12.16 and 17.96 of the <u>FMC</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.7 Visual Resources</u></p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Issue: [#392-5 Parapet Wall Graffiti Mitigation] the preferred Alternative 3 includes a 3.5-foot raise via a colored, concrete parapet wall. The city is concerned that a bare parapet wall might invite graffiti and related nuisances and could pose security concerns. The city suggests that a mitigation measure be included that either requires a funded graffiti abatement program in perpetuity, or the parapet wall be design in such that it is screen from public view by an earthen berm.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.9 Transportation and Circulation</u></p> <p>Issue; the increased vehicle traffic generated by the project, particularly the volume of large trucks carrying heavy loads, will have potentially significant structural and operations impacts on City roads. Heavy moving loads increase the wear and tear on asphalt roadways and significantly reduce the useful life of such roads. These vehicles also take up more space on the roadway and accelerate/decelerate much slower than most vehicles, meaning that a single heavy truck can have the same effect on roadway level of service as several smaller vehicles. The city is also concerned that if Folsom Point remains open to the public, as is desired by the community, safety issues need to be more adequately addressed, particularly in those locations where public and project traffic intersect.</p> <p>Section 3.9 of the DEIS/EIR indicates that the various project alternatives will increase Average Daily traffic (ADT) on several city arterials by between 300 and 400 daily trips. Many of these trips will be heavy trucks carrying gravel and rock between the project site and nearby quarries. While the document concludes that the resulting Level of Service (LOS) impacts will be less than significant, it is unclear if the document takes into consideration the added impact that these moving, heavy loads have on the physical integrity of the roads or the operational impacts associated with large, slow-moving vehicles.</p> <p>Table 3.9-12 through 3.9-16 refer to route letter designations A through E in regard to daily workers' trips per construction year. No explanation is provided regarding the location of these routes and whether there are significant related impacts. Further detail is needed to clarify these issues.</p> <p>Additionally, the ADTs cited in 3.9-86 through 3.9-93 are vastly inconsistent with the ADTs cited in Table 3.10-16 (Noise); this discrepancy should be clarified. The ADTs cited in Chapter 3.10 provide for up to 5,000 trips per day, but Chapter 3.9 does not indicate increases of more than 400 vehicles on any given road segment. It is also unclear if the vehicle trips associated with heavy trucks and daily workers on the project were treated as such in the LOS calculations; this should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>[#392-6 Transportation Mitigation] Mitigation Measure T-1 is vague and should be more specific about the intersections to be studied, including which agency will be responsible for analysis and review, which agency will perform the recommended improvements and which agency will be responsible for funding those improvements. Currently, this mitigation measure lacks these important parameters and is, therefore, deficient.</p> <p>The DEIS/EIR should provide more information on the volume of vehicular traffic that will be generated within the project site, particularly in areas where public access will be preserved. Based on this information, conclusions should be made on the potential traffic safety impacts to the public and possible mitigation measures. The location of the internal haul route is vague and should be clarified. Regardless, if this haul route crosses a public access road, appropriate traffic control measures</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>should be incorporated as mitigation, whether in the form of physical grade separation or a temporary traffic signal. Given the different operation periods for construction activities and peak recreation activities, it is possible a temporary traffic signal that assign right-of-way to construction traffic during the work week and functions in flashing yellow on weekends and holidays, may suffice; but, this require more information and analysis.</p> <p>Furthermore, the City recommends that the following mitigation measures be added to the DEIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heavy truck traffic in excess of 5 tons Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) is prohibited from suing public roads that are not designed as a truck route unless it is the only route possible to reach the trip origin/destination; in that circumstance the driver must take the shortest distance from the nearest designated truck route. 2. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) should be responsible for preserving the integrity and safety of the public roads damaged by project-related traffic through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic emergency repairs and, if deemed necessary by the City, resurfacing of affected roadways upon project completion. Roadways shall be returned to the condition they were in prior to the start of construction, including in-kind replacement of existing surface treatments, such as rubberized asphalt concrete (RAC) or open-grad asphalt concrete (OGAC). • Routine street sweeping following rock/gravel deliveries, taking necessary care to ensure that both vehicular and bicycle lanes are kept clear of rock and gravel. The street sweeping schedule shall be coordinated with and approved by the City. 3. In order to avoid exacerbating congestion issues, heavy trucks traveling to and from the project site should be prohibited from using the following road segments unless specifically authorized by the city: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Folsom Boulevard from US highway 50 to Greenback Lane • Greenback Lane from the Folsom city limit to Folsom –Auburn Road • Folsom-Auburn road from Greenback Lane to Folsom Dam Road • Iron Point Road from Folsom Boulevard to Empire Ranch Road • Blue Ravine Road from Folsom Boulevard to Oak Avenue Parkway • Empire Ranch Road from US Highway 50 to Sophia Parkway 4. If determined appropriate by the city, the lead agencies and/or their contractors shall pay a fee, to be determined and adopted by the City, to mitigate the impacts and damage to the City’s roadways resulting from this project. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.10 Noise</u></p> <p><u>Issue:</u> As acknowledged in the DEIS/EIR, construction noise may impact sensitive land used within the City. Accordingly, standard noise mitigation measures are included in the document to reduce the noise impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>#392-7 Noise Mitigation] In addition to the mitigation measures described in this section, the City recommends that affected residences and businesses receive 72-hour notification prior to scheduled blasting activity.</p> <p>Blasting permits are processed through the City Police Department. Requests for a variance from the City's Noise Control Ordinance are processed through the Community Development Department.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Section 3.13 Recreation Resources</u></p> <p><u>Issue:</u> Folsom Point would be the main construction staging area along the reservoir's southern edge, including contractor work area, construction materials and equipment storage, borrow material storage, and a crushing and processing plant. In addition, an internal network of haul roads for the project is proposed to be developed with one portion of the haul route extending from the proposed auxiliary spillway through Folsom Point to MIAD and eventually to Brown's Ravine. All alternatives include a coffer dam in front of the Folsom Point boat launch effectively eliminating any boat launching at this location. According to the DEIS/EIR, these construction-related activities will result in the full closure of Folsom Point from fall 2007 through 2012. Due to this closure, public access to boat launching, picnic, and trail facilities will be curtailed. The number of loss visits at Folsom Point during this period is estimated to be 816,021. (To a lesser extent, construction-related activity will also impact public access to recreational facilities at Beals Point and Granite Bay. These impacts could indirectly affect Folsom.)</p> <p>#392-8 Recreation Mitigation] Without adequate mitigation, these actions could have direct and long-term devastating impacts on recreation resources supported and relied upon by the residents and businesses in Folsom. With the closure of the Dam Road four years ago, Folsom Point became the only public means of access to the Folsom Lake Recreation Area located within the City. Closure of the Dam Road caused significant negative impacts to the businesses and residents of Folsom. Closure of Folsom Point would further negatively impact these businesses and those residents which have come to rely on public access at this location.</p> <p>Folsom Point is a highly used access point to Folsom Lake and, as previously mentioned, the only access point in Folsom. The City has a long history of promoting the use of the lake, and considers it a vital resource for community enjoyment and an important factor for tourism in Folsom. Folsom Point is used by thousands of visitors and residents to boat, jet ski, fish, hike, bike, picnic, and swim. The recent closure of the Ralph's Market at Blue Ravine Road and Natoma Street, just east of Folsom Point has significantly impacted the remaining businesses in that center who are struggling to continue to operate. Loss of Folsom Point as a recreational destination will further harm these remaining businesses, as well as those located at the new Raley's Center across the street.</p> <p>It is the City's view that Folsom Point must remain open year round and all recreation amenities must remain accessible for minimizing the adverse effects of the project. Absent Folsom Point remaining open for all uses year round, additional study must be done and alternatives created to provide the maximum access, particularly during peak season (May through September).</p> <p>#392-9 Recreation Trails] The DEIS/EIR does not address pedestrian/bicycle use at Beals Point and Granite Bay. The City</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>feels the pedestrian/bicycle trails at these locations are a significant regional resource that must remain open or alternative routes offered at all times.</p> <p>#392-10 Reservoir Water Levels] The Environmental document also does not address maintenance of the water level during the construction activity timeframe. The City further believes it is very important to maintain the highest possible water levels at all times during this project for preserving the recreational aspects of Folsom Lake.</p> <p>The DEIS/EIR describes, in general terms, development of a network of internal haul routes for construction purposes. While the approximate routes for these internal haul routes are depicted in Figure 2-15, the exact alignment, size, type, and configuration is unclear. As mentioned, previously, further explanation is needed that clarifies the final alignment for the proposed haul routes, as well as details any impacts these routes may have on existing wildlife and vegetation in the affected areas.</p> <p>#392-11 New Bridge Pedestrian Trail] More specifically, staff understands that construction of one of the proposed haul roads would result in a delay of over 6 years in construction of a portion of the planned Class I pedestrian/bicycle trail along the north side of the new Dam Road located between the existing vista/observation point and Dike 7. This delay would be a significant impact, since it would eliminate use of the new Class I pedestrian/bicycle trail on the new bridge and Dam Road for the length of the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project. It is important that the Class I pedestrian/bicycle trail begin constructed as part of the new bridge project be complete and functioning from Folsom/Auburn road to East Natoma Street as earlier as possible. The DEIS/EIR needs to explain how the project will impact this proposed Class I pedestrian/bicycle trail and what means will be employed to ensure this Class I pedestrian/bicycle trail is functional once the new bridge is open.</p> <p>#392-12 Dike 8 Cofferdam] There is no mention in chapter 3.13 regarding construction of a coffer dam at Dike 8. As shown in Figure 2-1 through 2-5, this coffer dam is so situated that it closes the channel providing waterborne access to the boat ramp at Folsom Point. Use of a coffer dam at this location should be either eliminated, or if truly necessary, explained further.</p> <p>#392-13 Folsom Point Mitigation] Mitigation Measure RC-3 should be revised to require that construction, staging, and processing areas proposed for Folsom Point be located to one or more of the following alternative sites: unused, unimproved area within Folsom Point, unused unimproved area adjacent to MIAD, undeveloped vacant private property adjacent to Folsom Point and MIAD, or a combination of any of the above alternative sites. Following the completion of the construction activity, proposed material processing and construction staging areas at or around Folsom Point should be converted into additional parking and picnic sites.</p> <p>In addition, the DEIS/EIR also should explore alternative locations for construction-related activity at Beals Point to minimize disruptions for public access to recreational facilities. Design of truck haul routes at these locations to permit uninterrupted public access to recreation facilities needs to be explore further. The DEIS/EIR should also analyze conversion of the proposed material processing and construction staging areas at Beals Pint into addition parking and picnic sites.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure RC-7 also should be revised to require that construction work be limited during peak seasonal use of the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>recreational facilities at Folsom Point, Beals Point, and Granite Bay to weekdays and non-holidays to minimize disruption to recreational uses at these locations.</p> <p>Section 3.13.4 of the DEIS/EIR identifies preliminary mitigation measures for impacts to recreational resources. The City recommends that the following additional mitigation measures be added to the DEIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Realign proposed truck haul route to south of Folsom Point so as to not impact the boat launching and picnic area facilities. Design the route through Folsom Point to eliminate conflicts between construction vehicular traffic and public vehicular access while also maintaining the protected oak trees at Folsom Point. One possible design alternative that should be considered is construction of a culvert east of the existing Ranger Station along a natural swale that construction truck traffic would use to move unimpeded through Folsom Point to and from the auxiliary spillway and MIAD. If this alternative should prove to be not feasible, install a temporary traffic signal within the Folsom Point area to facilitate continuous public access to recreational facilities during construction-related hauling activity. 2. To address any displaced demand at Folsom Point for boat launching, construct temporary additional boating facilities (i.e., launch ramp and parking) at or around Browns Ravine. 3. The alignment of the proposed haul road between the auxiliary spillway and Browns Ravine should be coordinated with State Parks and City to ensure the alignment is consistent with the Class I pedestrian/bike trail planned along this route. Upon completion of the project, a Class 1 pedestrian/bike trail shall be constructed, per State Parks and City standards, in place of the haul road. 4. Per the City Bikeway Master Plan, a Class I pedestrian/bike trail is planned on the surface of Dikes 7 and 8 and MIAD as part of the Folsom Lake Trail. Consistent with this plan, raising of the dikes and dam shall be designed to accommodate pedestrian and bicyclist use. No barriers shall be put in place to eliminate pedestrian and bicycle access on the surface of the dikes and dam. 5. If a coffer dam is required at Dike 8, the DEIS/EIR should require widening and deepening of the channel to provide improved access to the dock and boat ramp at Folsom Point. Access via Folsom Point is imperative to preserve recreation resources in the City. <p>The City appreciates this opportunity to review and comment on the DEIS/EIR. The City is supportive of the purposes of the Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction project. In addition, the City is extremely appreciative of the BOR and the USCOE outreach efforts to the community during this comment process and willingness to meet and discuss possible solutions to the potential impacts associated with the project. These efforts, including the decision to extend the comment period to January 26, are indicative of the spirit of on-going, close cooperation and communication that exists between the City, BOR and USCOE.</p> <p>However, the City is concerned that this project and the preferred alternative identified in the DEIS/EIR will have significant and adverse environmental impacts on Folsom. To lessen these impacts, a more thorough analysis of mitigation measures</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>needs to be undertaken and additional mitigation measures must be implemented to lessen the impacts.</p> <p>Consistent with Public Resources Code section 21177, the City reserves the right to provide further written and oral comment on this matter at any time prior to the close of the public hearing on the project and before the issuance of any notice of determination. The City requests that you provide the City with notice of all such public hearings and meetings.</p> <p>Thank you for you consideration of these matters.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kerry Miller City Manager</p>
393	Kelly Richardson	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. [#393-1 Alternative Staging] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1 – April 1. 3) If Folsom point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown’s Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5) Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p> <p>Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future, please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at he entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
394	Gregory L. Fuz	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver, Ms. Victorine, and Ms. Bronson:</p> <p>El Dorado County has reviewed the extensive comments prepared by the City of Folsom regarding the above referenced project. We understand the concerns they have and believe that impacts to traffic and more importantly, loss of recreational facilities will also impact the citizens of El Dorado County.</p> <p>[#394-1 Alternative Staging] We support the proposed changes requested by the City of Folsom as well as the addition mitigation measures and request that they are reflected in the final EIR/EIS.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.</p> <p>Gregory L. Fuz, Director Development Services</p>
395	Michael Myer	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver,</p> <p>Subject: Draft Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Drainage Reduction EIS/EIR</p> <p>The County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) have reviewing the pertinent sections of the subject document and have the following comments.</p> <p>[#395-1 Dam Release Impact to Downstream Facilities] Alternatives in the EIS/EIR that release large amounts of water into the American River may have significant damaging impacts on SRCSD facilities that cross under the river. A report, prepared August 13, 2002 by Ayres Associates, assessed the scouring of the American River for the Arden Sewer Force Main crossing under the lower American River. The primary purpose of the assessment was to estimate the vertical scour potential at the Arden Force Main crossing under the bed of the Lower American River near River Mile 7.3. Standard methodology for estimating scour published by the Federal Highway Administration in hydraulics Engineering Circulars number 18, 20, and 23 were used. The total scour depth was estimated for two flood events for peak discharges of 115,000 and 160,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). 150,000 cfs was used because it's the maximum capable outflow of Folsom Dam, and 160,000 cfs was used because it's the discharge at or near the point where levees are expected to breach. The total potential for scour that was estimated at the force main crossing is 31 ft below the existing channel bed for the 115,000 cfs event, and 36ft for the 160,000 cfs event.</p> <p>Currently SRCSD operates a parallel force main and triple siphon under-crossing. The Arden Force Main crossings are parallel 60-inch sewer force mains within twin 72-inch casings that convey as much as 100 million gallons of wastewater per day (MGD). The depth of the Arden Force Main ranges from 30 to 40 feet beneath the existing river bottom. The triple siphon under-crossing, known as the Northeast Interceptor Section 3, consists of triple 48-inch pipelines buried approximately 10 feet below the river bottom, constructed with 2 feet of rip-rap (large rocks) protection above the pipeline. The Northeast Section 3 Interceptor conveys as much as 75 MGD.</p> <p>Based on the potential of scour for 115,000 cfs and 100,000 cfs flood events, alternative that affect the aforementioned river under-crossings' ability to convey wastewater could have serious human health and environmental impacts. If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact me at (916) 875-7123.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael Meyer Senior Engineer CSD-1/SRCSD Policy and Planning</p>
396	Robert W Bense	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>#396-1 Alternative Staging] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. <li>2. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1 – April 1. <li>3. If Folsom point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown’s Ravine or Hobie Cove. <li>4. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal’s Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. <li>5. Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p> <p>Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future, please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
397	John P Fondale	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver: The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable.</p> <p>#397-1 Alternative Staging] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. <li>2. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1 – April 1. <li>3. If Folsom point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown’s Ravine or Hobie Cove. <li>4. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal’s Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. <li>5. Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future, please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
398	Rich Rumsey	<p>Shawn,</p> <p>I am a lifelong resident of Folsom, and I want to voice my disapproval of the proposal to close Folsom Point. Closure of the Dam Road has placed an unfair burden on Folsom already, but to compound it by closing Folsom Point and depriving us of our only access to Folsom Lake seems unconscionable. After all, it is FOLSOM LAKE (but you can't get there from Folsom?). Placer and El Dorado counties refuse to share in any of the expense of providing security to open the Dam Road, but it is their traffic that is choking our town. [#398-1 Alternative Staging] Why not use land around Beals Point or the open land in front of Mormon Island? Our businesses can not afford, and don't deserve to shoulder this additional burden. I am a Broker Associate with Prudential California Realty, and I worry about the affect on our home values, as well. We already face the bleak prospect of Intel doing a major lay off this year, and between the two forces, the financial impact on our town could be quite significant.</p>
399	Ben Roth	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. [#399-1 Alternative Staging] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1 – April 1. 3. If Folsom point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown's Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5. Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p> <p>Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future, please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
400	William T Hetland	<p>Dear Mr. Shawn Oliver:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIS/EIR. We acknowledge that the Folsom Joint Federal Project (JFP) is being</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>developed to coordinate the efforts of both the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for the long-term viability and safety of Folsom Dam and associated flood damage reduction benefits.</p> <p>#400-1 Existing Conditions Operations] As we understand it, current flood control operations for Folsom Dam and Reservoir (including regulating criteria) are set out in the Corps' <i>Folsom Dam and Lake, American River, California Water Control Manual</i> (1987). In 1996, the Interim Flood Control Plan Diagram for Folsom Reservoir (a.k.a. Interim Flood Operations) was developed cooperatively between the USBR and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA). A significant component of the Interim Flood Operations was the variable 400,000 to 670,000 acre-feet empty space storage requirements for Folsom Reservoir which changed the then authorized storage space which was fixed at 400,000 acre-ft. As a 5-year Interim Agreement, this was intended to increase the available flood storage space in Folsom Reservoir to a maximum of 670,000 acre-feet depending on upstream storage conditions providing ostensibly, great flood storage relief during times of high runoff or reservoir inflow. Upon expiration in 2000, this Interim Agreement was extended for 2-years. From 2002-2004, however, no agreement was in place.</p> <p>In 2004, a new agreement was negotiated between the USBR and SAFCA to continue with the 400,000 – 670,000 acre-feet variable flood storage operation unless and until such time as the Corps implemented a new water control manual and associated new flood control diagram.</p> <p>Under this current agreement, the operational criteria (e.g., 400,000-670,000 acre-feet variable flood storage) will expire in 2018. Our current understanding is that, as part of this joint effort, the Corps will be developing an Updated Flood Management Plan and Flood Control Manual (e.g., a new flood control diagram).</p> <p>Regarding the interests of the El Dorado County Water Agency, Folsom Reservoir represents a key water supply source for a significant portion of the western slopes of El Dorado County.</p> <p>Accordingly, the El Dorado County Water Agency as well as the El Dorado Irrigation District hold strong and continuing vested interests in the long-term management, operation, and viability of this federal facility. Any change in reservoir operations that may affect the storage upon which the western slopes of El Dorado County depend is of significant interest to us. With a variety of water entitlements that depend on water year type and, therefore, indirectly on year-to-year reservoir carryover, any change in operation releases (vis-à-vis a new flood control diagram) could affect the degree with which we would be able to obtain full deliveries under our federal contracts.</p> <p>Consequently, as the Corps develops the Update Flood Management Plan and Flood Control Manual, the El Dorado County Water Agency will be very interested in ensuring that the operation assumptions used to develop a new flood control diagram carefully consider the demands, seasonal timing, and infrastructure requirements (both current and future planned) associated with the water supply needs of El Dorado County Water Agency and El Dorado Irrigation District. As an example, any forecast-based operation feasibility studies that contemplated the release from storage of water earlier, in advance of coming storms, must carefully consider the seasonal demand curve of El Dorado County purveyors, reservoir refill capabilities based on historical records, the sensitivity of the flood diagram <i>shoulder periods</i> (early spring and late fall), and the potential future changes in runoff hydrology from the American River basin resulting from long-term climatic variations.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We look forward to reviewing the Final EIS/EIR and appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document. Please feel free to call me if you seek clarification on any of our comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, William T. Hetland, P.E. General Manager El Dorado County Water Agency</p>
401	Linda Freeman	<p>To all of our honorable representatives:</p> <p>RE: " PROPOSED" CLOSURE OF FOLSOM POINT STATE PARK (A.K.A. DYKE 8) by BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.</p> <p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA, have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. [#401-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#401-2 Vegetation and Wildlife]. I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. [#401-3 Air quality.] The environmental impact on our air quality could be dangerous for residents.] This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point.</p> <p>[#401-4. Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern.</p> <p>We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. [#401-5 Public Involvement.] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th. 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially " no notice." We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We use this point multiple times a week from May to August and a few times per month during the winter. Our children need a place to have family barbeques in the picnic area. We need a place to walk our dog on the leash. We need easy access to a boat ramp. Folsom Point is a place our community needs to gather and enjoy family time. We need not have easy access to Granite Bay and the El Dorado Hills boat ramp cannot accommodate all of us. Please do not close Folsom Point.</p>
402	Peter	<p>To all of our honorable representatives:</p> <p>RE: " PROPOSED" CLOSURE OF FOLSOM POINT STATE PARK (A.K.A. DYKE 8) by BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.</p> <p>Please be advised that we, citizens of Folsom, CA, have been put on notice that a proposed closure of our park is scheduled for the fall of 2007. This proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is our understanding that our beautiful park and recreation area will be used as a construction staging area for different work projects on the dam and Mormon Island Spillway by the Bureau and Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>It is our belief that this closure will have deep and dramatic effects on families, businesses, tourism and the environment. The consequences are far reaching. [#402-1 Recreation lake access closure.] This is a family community. We bring our children to the lake to walk, bike, swim, picnic, fish, boat and just enjoy nature. This scenario is repeated over and over again. Folsom Point is one of the reasons people buy homes in this area. This park is one of the jewels of Folsom. Bird Watchers frequent the park. [#402-2 Vegetation and Wildlife.] I might point out that even though the Bald Eagle is no longer on the endangered species list, it is still protected by the "Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act". It is my understanding that one of the afforded protections is not to disturb the nesting area or flight pattern area. This needs more investigation. We have not been given adequate time to investigate the impact that this proposal will have on our environment. We have other migratory birds that now nest there as well. [#402-3 Air quality.] The environmental impact on our air quality could be dangerous for residents. This is a pathway for many other animals as well. Rattlesnakes also reside at Folsom Point. [#402-4. Socioeconomics businesses.] The businesses in Folsom will definitely realize a financial impact. Our business owners look forward to the summer months when tourists and other lake traffic provide much needed revenue. Our businesses suffered with the closure of the Dam Road and now this may be the proverbial "straw" for financial loss. Business owners have expressed a great concern. We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses, wildlife, and real estate values. [#402-5 Public Involvement.] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th. 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially " no notice." We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We ask all of you, as our voice and representatives, to please aid us in this endeavor.</p> <p>Have all other avenues been exhausted? This seems crazy that closing the point fro 7 years is our only choice. Business will suffer worse than the closing of the Dam Road. Home values will erode. It should NOT be up to citizens to come up with alternatives. What about using land behind the P.I.A as staging area?</p>
403		
404	Paul & Connie	We do not oppose positive improvements on the dam. We request a staging area that will not hurt so many families, businesses,

No.	Name	Comment
	Freese	<p>wildlife, and real estate values. [#404-1 Public Involvement.] In all truth we have not been given adequate time in which to address these issues. Our first notice was on January 9th, 2007. We were advised that 3,000 flyers were sent out. This is a city with a population of 63,000. The deadline given to us to discuss the closure is January 22, 2007. That was essentially “no notice.” We need counsel as to our rights and the right of the wildlife who cannot speak for themselves.</p> <p>We have built 2 custom houses in Briggs Ranch over the last 16 years because we have loved the access & recreation that Folsom Point has given us in the raising of our 4 daughters. We go for daily walks there & have enjoyed years of boating on the lake- We have invested close to if not over a million dollars in the building of these homes & quite frankly would not want to live anywhere else in Folsom or Sacramento but here. If this construction takes place for the period of time your project we will have no alternative but to move & take our family, business, and livings elsewhere. I project that will be the path MANY will follow if this happens.</p>
405	Steve & Jan Volker	<p>Dear Shawn Oliver, [#405-1 Public Involvement.] Would you be willing to help us here in Folsom with finding an alternate site for staging and construction equipment for the retrofitting of Folsom Dam? Folsom has already been negatively impacted by the closure of the Dam Road & the overlook parking & access area. Closing our only other real access to the lake would be only what we would call tragic for families who moved here knowing there was lake access for picnics, swimming, walks with kids, camp fires, boating, viewing and watching sunsets and taking visitors to Folsom. Please encourage the construction people and the engineers to find another staging site or another way to use the alternatives that the Folsom City Council has proposed. They should flex a little and make it possible that they should not do such a drastic closure of our one park & picnic & access area to our Folsom Lake.</p>
406	Joseph Hurley	<p>Thank you for sending the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Draft Environmental Impact Study/Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (District) for review and comment. District staff comments follow.</p> <p>[#406-1 Air Quality.] Section 3.3, page 7 of the DEIR contains Table 3.3-4 which summarizes General Conformity de minimis Thresholds. Please note that the thresholds listed in this table may change as a result of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia decision, December 22, 2006 in South Coast Air Quality Management District v. Environmental Protection Agency (Case number 04-1200).</p> <p>Section 3.3 (Air Quality) page 10 of the DEIR state:</p> <p>“If project construction NOx emissions exceed 85 lbs/day, then a standard set of construction mitigation measures must be incorporated into the Draft EIR and mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP). The inclusion of these measures allows the applicant to assume a 20 percent reduction in NOx emissions from construction activities. If the mitigated NOx emissions still exceed 85 lbs/day, SMAQMD’s policy is to charge a mitigation fee of \$14,300/ton of excess (greater than 85 lbs/day) NOx emissions.”</p> <p>Because this project is anticipated to generate significant emissions of criteria pollutants, it is likely that the District will need to devote significant staff resources for administration of the mitigation program. Consequently, the district recommends that this project utilize the updated fee calculation methodology scheduled to commence on February 15, 2007. The updated fee calculation methodology includes an administrative fee that will offset district expenditures related to this project. The updated fee calculator can be downloaded from the following internet site: http://www.airquality.org/cega/index.shtml#MitFees.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>As identified in section 3.3, page 26, the meteorological data used in the dispersion analysis is based on Lakes Environmental Webmet. Please note that SMAQMD has not reviewed the Lakes data for accuracy, and does not endorse it, or any other specific data, at this time. However, we recognize that Lakes data is commonly used as a source of meteorological data for environmental documents.</p> <p>Section 3.3, page 35 of DEIR lists "AQ-5" (use of emulsified or aqueous diesel fuel) as a potential measure to mitigate NOx emissions resulting from the project. This mitigation measure is infeasible because this type of diesel fuel is not available in the Sacramento Area. The district recommends that this mitigation measure be omitted in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Section 3.3, page 38, includes a discussion of a particulate matter. The district recommends changing the discussion of the particulate matter modeling results to provide a more thorough disclosure of the project's impact. The district suggests using the following language: "The project's impact (with mitigation) on the 24-hour PM2.5 concentrations is up to 40% of the NAAQS. This impact contributes to existing violations of the NAAQA occurring in the area." This would replace the current language.</p> <p>Appendix E in Volume II of the DEIR contains detailed tables of anticipated emissions of criteria pollutants from various types of construction equipment that will be used on the project site. The total amount of anticipated emissions is calculated using estimates based on the duration of equipment use, year of use, and emission factors from the District's 1994 CEQA guidance document. Since the release of the 1994 document, updated emission factors that better reflect actual emission rates from off-road vehicles during the period of active construction have become available. The District provided up to date emission factors to project staff and the District recommends that the final EIR/EIS utilize these updated emission factors.</p> <p>Please contact me at 916-874-2694 or jhurley@airquality.org if you have questions regarding district comments on this project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Joseph Hurley Assistant Air Quality Planner/Analyst Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District</p> <p>Cc Larry Robinson SMAQMD</p>
407	Christopher Hodges	<p>RE: Summary of Comments on Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction EIS/EIR</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>Attached are 4 letters of comments I have on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction Draft EIS/EIR. I divided the comments into four letters by subject (Congestion, Economic Modeling, Staging and Notices) to assist in your distribution to the appropriate responsible individuals. I have not fully considered all issues but felt it was most important to get comments in before Monday's deadline. I may submit additional comments at a later time.</p> <p>I sincerely appreciate the hard work that your organizations have invested in this project, the cost savings you have achieved and the</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>rapid speed in which the project has been assembled. I thank you for the time you have spent in the last week and a half discussing the project with myself and the community.</p> <p>There is just this one little issue... the closure of Folsom Point. Thank you again for your time and dedication.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Hodges Vice President Brothers Boats- Sacramento RE: Comments on Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction EIS/EIR – Staging</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>#407-1 Alternative Staging. The following are comments on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction Draft EIS/EIR regarding construction staging on the east side of Folsom Lake. No alternatives were considered that avoided major impacts to Folsom Point public access. I would appreciate responses to the following suggestions on maintaining Folsom Point public access:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Relocating the staging area to the west side of Dike 8 2) Relocating the staging area to the east of Dike 7 (lake side). 3) Relocating the staging area to the west of Dike 7. 4) Relocating the staging area to the south of Folsom Point or south of MIAD with a haul road that allows continued public access to Folsom Point. 5) Relocating the staging area to the northeast of MIAD with a haul road described in suggestion 4. <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Hodges Vice President Brothers Boats – Sacramento RE: Comments on Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction EIS/EIR – Congestion</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The following are suggested alternatives for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction Draft EIS/EIR regarding congestion issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Maintain full public access to Folsom Point by relocating the staging and processing areas to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then the closure time should be restricted to the off season period of Oct 1-April 1. 3) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures that utilize Brown's Ravine or Hobie Cove.

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>4) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008.</p> <p>5) Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass to cross the park entrance road to minimize loss of use at Folsom Point and the resulting congestion around Folsom Lake.</p> <p>6) Relocate public facilities to the area northeast of MIAD but south of Brown's Ravine.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Hodges Vice President Brothers Boats – Sacramento RE: Comments on Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction EIS/EIR – Notices</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>#407-2 Public Involvement.] The following are comments on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction Draft EIS/EIR regarding notices given and future notices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The comment period should be extended for at least 30 days. 2) Public notice was not adequate regarding possible closure of Folsom Point. Our business received no direct notice. No notices describing the potential closure were published in local papers or covered in press releases. 3) No notice of possible closure was posted at Folsom Point until an ad-hoc flier appeared early this week. 4) In the future, I would like to receive notices directly. 5) Local community and user associations should receive notices directly. 6) Neighboring property owners and neighborhood associations within proximity to the affected areas (1000 feet?) should receive direct notification. 7) As the project moves forward please involve our organization before setting times during which access to Folsom Lake may be restricted. <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Hodges Vice President Brothers Boats – Sacramento RE: Comments on Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction EIS/EIR – Economic Model</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>#407-3 Socioeconomics.] The following are comments on the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Reduction Draft EIS/EIR Economic Modeling:</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There appears to be a significant under-estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered. 2) The annual "retail effect" listed in Table 4-14 at \$174,500 is very low. The impact on our business alone (extrapolated from the losses caused by the closure of Folsom Dam Road and closing of the Folsom Lake during the past flood gate failure) we estimate at more that \$500,000 per year. 3) The economic model only examines the regional "tri-county" effect yet the losses are primarily in the City of Folsom and the gains are regional. The modeling should explicitly examine the net effect to the City of Folsom. 4) The gains and losses shown in Table 4-24 which imply a net economic gain during construction will mislead readers considering comments 1-3 above. <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Hodges Vice President Brothers Boats – Sacramento</p>
408	John M. Sanfilipia	<p>[#408-1 Alternative Staging.] As a Resident of Folsom I urge the Bureau of Reclamation to find an alternative site to stage improvement operations to the Folsom Dam. In the spring and the summer I use Folsom Point as a place to fish and launch my boat from. If Folsom Point is closed I will no longer purchase an annual recreational pass for access to the lake and I will not stand in line at Brown's Ravine or any other launch facility to launch a boat (economic impact). Additionally Folsom lake is open to the public and access to it should remain in the public's domain. Completing the work from another staging area makes sense! This would allow continued access to the lake at Folsom Point for fisherman, recreational boaters, and those using the picnic areas.</p>
409	Rob Langbehn	<p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. [#409-1 Alternative Staging.] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1-April 1. 3) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown's Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4) If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5) Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered.</p> <p>Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
410	Jeffrey Paylor	<p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. [#410-1 Alternative Staging.] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1-April 1. 3. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown's Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5. Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered. Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
411	Nicole Johnston	<p>The proposed closure of Folsom Point recreation area during the 7 year construction of Folsom Dam improvements is not acceptable. [#411-1 Alternative Staging.] Please comment on the following alternatives which were not included in the draft EIS/EIR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternatives that allow Folsom Point to remain fully open by relocating staging and processing area to the west side of Dike 8 or further west to Dike 7. 2. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then restricting the closure time to the off season period of Oct 1-April 1. 3. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then adopt congestion relief measures using Brown's Ravine or Hobie Cove. 4. If Folsom Point closure is unavoidable then relieve congestion by adding facilities at Beal's Point and only close Folsom Point after the new bridge is completed at the end of 2008. 5. Route the haul road at Folsom Point out of the public areas and use a flagman crossing or an underpass at the park entrance road to minimize disruption and the resulting congestion. <p>Regarding the economic modeling used in the EIS/EIR there appears to be a significant under estimate of the local economic impact. The reduction in sales of large ticket items (homes, land, boats, vehicles, water toys) should be considered. Regarding the opportunity for public input it appears that local stakeholders were not notified of the project. In the future please copy me on the official notices. Also please post notices at the entrances to Folsom Lake State Recreation areas as well as noticing local user or neighborhood associations.</p>
412	Joseph and Jeanette Abbate	<p>We definitely support the building of a new bridge, but our community has suffered enough. [#412-1 Recreation Site Closure] We believe there may be other sites that are usable without taking away our recreation area and lake access, e.g the old "Look-out point" on the now closed Dam Road.</p> <p>We understand officials of the city of Folsom have offered three alternatives to the use of Folsom Point, Beals Point or Granite Bay recreation areas. The use of our recreation areas should only be considered when there are absolutely no other possible alternatives. Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
413	Scott Schaffer	<p>My family and I moved up here to Folsom for the primary reason of being close to the lake and the Folsom Point boat launch. We purchased our home in the Parkway as apposed to other areas of less cost so we would have such easy access to the lake and launch. The thought of trying to get out early enough to launch from the other launch this side of the lake is terrible. Driving around to try and get out of Granite Bay side leaves us in similar circumstances. We moved away from a city where you had to “try” and get to the lakes early enough before the parking lots filled and closed for the day. Many other residents of Parkway also feel a huge part of why we moved to this track in particular is now being taken away. Is there not enough open land in other parts of the lake that would not cause all of us to loose the ramp? I can not imaging the cost vs. alternate ares could be so impactful to cause an entieres citys boating population to loose there ramp for 7 years!</p> <p>[#413-1 Recreation Site Closure] I' am discouraged and disapointed at the lack of effort for not designing alternate plans. Rather, the plans simply take away from Folsom residents. How will this effect our homes values? And if this does effect values, how is this to be compensated.</p>
414	Katrina Jackman	<p>Don't you think Folsom has had enough? [#414-1 Recreation Site Closure] First you close the Dam Road and now you are considering Folsom Point. Do you plan on financially helping all those residents and business effected? I really do not think they can take one more thing. Around the corner is the building of the new bridge. This will also make if difficult in Folsom and the surrounding areas. Enough is enough. Please come up with one plan that incorporates all the pieces before you start throwing darts at what to do without taking into account how your decisions effect those around the job sites. How about storing your equipment at the prison? They have lots of land. While your at it you could consider actually planning the bridge we all have been promised.</p>
415	Daniel M Corcoran – EI Dorado Irrigation District	<p>Re: Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project Draft EIR/EIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Mr. Oliver and Ms. Victorine:</p> <p>The EI Dorado Irrigation District (EID) has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) / Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) completed for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project. Folsom Reservoir serves as the primary water supply source for the western portion of EID's service area. As such, EID submits the following comments related to water quality impacts associated within construction in the reservoir and water supply impacts associated with placement of additional fill in the reservoir.</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u> [#415-1 Water Quality] Section 3.1 of the EIR/EIS discusses potential water quality impacts and potential mitigation measures to meet Basin Plan standards. Specifically, this section includes mitigation measures with best management practices (BMPs) and monitoring plans to minimize water quality impacts during in-reservoir borrow excavation and placement of fill. The Environmental Compliance Monitoring Plan described in Section2 of the EIR/EIS should specify a procedure for notifying affected parties that treat water from the reservoir for consumptive purposes if implementation of BMPs and monitoring do not succeed in protecting water quality. This action is necessary for the affected parties to take the appropriate actions necessary to ensure proper water treatment.</p> <p><u>Water Supply</u> [#415-2 Water Supply] Section 3.2 of the EIR/EIS discusses potential water supply impacts and potential mitigation measures necessary to maintain water supply during construction and subsequent operation. According to the EIR/EIS, Folsom Reservoir supplies about 140,000 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water supply and up to 1,243 acre-feet of reservoir capacity may be</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>replaced with fill through implementation of each project alternative. The EIR/EIS states that during construction and post-construction water allocations and timing of deliveries to Central Valley Project contractors, including EID, would remain the same as existing conditions. The EIR/EIS should specify how the reduction in storage volume will be handled in modeling analysis, such as CalSim-II, when determining availability of water for existing and future water service or Warren Act contracts to demonstrate that water allocations and timing of deliveries will not be affected.</p> <p>[#415-3 Water Supply Infrastructure] The EIR/EIS lists the water contractors from Folsom Reservoir and point of delivery for water contractors diverting from the Natomas Pipeline. However, there is no information provided for water contractors diverting from other locations within Folsom Reservoir. EID diverts water through a pump station located within Folsom Reservoir on U.S. Bureau of Reclamation property between Brown's Ravine and New York Creek tributaries. Any dam raises discussed through project alternatives should address potential impacts to water supply through inundation of infrastructure such as the EID pump station.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project. If you have any questions, please contact me at (530) 642-4082.</p> <p>Sincerely, Daniel M. Corcoran Environmental Review Division Manager</p> <p>DMC:le</p>
416	Laura Fuji USEPA	<p>Dear Mr. Oliver:</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Our comments are provided in accordance with the EPA-specific extension granted by you on January 8 (email verification received on January 17) from January 22, 2007 to January 29, 2007. We greatly appreciate the additional time provided for our review. Our detailed comments are enclosed.</p> <p>Based upon our review, we have rated this DEIS as EC-2, Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information (see attached “Summary of the EPA Rating System). We have concerns with the potential adverse effects of the proposed project on air quality. We urge implementation of aggressive mitigation measures to reduce project-related emissions to the maximum extent feasible. Furthermore, the required General Conformity Determination should be included in the Final EIS (FEIS).</p> <p>A number of actions were evaluated at a programmatic level pending completion of the detailed engineering design. Actions such as the updated Folsom Facilities operations manual and Auxiliary Spillway dredging are of specific interest to EPA given their potential water quality effects. We request notification of these actions and receipt of the project-level environmental documentation.</p> <p>The Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Project integrates the engineering solutions addressing hydrologic control, seismic, and static issues authorized in the US Corps of Engineers Folsom Dam Modification and Folsom Dam Raise projects. EPA comments regarding these projects are enclosed for your reference and consideration.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS. Please send two copies of the FEIS to the above address (mail code: CED-2) when it is released for public review. If you have questions, please call Nova Blazej, the new Manager of the Environmental Review Office, at 415-972-3846, or Laura Fujii, the lead reviewer for this project, at 415-972-3852, or at fujii.laura@epa.gov.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Paula Bisson, Manager Environmental Review Office Communities and Ecosystems Division</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS</p> <p>This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“LO” (Lack of Objections)</i></p> <p>The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“EC” (Environmental Concerns)</i></p> <p>The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“EO” (Environmental Objections)</i></p> <p>The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“EU” (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)</i></p> <p>The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT</u></p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Category 1” (Adequate)</i></p> <p>EPA believes that the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Category 2” (Insufficient Information)</i></p> <p>The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be identified in the final EIS.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Category 3” (Inadequate)</i></p> <p>EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assess potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purpose of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.</p> <p>EPA DETAILED COMMENTS, DEIS FOLSOM DAM SAFETY AND FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCITON PROJECT, FOLSOM, CA, JANUARY 22, 2007</p> <p><u>Air Quality Comments</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Implement aggressive air quality mitigation measure and include the General Conformity Evaluation in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</i> The project area is located in an area designed as non-attainment for ozone and fine particulate matter. Construction-related emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx), a precursor for ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 and 2,5 microns in diameter (PM10) and PM2.5) would exceed Federal and/or California air quality standards (pps. 3.3-29 to 3.3-37). Mitigation measures are necessary to reduce these adverse emissions. Even with mitigation, NOx, PM10 and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions would be greater than the General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> thresholds, triggering the requirement for a full general conformity evaluation for the selected preferred alternative prior to the Record of Decision (ROD) (p. 3.3-37). We note that the incremental effects of the NOx, PM10, and CO emissions would be significant under the cumulative condition (p. 3.3-38).</p> <p>Recommendations: [#416-1 Air Quality Conformity and Mitigation] EPA recommends aggressive implementation of all feasible mitigation measures to address exceedances of air quality standards. The FEIS should include a detailed mitigation plan providing an implementation schedule, the responsible parties, and monitoring and reporting requirements.</p> <p>We recommend that required General Conformity Determination be included in the final environmental impact statement (EIS)</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>with a description of the mitigation/offset measures that will be implemented prior to the project start date.</p> <p>The FEIS should also include a description of the projected operational emissions that will be generated by the completed project.</p> <p><u>NEPA Compliance</u></p> <p><i>Commit to future NEPA compliance for project changes.</i> Alternative 5 would raise the Folsom facilities by 17 feet in order to increase the reservoir capacity to contain the Probable Maximum Flood. While we recognize this would be a “dry” raise providing for an increase in flood storage capacity, there is concern with the potential future conversion of this storage and flood surcharge space to water supply or multipurpose use (“wet” dam raise). Of specific concern is the potential for changes in use without appropriate public and environmental review.</p> <p>Recommendation: [#416-2 Future NEPA Compliance] We recommend the FEIS and ROD include a commitment to future NEPA compliance, with appropriate public review processes, prior to any decision to modify the use of the additional flood storage capacity.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p><i>Notify EPA of supplemental environmental documentation.</i> A number of actions were evaluated at a programmatic level pending selection of the final preferred alternative and completion of the detailed engineering design. For example, the lead agencies plan to complete a revised water plan and control manual (p. 1-9), and the US Corps of Engineers (Corps) may dredge the proposed Auxiliary Spillway approach 40 feet deeper than planned by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) (p. 3.10-18). Both future actions would be evaluated in supplemental NEPA compliance documentation. EPA has interest in these actions, given their potential effects on water quality and beneficial uses within Folsom Reservoir and downstream in the American River.</p> <p>Recommendation: [#416-3 Updated Flood Management Plan] Please send two copies of the supplemental environmental compliance documentation and a copy of the Final Updated Flood Management Plan to the address above (mail code: CED-2) when they are released for public view.</p> <p><i>Document final decisions in separate Joint Federal Project, Reclamation, and Corp Record of Decisions.</i> The DEIS evaluates a Joint Federal Project that will meet Reclamation’s dam safety hydrologic objective and the Corp’s flood damage reduction objective, plus a range of alternative that address other stand-alone flood damage reduction, dam safety, and security actions (p. 1-25).</p> <p>Recommendation: [#416-4 Clear Project Definition and Responsibilities] The FEIS should clearly identify the specific decisions and responsible parties for the Joint Federal Project and stand-alone flood damage reduction, dam safety, and security actions. We</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		<p>recommend the final decisions be documented in three distinct Record of Decisions for the Joint Federal Project, Reclamations' stand-alone actions, and the Corps' stand-alone actions.</p> <p>Complete and include in the FEIS all Federal requirements. Various Federal requirements will be completed prior to completion of the FEIS or ROD. For instance a draft US FWS biological opinion will be obtained prior to completion of the Final EIS/EIR and a General Conformity Determination completed prior to issuance of the ROD (pp. 1-32 to 1-35).</p> <p>Recommendation: [#416-5 NEPA Process Coordination]The NEPA process is intended to assist public officials make decisions that are based on an understanding of the environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment (40 CFR Part 1500.1(c)). We recommend that information sources such as the US FWS Biological Opinion and General Conformity Determination be completed prior to the ROD and included in the FEIS.</p>
417	Jan and Steve Volker	<p>Dear Becky Victorine –</p> <p>[#417-1 Alternative Staging] I am writing to request that you could help us if you would be willing. Many, many (in fact the vast majority) of Folsom residents request that you and some other creative engineers could find an alternative place for a staging area for construction equipment rather than closing our one access to Folsom Lake—Folsom Point. Please listen to our city council who has 3 other places.</p> <p>Folsom has already had much negative impact from the closure of the Dam Road and the overlook parking area. The citizens of this town have already flexed and suffered from traffic problems, inconveniences, and business slow down, and perceived impact that we feel affects property values and whether Folsom is a desirable place to live since the Lake is a key part of people living in and moving to Folsom.</p> <p>We believe the construction people and engineers could flex and move to an alternative site. The residents of Folsom should not have to have our one access closed for 7 years. Folsom Point is a key, central part of living in Folsom.</p>
418	Beth Lusar	<p>Becky Victorine,</p> <p>[#418-1 Auburn Dam] I have lived in Sacramento since 1939 and will remember the flowing part of the American River and the closure of the 14 Street Bridge. Then the Folsom Dam was built with certain specifications as to height and water holding capacity and the number of outlets on the base. To raise the height to increase the holding capacity and at the same time cut more outlets in the base, in my thinking, would weaken the original base. Also, late last year, the Sacramento Bee published a statement from one of the Corp. of Engineers that it would be very difficult to find consultant workers to do this kind of reconstruction.</p> <p>The answer to flood protection is to complete the Auburn Dam promptly.</p>
419	Michelle Hamilton	<p>[#419-1 General] Please do not close Folsom Point!! One of the reasons we moved to Folsom was to be close to the lake. We store our boat at home and use Folsom point all the time. I think it is a huge inconvenience for the citizens of Folsom to use this resource as a storage facility. Shame on the city officials for even considering such actions.</p>
420	Patricia Gibbs	<p>Ms. Lasala,</p> <p>My name is Patricia Gibbs I spoke to you at the Folsom Meeting last Wednesday night.</p> <p>[#420-1 Possible Property Impacts] I own property, in Placer County, which borders Folsom Lake. As I had mentioned, I am concerned about possible changes to the current Fed Gov property line around Folsom Lake as a result of raising the dam and</p>

No.	Name	Comment
		surrounding dikes. Any information and/or maps or other graphical info referencing elevations or contour lines you could provide regarding changes to the Fed Govmnt property line as it affects my parcel (number 036-190-075-000) would be greatly appreciated.
421	K. Leonard	[#421-1 General] Hello, I fish Folsom Lake all the time. Folsom Point is the only ramp I use. I don't care if construction trucks are driving in the area or over the Point road. I just want to be able to launch. Please do not close our ramp.
422	Ron Adley	<p>Mr. Finnegan,</p> <p>As a twenty year resident of Folsom, the last 14 years in Briggs Ranch, I certainly would not want to see Folsom Point closed any more so than those you have heard from already. At the same time, having years of experience in the steel business having supplied steel to Kiewit Pacific among other firms for large bridge jobs including C.C. Myers after the collapse of the Santa Monica Freeway, Loma Prieta damage, the new Folsom Bridge and many other projects of this magnitude, I understand the difficulties associated with logistics, equipment containment and public safety concerns involved on such large projects. With that said, and assuming your acknowledgement of my experience in such matters, I would like to offer what could be a reasonable solution.</p> <p>I originally hale from Louisiana where, as you know, flood water is overly abundant which has and will forever more require construction of coffer dams, "large drainage ditches" to divert water away from much needed levee repairs and/or proposed highway projects, including new bridges, not unlike this one on a smaller scale. [#422-1 Barging Alternative]To meet those demands, extreme large quantities of dirt and rock must be moved and/or excavated as is the case here. In the face of similar concerns and issues here, the solution was the use of barges to move the materials needed. In fact, I suggested the use of barges on the San Ramon Bridge addition project a few years back and they worked perfectly. You may know but if not, the water depth around that bridge is very shallow and sometimes gets very shallow depending on the tide movement and weather. Certainly, a much greater margin of difficulty given the varying water depths when compared to Folsom Lake. Frankly, I would have to believe you have considered the barge option already.</p> <p>By plotting the depths and lake bottom topography necessary to accommodate barge tare weight (there are several barge variations to choose from depending on the application) and material load capacity, surely barges would be the way to manage this situation. Granted, the barges would need to move across recreational boating lanes but if properly marked off noting these barge lanes, I could hardly see that as an encroachment to recreational boating. If need be, the barges could be moved at night and staged for unloading the next working day. Take a look at your aerial maps on hand and you will see that barge traffic from point to point should not pose a problem. Also, where the depths are not sufficient to accommodate a large load, dredge the bottom accordingly thereby creating more usable materials to shore up the Dike at Mormon Island.</p> <p>Again, I would think this option has been considered and if so, I would strongly encourage you to go a bit further in your due diligence in determining the validity of this option. I've seen it work many times in areas much more difficult than what I see at Folsom Lake. However, given the likelihood there may be more involved details to this project limiting my simplistic view, you are much more qualified as to whether this option has merit. As I watched the public outcry unfold over the last weeks however, I haven't heard or read where this option would be considered so thought I would throw my hat in, for what it's worth.</p> <p>Whatever the final outcome, closing Folsom Point is not viable just from recreational revenue losses alone much less having the public's ire focused on your every move. Thanks for taking the time in reading this and good luck with the decision. In the remote chance you feel it necessary to call me, please feel free in doing so.</p>

No.	Name	Comment
423	Brian and Jolene Shirey	<p>Mr. Finnegan,</p> <p>I just read the article in the paper about Folsom Point. My husband and I have not yet participated in voicing our opinion on the issue, but would like to add our names to the "concerned residents" list. This closure would significantly affect the active lifestyle of Folsom which is why many people brought their families here. [#423-1 Socioeconomics] It would definitely hurt local businesses that benefit from the use of Folsom Point. We just wanted to add our two cents in hopes that you will listen to the community and find a suitable alternative.</p>
424	Eric & Heather Olson	<p>Mr. Finnegan,</p> <p>We missed the open comment period on the proposal to use Folsom Point as a staging area for the Folsom Dam spillway project and we hope that you'll consider our two cents in your planning for the project. To the point, we moved to the Briggs Ranch neighborhood nearly four years ago to start a family and have easy access to Folsom Lake. Now that our two children are almost one and three years old, we often walk from our home to Folsom Point for "getaway adventures." I assume that we're not counted in the number of official visitors to Folsom Point since we arrive on foot. [#424-1 Alternative Staging] My purpose in writing you is to urge you to find an alternate staging location for as many years as it takes to finish the project so that my family and the hundreds of others like ours in this neighborhood can enjoy the lake that inspired us to move here.</p>
425	Robert Walter	<p>Dear Sirs, [#425-1 General] Please do not close Folsom Point. My family and our friends in the neighborhood use that access to go boating and have picnics. Robert Walter 203 Davies Court Folsom, CA 95630</p>
426	Kathy and Troy	<p>[#426-1 General] We oppose the closure of Folsom Point for staging of the new bridge construction.. [#426-2 Alternative Staging] Please try another alternative that will not impact the recreational area for families and all. Thank you.... Kathy and Troy Folsom Residents</p>

Responses to Comments

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
1	1-1	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could also potentially flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, there is not a need for new embankments or berms.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
1	1-2	See Response # 1-1.
1	1-3	See Response # 1-1.
2	2-1	Population and Housing/raise – Alternatives 4 and 5 involving a 7-ft raise and 17-ft raise respectively were included in the Draft EIS/EIR analysis for comparative purposes, and have been eliminated from consideration in the Final EIS/EIR. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR includes language to clarify this. Please see Response to Comment #1-1 for additional information on property impacts. Also see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information on the project description.
2	2-2	Previous Corps Studies – The Corps Selected Plan for the Folsom Raise Project, as disclosed in the 2002 Long Term Study Final EIS/EIR included a 7-ft dam raise. Because of the hydraulic benefit of the proposed auxiliary spillway, the Selected Plan now recommends a 3.5-ft raise, primarily to provide additional freeboard capacity, instead of a 7-ft raise. Preliminary cost estimates indicate that a parapet wall may be more cost effective than an earthen raise, however, the design of the 3.5-ft raise would be determined, along with appropriate environmental analysis, coordination and compliance documentation, in the Pre-construction, Engineering and Design phase when more detailed information is available. The Corps intends to adopt the Final EIS/EIR to satisfy the requirements of NEPA for the flood damage reduction features of the proposed action (JFP, 3.5-ft raise and emergency gate replacement) that would be accomplished under the Corps' Folsom Dam Modifications and Folsom Dam Raise Projects. A Record of Decision (ROD) for the flood damage reduction only features of the Selected Plan (3.5-ft raise and emergency gate replacement) would be

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		completed separate from the Joint Federal Project ROD, and would be completed in the pre-construction, engineering and design phase of the project.
2	2-3	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could also potentially flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, your property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
2	2-4	Alternative 5 Selection – Alternative 5, the 17-ft raise, is no longer being considered, as described in Section 2.3.4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
2	2-5	See Response 2-3
2	2-6	See Response 2-3
3	3-1	Reservoir Storage – There is no planned decrease in "Water Storage" at Folsom Dam with the Folsom Dam Safety/Flood Damage Reduction action. Costs incurred with storage of irrigation and municipal and industrial (M&I) water supply and hydropower generation at Folsom Reservoir are recovered by Reclamation from Central Valley Project water and power contractors and non-project purveyors as specified by various water service and repayment contracts with Reclamation. Costs incurred with water supply for fish and wildlife and other non-reimbursable project purposes are funded by tax payers in the form of federal appropriations.
4	4-1	Project Footprint - Section 2.2.3 of the Final EIS/EIR indicates haul routes as being predominantly within the Federal Boundary property. The government will not be using property outside of Folsom Reservoir for project work.
5	5-1	Operational Effects to Bridges - The Partner Agencies view this concern to be a result of the levee improvements below Folsom Dam, as noted by the commentor. Accordingly, it is being addressed under the Common Features authority, and not the subject of this EIS/EIR. The agencies position relative to this

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		<p>concern follows, as does a description of the work that is ongoing and planned to further address it.</p> <p>The proposed project significantly reduces the frequency and magnitude of flood flows on the Lower American River (LAR). A project condition outflow of 160,000 cfs corresponds to substantially greater outflows under existing (pre-project) conditions. Pre-project condition flows ranging from the 1/110 (210,000 cfs) to the 1/240 chance events (449,000 cfs) would all be reduced to 160,000 cfs. This overall decrease in the size and frequency of large flood events under proposed project conditions represents a sizable reduction in the risk to downstream bridges. In this regard, the proposed project actually mitigates any impacts to LAR bridges that might result from improving the downstream leveed conveyance system to reliably convey the objective sustained release of 160,000 cfs. Therefore, neither the project proposed in the Folsom DS/FDR EIS/EIR nor improvements to the downstream levees represent an "impact" to the LAR bridges.</p> <p>Because the LAR bridges are critical elements of multiple flood evacuation routes and risks to their structural integrity represent a threat to the leveed LAR conveyance system, the project agencies are concerned with the risk of pier/abutment scour. An analysis completed by Ayres Associates for the Corps in 1997 concluded that there is significant pier/abutment scour potential at all LAR bridges under existing conditions. It also concluded that an increase in flow from 115,000 cfs to 160,000 cfs does not significantly alter computed scour depths. Therefore, the project agencies plan to assess what measures have been taken to protect the LAR bridges from pier scour under existing conditions, and whether such measures are adequate to protect against a sustained release of 160,000 cfs. The project agencies plan to work with the parties responsible for the LAR bridges to ensure that the bridges are adequately protected to this standard, but note that neither the proposed project nor downstream levee improvement efforts are responsible for deferred actions to adequately protect the bridges from the existing flow regime.</p> <p>A study to determine what measures are necessary to assure the long-term vertical and lateral stability of the LAR under the proposed flow regime, including the objective sustained release of 160,000 cfs, is currently being performed under the Common Features authority. This study will address the potential for significant bed degradation and profile lowering, which is the single overriding concern relative to the integrity of the LAR leveed flood conveyance system and the bridge structures within it. Proposed measures resulting from this study could range from grade control to increased monitoring.</p> <p>In any case, hydraulic modeling performed indicates that 160,000 cfs will pass under all publicly owned bridges on the LAR without inundating their low chords. Previous analyses performed for the Corps concluded that pier/abutment scour potential doesn't increase significantly when flows increase from 120,000 cfs to 160,000 cfs. This response also applies to bridges on the Sacramento River. The requested reports will be made available - please contact Mr. Brett Whitin of the Corps at (916) 557-7530. The project agencies</p>

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		<p>appreciate the commentor's offer to assist. Mr. Champion will be contacted by Corps staff</p> <p>Please note: Additional attachments were sent with this comment. These are available in electronic format in the Final EIS/EIR Appendix.</p>
6	6-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
7	7-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
7	7-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
8	8-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
9	9-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
9	9-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
10	10-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
11	11-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
12	12-1	The socioeconomic analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR was based on a very conservative approach ("worse case") using the assumption that recreation facilities would be closed for extended periods. Based on comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR, the Partner Agencies no longer plan for extended recreational facility closures (See Response to Comment # 7-1). Therefore, there will not be an adverse impact to either the CDPR or local revenues due to the Folsom DS/FDR project. Please see Section 4.3.3 in Chapter 4 Topical Responses of the Final EIS/EIR for more information on the Socioeconomics analysis required under CEQA and NEPA.
13	13-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
14	14-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
15	15-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
16	16-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
16	16-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
16	16-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
16	16-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
17	17-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
17	17-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
17	17-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. In addition, the comment period was extended by four days (to January 26th) to allow more comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
18	18-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. In addition, the comment period was extended by four days (to January 26th) to allow more comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
18	18-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
18	18-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
19	19-1	Project Description - The project addressed in the Draft EIS has three elements: Dam Safety, Dam Security, and Flood Damage Reduction. Dam Safety and Dam Security are the responsibility of Reclamation while Flood Damage Reduction is the responsibility of the Corps and its local partners. Congress has requested that Reclamation and Corps seek common solutions where possible. The Joint Federal Project auxiliary spillway has been designed to address the Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction hydrologic concerns of both agencies. Work at L.L. Anderson, the Folsom Bridge Project, and along the lower American River are separate Corps projects, not related to the Folsom DS/FDR actions. Spillway improvements at L.L. Anderson Dam were included in the originally authorized Folsom Dam Raise Project. However, the Corps' current Selected Plan, as described in the PAC Report, recommends deleting this element from the Folsom Dam Raise Project, as it has recently been determined that Placer County Water Agency, the owner of the dam, will take responsibility for these improvements. Section 1.3 further describes coordination of the projects.
19	19-2	Cost Allocation - Any raise would be for flood damage reduction purposes only and therefore funded by the Corps and their cost share partners. Reclamation would recover up to 15% of total dam safety costs at Folsom Dam and Reservoir from among the reimbursable project functions, namely irrigation water supply, municipal and industrial water supply and power. Recovery of dam safety costs would be in compliance with prevailing statutes and policies.
19	19-3	Alternatives Costs – Costs of the alternatives are normally not presented in an EIS/EIR because costs are not a primary comparison criterion when presenting and evaluating alternatives in the EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR is focused on the project's potential impacts to the physical, biological and social environments. The EIS/EIR identifies an environmentally preferred alternative based on an assessment of impacts, not an evaluation of costs. The cost of the fuseplug spillway would be less than the JFP gated spillway because it involves less excavation, concrete, and steel work than the JFP gated spillway. However, the fuseplug would not meet any flood damage reduction objectives and is not a joint federal project.
19	19-4	Temperature control devices are not assessed in this EIS/EIR. As described in the Corps PAC Report, the originally authorized Folsom Dam Raise Project included improvements to the temperature control shutters as part of the ecosystem restoration component of the project. The Selected Plan (Refined Authorized Project) described in the PAC Report does not recommend any changes to this element of the authorized

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		project, which is analyzed in the 2002 Long Term Feasibility Study/EIS/EIR. Supplemental environmental analysis, coordination and documentation would be completed if needed for this feature in the pre-construction, engineering and design phase of the project.
19	19-5	<p>Project Reoperations - The Corps will initiate a collaborative process with CVP water and power contractors, Reclamation and other stakeholders to develop a concept and plan for permanent re-operation of Folsom Dam and Reservoir. The Corps is committed to that process and will not make any final decisions pending the outcome of the process. Permanent re-operation of Folsom Reservoir is outside the scope of this EIS/EIR and will require separate environmental documentation.</p> <p>The authorization for the Folsom Modification Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-ft to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modification Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process. Therefore, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements in this EIS/EIR. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.</p>
19	19-6	Security Features - Congress required Reclamation to recover operation and maintenance costs associated with security operations from reimbursable project beneficiaries beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2007. Capital costs associated with physical site security will remain non-reimbursable.
20	20-1	Cost allocation -Flood control costs associated with the project are non-reimbursable and non-refundable from CVP water and power contractors. Reclamation is responsible for recovering the reimbursable portion of the safety of dam costs from contractors. Reclamation will comply with the spirit and intent of all statutes and policies concerning coordination and review by beneficiaries of recoverable costs. The 3.5-ft dam raise will be 100% flood damage reduction. The Corps PAC Report provides text clarifying this.
21	21-1	Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety or dam security objectives as described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
21	21-2	The 3.5-ft raise options currently being considered would be unlikely to block views of local residences or of people using Folsom recreation facilities.
21	21-3	Mormon Island Cemetery – The Mormon Island Cemetery is located remote from any area of potential effect from the Folsom DS/FDR project.
22	22-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
22	22-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
22	22-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point would remain open for recreation during peak season; therefore, impacts to property values with regards to the closure of Folsom Point would not occur.
22	22-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
23	23-1	Traffic impacts due to the project were addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 3.9. This section includes 84 pages of text and tables presenting existing traffic conditions and circulation patterns, locations with traffic problems, and the impacts of construction traffic on local traffic patterns. The City of Folsom has provided comments and suggestions on the EIS/EIR traffic impacts. Prior to construction and hauling of materials, the Partner Agencies and their contractors will submit a traffic control plan to the City of Folsom outlining proposed routes and times of transport. The Partner Agencies and their contractors will adhere to the plan mutually agreed to with the City of Folsom. There would be less additional traffic on city streets during construction due to haul roads remaining on Federal land. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
23	23-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Also, see the Topical Response for recreation mitigation in Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR regarding refinements to the project to keep Folsom Point open.
24	24-1	Geology, soils, dam stability - During the pre-construction, engineering and design phase for the 3.5-ft raise, the project would be designed to ensure that the stability of the concrete dam and all embankments is not decreased. Previous engineering analyses indicate that the 3.5-ft raise being considered can be safely built.
24	24-2	Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety or dam

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		security objectives as described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom Facility, which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
25	25-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
26	26-1	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
26	26-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
26	26-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
27	27-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
28	28-1	<p>Alternatives 4, a 7-ft raise, and Alternative 5, a 17-ft raise, are no longer being considered; however, a 3.5-ft raise is still possible. The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that also could potentially flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, your property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information on the revised project description.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
28	28-2	See Response #28-1 above.
29	29-1	Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety, or dam security objectives as described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
29	29-2	Project Purpose - The reviewer is referred back to Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR for more details on the purpose of the project. Folsom Dam is made up of 12 separate facilities, each requiring some type of improvement. Although the spillway gates require upgrade, as is indicated in the comment, the spillway gates are not properly situated to provide the necessary hydrologic control of large flood events and to meet dam safety requirements. The auxiliary spillway is being proposed as a future operational tool to meet hydrologic control needs. The main dam also needs seismic upgrades for earthquake protection, as does Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam. Many of the earthen structures require filter upgrades to control seepage. Dredging of the reservoir bottom is not a viable option due to the existing spillway gates and there is no place to put millions of yards of dredged material that would be required to increase reservoir capacity.
30	30-1	<p>Mormon Island Dam Stability - The Safety of Dams modifications to be constructed include significant improvements to Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam. The foundation will be strengthened with jet grouting and a large earth fill overlay will be constructed on the downstream face to prevent failure during strong earthquake events. In addition, the embankment will be protected against seepage pressures by construction of filter and drainage zones along the entire length of the dam. Detailed seismic analyses, seepage analyses and static stability analyses have been completed to ensure the dam will remain strong in any conceivable loading condition.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
31	31-1	Federal Property - The proposed JFP, 3.5-ft raise, and emergency gate replacement make no changes to the federal property line as part of the proposed project. There are no plans to acquire adjacent lands. See Section 4.3.4 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information. Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.
31	31-2	Recreational Trails - Construction work near the dikes, wing dams, and MIAD would require temporary closure, and where possible, rerouting of trails. A recreation management plan will be developed which will describe which trails will be closed or rerouted, when, and for how long. At present, trails near or on Folsom Point, Dikes 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, the wing dams, and MIAD will be temporarily affected during periods of construction. See Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information.
32	32-1	<p>Study Authority – The current study was implemented under several existing authorizations. Primary authority and guidance for flood damage reduction is provided in the Folsom Dam Modifications Project Authority under Section 101(a) (6) of the Water Resources Development Act (PL 106-53) and the Folsom Dam Raise Authority under PL 108-137, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for 2004. The Folsom Dam Modification and Folsom Dam Raise authorities share the objective of improving flood management on the American River, primarily through structural modifications to the existing Folsom Dam and appurtenant facilities. With the Folsom Dam Raise authority, Congress also authorized the Corps to construct an ecosystem restoration project component on the Lower American River and a permanent bridge, provided that certain funding conditions were met.</p> <p>In addition, Reclamation has been pursuing Safety of Dams modifications separately through its existing Safety of Dams Program. Investigations and analyses by Reclamation have identified needed dam safety modifications at Folsom Dam and appurtenant facilities. In response to these studies, Reclamation initiated a Corrective Action Study (CAS) to identify technically feasible and environmentally and socially preferable alternatives that would address the identified safety concerns. A CAS Report, supported by the analyses in this EIS/EIR, will present a preferred alternative for incorporation into a Modifications Report. This Modifications Report will be submitted to Congress for approval. Recent modifications to both agencies' existing authorities were made in the Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2006, which directed the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior to collaborate on authorized activities to maximize flood damage reduction improvements and address dam safety needs at Folsom Dam and Reservoir as one project; and authorized both agencies to expend funds for design of a joint project.</p> <p>See Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for information on changes to use of Folsom Point for construction.</p>
32	32-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
32	32-3	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to comment #12-1.
32	32-4	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
33	33-1	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to comment #12-1.
33	33-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
34	34-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
34	34-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
34	34-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
35	35-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
36	36-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
36	36-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
37	37-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
38	38-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
39	39-1	Recreation Site Restoration - The Partner Agencies will return (with the concurrence of CDPR) any FLSRA facility that is removed or altered as part of the construction of the Folsom DS/FDR features to its existing condition.
39	39-2	Recreation Trails Inundation – The Folsom DS/FDR Project will not result in an increase in reservoir pool elevation that would impact recreational facilities greater than already occurs today. Repair or restoration of trails that have been established by DPR within the operational flood zone of Folsom Reservoir would remain the responsibility of DPR to perform. This project will not cause additional flooding of trails. Also see Response to Comment #49-1.
39	39-3	Geology and Asbestos - Geologic evaluations of soil and rock conducted by Reclamation geologists have shown that there is no serpentine rock or asbestos bearing rocks within the area proposed for excavation of the Auxiliary Spillway. Soil and rock that may contain minute amounts of asbestos may exist east of Dike 8. Dust abatement measures will be employed for disturbance of soil at all construction sites including activities east of Dike 8. See Section 3.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR for more information.
39	39-4	Flood Warning for Flow Release – The decision for release of flows potentially threatening the lower American River levees would be a multiple agency decision (DWR, Corps, Reclamation, and SAFCA). The emergency response plan developed by these joint agencies relative to potential flooding downstream of

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		Folsom Reservoir would be implemented in advance of a significant flow release.
40	40-1	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could potential flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, your property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
41	41-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
42	42-1	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
42	42-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
42	42-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
43	43-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
43	43-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
44	44-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
44	44-2	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
45	45-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
46	46-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
47	47-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
47	47-2	Dam Road Closure – The Record of Decision for the closure of the Folsom Dam Road allows limited reopening of the road during rush hours. Reopening is pending capital, operational, and maintenance commitments from the City of Folsom.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
48	48-1	New Bridge comment. - The subject bridge is a separate project and is not part of the Folsom DS/FDR project. See Section 4.3.13 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
48	48-2	<p>Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety and dam security objectives, as described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.</p> <p>As indicated in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative. Section 4.3.2 describes access to the project documents.</p>
49	49-1	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could potential flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore your property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
50	50-1	The potential to accommodate the request to provide material will be assessed during final design.
51	51-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project. Alternatives 4 and 5 are no longer being considered.
52	52-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
53	53-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		of the Final EIS/EIR.
53	53-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
54	54-1	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point would remain open for recreation during peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values with regards to the closure of Folsom Point.
55	55-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
55	55-2	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
56	56-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project. Alternative 5 is no longer being considered.
57	57-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
58	58-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
59	59-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
59	59-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
60	60-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
60	60-2	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
61	61-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
61	61-2	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
62	62-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
63	63-1	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
64	64-1	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
65	65-1	Observation Point Mitigation – The observation point was closed due to national security concerns and is addressed in the Folsom Dam Access Restriction EIS. There are no plans under the Folsom DS/FDR project to replace the observation point.
66	66-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
66	66-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
66	66-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
66	66-4	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
67	67-1	The comment does not pertain to, or raise, environmental issues related to the proposed Project alternatives. This and other such written comments, not related to environmental issues, which were received during the public review period for the DEIS/R are included as part of the Final EIS/R and may be considered by decision-makers during project deliberations; however, written responses to such comments are not required by CEQA or NEPA.
68	68-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
68	68-2	Recreation illegal access – Reclamation plans additional security measures near the main dam and dikes to control access. Illegal entry points will be closed and blocked as necessary. CDPR will remain responsible for security around the facilities it manages.
68	68-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
68	68-4	The Folsom DS/FDR project will not involve increasing the storage capacity or raising the water elevation during recreation season. The reservoir will continue to be operated as it currently is, or until a change in the reservoir's operation manual is put into place. Changing reservoir operations will be subject to its own environmental review process. Also please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete description of the project. A 3.5-ft raise is being considered at this time; a 7-ft raise is no longer being considered.
68	68-5	Recreation Transportation – There is a potential for some additional recreational traffic for individuals traveling through downtown Folsom; however, after the new bridge is complete, this traffic will take the shorter route. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. The continued access to Folsom Point would reduce potential traffic through downtown Folsom.
68	68-6	Purpose and Need - The Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction objectives for the Project are discussed in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional discussion regarding the potential need for flood damage reduction improvements.
69	69-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
69	69-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
70	70-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
71	71-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
72	72-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
72	72-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement and will alert the public of any potential temporary interruptions to recreation facilities. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
72	72-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - Reclamation and the Corps have been working closely with USFWS in the identification of impacts that could result from Folsom DS/FDR construction actions and in the development

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		of mitigation measures to prevent or minimize those impacts. This work has resulted in the identification of endangered species and wildlife habitats potentially affected. The results of the coordination work are presented in the Wildlife Coordination Act Report and Biological Assessment documents prepared for this project, Appendices D and E of the Final EIS/EIR. These documents along with the mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR will protect wildlife species to the extent practicable under law. The migration of wildlife species from the Folsom Point area is not expected because the majority of the area intended for use is either already paved or is within the inundation zone of the reservoir and does not afford sensitive habitat. Section 3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR presents the potential impacts to terrestrial vegetation and wildlife. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
73	73-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
74	74-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
75	75-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
76	76-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
77	77-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
77	77-2	Socioeconomic Business - See Response to Comment #12-1.
78	78-1	No Action Alternative Relative to Operations - As per WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53) an interim operation agreement is assumed to continue in place until 2018 or until completion of the revised water control manual, which is anticipated to complete one year prior to completion of construction of the JFP. A permanent re-operation study addressing these concerns is currently being scoped, and will include the appropriate level of environmental analysis, agency, stakeholder and public coordination and documentation.
79	79-1	Project Description relative to Operations – This EIS/EIR introduces the likelihood that operations of Folsom Reservoir may change in the future as a result of updating the Water Control Manual. The update of the Water Control Manual and resulting changes would occur irrespective of the Folsom DS/FDR project. The changes are not directly linked to this project. Project agencies are in the process of identifying the changes, and when the changes are defined, they will be assessed and disclosed in a separate environmental document.
79	79-2	The Folsom DS/FDR project addresses measures to improve the seismic, static, hydrologic, security, and flood damage reduction issues related to Folsom Dam and its associated facilities. Improvements to the downstream levees are being addressed under the Corps Folsom Modifications Project under a separate authorization.
80	80-1	Hydropower relative to reoperations/cumulative effect – There are no proposed changes to the operations of Folsom Reservoir under the Folsom DS/FDR that would affect power customers of WAPA. As per WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53) an interim operation agreement is assumed to continue in place or until completion of the Folsom Modifications Project. A permanent reoperation study which will include the implementation of a new

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		water control manual is currently being scoped parallel to this project. The reoperation study will also analyze forecast based operation. The reoperation study will include the appropriate level of environmental analysis, agency, stakeholder and public coordination and environmental compliance documentation.
80	80-2	Hydropower - The proposed project will not change the manner in which the hydropower facilities at Folsom and Nimbus dams are operated and managed. As per WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53) an interim operation agreement is assumed to continue in place or until completion of the Folsom Modifications Project. A permanent reoperation study which will include the implementation of a new water control manual is currently being scoped parallel to this project. The reoperation study will also analyze forecast based operation. The reoperation study will include the appropriate level of environmental analysis, agency, stakeholder and public coordination and environmental compliance documentation.
81	81-1	CVP Cost Allocation - CVP cost allocation and repayment are outside the scope of the NEPA process. Any reimbursable costs associated with the projects at Folsom Dam and Reservoir will be recovered by Reclamation as appropriate in compliance with Reclamation law and policy. The Corps PAC Report contains cost information for the flood damage reduction portion of the project.
82	82-1	CVP Cost Allocation - CVP cost allocation and repayment are outside the scope of the NEPA process. At their discretion, CVP water and power contractors may elect to approach Reclamation administratively with their proposal to establish a separate repayment period for recovery of Dam Safety costs for Folsom Dam and Reservoir.
83	83-1	The text referenced in the comment relates to the specific Congressional authorizations that direct Reclamation to address dam safety and the Corps flood damage reduction issues at Folsom Dam and Reservoir. Those specific authorizations are presented in the text immediately following the referenced page ES-2 statement on pages ES-3 and ES-5.
84	84-1	Study Authority - The authorizations are as follows: 1.5.9: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2006 (PL109-103) for the Auxiliary Spillway (Page 1-19 of the PAC) and Folsom Modifications Project authorization is WDRA 1999 (PL 106-53) (Page 1-17).
85	85-1	Construction of a fuseplug control for the auxiliary spillway by Reclamation would be an interim measure prior to the Corps construction of the gated spillway. Reclamation would construct a fuseplug spillway control only if it was determined that there would be a delay in Congressional funding for the Corps to construct the gated spillway
86	86-1	The security features are a Safety of Dams only project feature.
87	87-1	Study Authority for Folsom Modifications Project - No, but the purpose of flood damage reduction is implicit in the authorization because it is specified in the documents referenced by the legislation. Section 128 of the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2006 (PL109-103) authorizes the Corps and Reclamation to work together on an auxiliary spillway.
88	88-1	The Folsom DS/FDR project would not involve any increase in permanent reservoir pool storage. Any

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		increase over existing storage limits would be temporary and only based on hydrologic control needs related to flood damage reduction. The 7-ft and 17-ft raises are no longer being considered.
89	89-1	Safety Requirements – Features to ensure facility security will be included in this project. To the extent that such features are retrofits to existing facilities or areas that are not being modified for flood damage reduction or dam safety purposes, the features will be funded through Reclamation's Site Security Program. Where security features are a part of modifications necessary for flood damage reduction and/or dam safety, they will be incorporated as part of the facilities authorized to be constructed through those programs.
90	90-1	Study Authority for Folsom Modifications Project - Section 1.5 of the of the Corps' PAC report provides all authorities specific to the Folsom project (pages 1-9 to 1-20).
91	91-1	Study Authority for Security – Beyond the fiduciary responsibility that the federal government has as the owner of the facility, Presidential Directive HSPD-7 (Critical Infrastructure Identification, Prioritization, and Protection) requires federal agencies to protect the nation's critical infrastructure and key resources against terrorist acts that could cause significant harm.
92	92-1	Alternative 1 is a Safety of Dams only alternative because it includes the fuseplug spillway. The fuseplug spillway would not meet the flood damage reduction goals established by the Corps and its local partners. Alternative 1 would only be implemented if the Corps did not receive funding to construct the JFP gated Auxiliary Spillway.
93	93-1	The Folsom DS/FDR project will not change current operations nor will it change water deliveries to water contractors. The authorization for the Folsom Modifications Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-feet to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modifications Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process and is not linked to the Folsom DS/FDR. Therefore, in this EIS/EIR, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.
94	94-1	The Folsom DS/FDR project would not impact water deliveries to the City of Roseville, San Juan Water District, and Suburban Water District. Any rerouting of pipelines will be handled in a manner that does not interrupt water supply.
95	95-1	Any raise under the Folsom DS/FDR project would be to add additional freeboard or temporary flood storage capacity (related to hydrologic control issues) and not to increase the operational storage capacity of the

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		<p>reservoir. The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could potential flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
95	95-2	<p>The Folsom DS/FDR project would not result in a permanent increase in reservoir storage levels that would require relocating or rebuilding roadways or structures supporting recreation at Folsom Reservoir.</p>
95	95-3	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could potential flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document. There would be no removal of vegetation along the shoreline in relation to reservoir levels. All vegetation removed would relate to construction of the auxiliary spillway and staging for construction near MIAD, the wing dams, and the dikes.</p>

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		Where possible, disturbed areas will be restored following completion of construction.
95	95-4	The Folsom DS/FDR project would not result in a permanent increase in reservoir storage levels that would require relocating trails at Folsom Reservoir.
95	95-5	Alternative 5 is no longer being considered as a viable project that would meet the purpose and needs of this project.
95	95-6	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
96	96-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
97	97-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
97	97-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
97	97-3	Currently, maintenance and replacement of trails and vegetation is the responsibility of CDPR. The Partner Agencies will repair any facility or reroute any trail affected by construction work on any of the Folsom Facilities. Vegetation replacement will be in accordance with approved plans. Please see Section 2.5 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information on the Recreation mitigation measures.
98	98-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
98	98-2	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
99	99-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
100	100-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
101	101-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
102	102-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
102	102-2	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1. Also see Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for changes to the use of Folsom Point for construction activities.
103	103-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
104	104-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
105	105-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
105	105-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
106	106-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
106	106-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
107	107-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
108	108-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
108	108-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
109	109-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
110	110-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
110	110-2	Recreation Transportation - The comment assumes that all rerouted traffic would start at Folsom Point, which is not the case. Traffic would take several routes depending on the origin of the visitor. Roads at Granite Bay and Beal's Point are configured to accept their capacity traffic. Also, because Folsom Point would be left open under the revised project description, less recreation traffic to get to other sites would occur. See Section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
110	110-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
111	111-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
112	112-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
113	113-1	Bridge Project Purpose and Need – Folsom Point would not be closed for staging of construction of the new bridge. Please see Section 4.3.13 for more information on the New Folsom Bridge Project. For more information on Recreation, please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
113	113-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
114	114-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
115	115-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
116	116-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
117	117-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
118	118-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
119	119-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
120	120-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
121	121-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		of the Final EIS/EIR.
121	121-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
121	121-3	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Response to Comment #72-2. Surveys that have been completed to date have not identified any burrowing owls in the project area. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
122	122-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
123	123-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
124	124-1	Socioeconomics Businesses - See Response to Comment #12-1. The Partner Agencies have determined that Folsom Point will remain open during the peak recreation season. Opportunities to access the lake will also be maintained during the remainder of the year because alternative lake access points would not be closed at the same time as any temporary closure to Folsom Point. Recreation traffic from displaced visitors at Folsom Point would not longer occur under the revised project description. For further information, see Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.3 and 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
125	125-1	Noise – Existing daytime noise levels are higher than the City of Folsom noise standards primarily due to traffic along major secondary roads around Empire Ranch. However, projected daytime construction noise impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementing mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.10.3. The construction noise analysis did take into account topographic features and atmospheric conditions when estimating noise impacts at noise-sensitive receptors. It was noted in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR that under certain atmospheric and wind conditions, the noise levels could be higher than those projected for each noise-sensitive receptor at night. No excavation or hauling will occur during nighttime hours; however, drilling and concrete for spillway work on the main concrete dam could occur 24 hours a day. There are not sensitive noise receptors in the area. Therefore, the projected construction nighttime noise impacts would be further reduced.
125	125-2	Geology/Asbestos – The prevailing winds for the region are from the south and southwest, although it is recognized that there are times when winds can blow from the north. The soils and rocks for the Auxiliary Spillway site area have been tested for asbestos and no asbestos is present. Testing of soil near MIAD has shown the possibility of minor amounts of asbestos mineral, but at levels well below regulatory standards. Nevertheless, dust control measures identified in Section 3.6.4 of the Draft EIS/EIR would be implemented to prevent dust issues as part of construction work.
126	126-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
126	126-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
126	126-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
127	127-1	See response to comment #12-1. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		from the closure of Folsom Point. Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
128	128-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
128	128-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
128	128-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
129	129-1	See response to comment #12-1. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point. Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
130	130-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
130	130-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
131	131-1	Noise – Section 3.10.2.2 of the Draft EIS/ERI summarizes the results of the transportation noise impact analysis. Construction truck traffic noise impacts along East Natoma Street were estimated to increase less than 2 dBA in 2009 (when peak truck traffic would occur) and less than 4 dBA over current conditions. These noise level increases during the day are considered to be perceptible by most people, but are below noise ordinance standards. The Project Agencies will be required to meet those levels and will implement mitigation measures to ensure that noise standards are met. Also see Section 4.3.10 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
131	131-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
132	132-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
132	132-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
133	133-1	Section 3.10.2.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR summarizes the results of the transportation noise impact analysis. Construction truck traffic noise impacts along East Natoma Street were estimated to increase less than 2 dBA in 2009 (when peak truck traffic would occur) and less than 4 dBA over current conditions. These noise level increases during the day are considered to be perceptible by most people, but are below noise ordinance standards. The Partner Agencies will be required to meet those levels and will implement mitigation measures to ensure that noise standards are met. Also see Section 4.3.9 and 4.3.10 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. The Partner Agencies are in consultation with SMAQMD and will meet air quality standards set forth by the Clean Air Act.
133	133-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
133	133-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
133	133-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
134	134-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
135	135-1	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
135	135-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
135	135-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
136	136-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
137	137-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
138	138-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
139	139-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-3	Air Quality - All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented in the air quality permit to be issued by the Air Quality Management District. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-4	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
140	140-5	Noise – Noise production is a recognized outcome of any construction project, including projects that involve transport of materials. The noise impacts due to the Folsom DS/FDR action is discussed in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Folsom, and Sacramento, El Dorado, and Placer counties have noise ordinance measures that limit the amount of construction noise during the daytime and at night. The Partner Agencies will be required to meet those levels and will implement mitigation measures to ensure that noise standards are met. Also see Section 4.3.10 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-6	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Response to Comment #72-2 See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
140	140-7	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
140	140-8	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
141	141-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
141	141-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point. Socioeconomics- See Response to Comment #12-1.
141	141-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
142	142-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
142	142-2	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
142	142-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point. Also see Response to Comment #12-1.
143	143-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
144	144-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
144	144-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
145	145-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
145	145-2	Transportation Impacts – Construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
145	145-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
146	146-1	Mr. Oliver is the primary point of contact for Reclamation for the Folsom DS/FDR EIS/EIR.
147	147-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
148	148-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
149	149-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
149	149-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
149	149-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
149	149-4	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
150	150-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
150	150-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
150	150-3	Haul Truck Traffic – The primary reason that construction haul traffic is planned to remain largely within the reservoir boundary is to keep that traffic off city streets. This is a primary safety issue, particularly for children. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
150	150-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
151	151-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
151	151-2	<p>Bald eagles are known to winter and forage in the Folsom DS/FDR Action area. There is potential for bald eagle occurrence as breeding birds within the Folsom DS/FDR Action area based upon the availability of adequate nesting sites and foraging habitat. Successful nesting has not yet been recorded at Folsom Reservoir. Based on anecdotal observations, a pair of immature eagles was noticed engaging in possible breeding behavior in early Spring 2006. By March 2006, the eagles had left the Folsom DS/FDR Action area without any sign of successful breeding (SPR pers. comm. per the Biological Assessment for the Project). No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Direct impact to individuals of this species is a significant impact.</p> <p>Wintering bald eagles occurring within or less than 0.5 mile from proposed dike construction zones, haul routes, staging areas and borrow sites could incur effects as a result of noise and human presence. Alteration of aquatic habitat could temporarily prevent bald eagles from foraging in areas adjacent to on-going construction-related activities.</p> <p>There will not be any operations-related impacts to this species under the current project description.</p> <p>Construction activities, including earth moving, earthen dike retrofit, and haul route construction could result in permanent alteration of up to 95 acres of potential bald eagle wintering habitat. The avoidance and minimization measures would reduce the effects to this species.</p> <p>Because the bald eagle is federally listed as a threatened species, Reclamation shall implement reasonable and prudent measures and conservation measures, per the Biological Assessment that was submitted to USFWS and the Biological Opinion that is anticipated from USFWS. Proposed avoidance and minimization measures included in the Biological Assessment for the Project are:</p> <p>Prior to the implementation of vegetation removal, a Service-approved biologist will conduct surveys to ensure no bald eagles are present within the area in which vegetation is to be removed. If no bald eagles are observed, then no further mitigation measures will be implemented.</p> <p>If bald eagles are present, vegetation removal will be postponed until eagles vacate the area of their own volition. Eagles would not be disturbed in order to clear them from the area.</p> <p>If breeding bald eagles are found to be present within or less than 0.5 mile from the proposed Folsom DS/FDR Action boundaries, a 0.5-mile buffer would be established around the nest site. This buffer zone would not be entered for Folsom DS/FDR Action construction activities until the eagles have completed breeding activities and have vacated the area of their own volition. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.</p>

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
151	151-3	Air Quality - All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented in the air quality permit to be issued by the Air Quality Management District. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
151	151-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
151	151-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
152	152-1	The comment does not pertain to, or raise, environmental issues related to the proposed Project alternatives. This and other such written comments, not related to environmental issues, which were received during the public review period for the DEIS/R are included as part of the Final EIS/R and may be considered by decision-makers during project deliberations; however, written responses to such comments are not required by CEQA or NEPA.
153	153-1	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
153	153-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
154	154-1	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
154	154-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
155	155-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
156	156-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
157	157-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
157	157-2	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. The cumulative noise impacts of Folsom DS/FDR and the New Folsom Bridge Project are expected to occur during the same period beginning in 2008. Both projects include mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts to less than significant levels. Noise impacts and mitigation for the new Folsom Dam Bridge are presented in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2006, American River Watershed Project Folsom Bridge Draft SEIS/EIR, May 2006. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
157	157-3	Noise – Noise production is a recognized outcome of any construction project, including projects that involve transport of materials. The noise impacts due to the Folsom DS/FDR action is discussed in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Folsom, and Sacramento, El Dorado, and Placer counties have noise ordinance measures that limit the amount of construction noise during the daytime and at night. The Project Agencies will be required to meet those levels and will implement mitigation measures to ensure that noise standards are met. Also see Section 4.3.10 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
158	158-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
159	159-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
159	159-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
159	159-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
160	160-1	An economic study is not required for an EIS unless there would be physical or natural effects as a result of the economic impacts. The Draft EIS/EIR did include an economic discussion. See Socioeconomic Comment Response #12-1
160	160-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
160	160-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
160	160-4	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
160	160-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
160	160-6	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
161	161-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
162	162-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
163	163-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
164	164-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
164	164-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
165	165-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
166	166-1	No Action Alternative Operations Presentation – The authorization for the Folsom Modifications Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Reservoir from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-feet to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modifications Project has been implemented. Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process and is not linked to the Folsom DS/FDR. Therefore, operations are analyzed and disclosed based on current operational requirements in this EIS/EIR. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and supplemental environmental compliance documentation. The existing water control manual is for a fixed flood space of 400,000 acre-feet. A new NEPA document will be required to analyze impacts of changing the operation from the fixed 400,000 acre-feet in the existing water control manual to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation in a new water control manual. This NEPA document will also be completed as part of the process.
166	166-2	Impacts of Reoperations- Although it is recognized that there is a need to update the Water Control Manual, that need and process are totally separate from the Folsom DS/FDR actions. The authorization for the Folsom Modifications Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-feet to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modifications Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process and is not linked to the Folsom DS/FDR. Therefore, in this EIS/EIR, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.
166	166-3	Impacts and economic impacts to water users – Permanent re-operation of Folsom Reservoir is outside the scope of the EIS/EIR. The Corps has committed to a collaborative process with CVP water and power contractors, Reclamation and other stakeholders to develop a consensus approach to permanent re-operation. The Corps has consistently stated that no final decision will be made on permanent re-operation pending the outcome of that process.
167	167-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
168	168-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
169	169-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
169	169-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
170	170-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
171	171-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciates the comment reflecting support for the project.
172	172-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
173	173-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
173	173-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
173	173-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point would remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
174	174-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
175	175-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
175	175-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
176	176-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
176	176-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2 See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
176	176-3	Air Quality - All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		the EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented by the Air Quality Management District. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
176	176-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
176	176-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
177	177-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
178	178-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
178	178-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
178	178-3	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
178	178-4	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
179	179-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
180	180-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
181	181-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
182	182-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
183	183-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
184	184-1	Cost Allocation – Any reimbursable costs associated with the projects at Folsom Dam and Reservoir will be recovered by Reclamation as appropriate in compliance with Reclamation law and policy. The Corps PAC Report contains text clarifying this.
185	185-1	New Bridge Costs – The Folsom Dam Bridge is covered in separate documentation, the September 2006 Corps of Engineers Post Authorization Decision Document and EIS, American River Project, Folsom Dam Raise, Folsom Bridge. Although the bridge is mentioned in the PAC Report, no changes have been made to

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		the bridge since the 2006 report. See Section 4.3.13 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information.
186	186-1	No Action Relative to current operations – As per WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53) an interim operation agreement is assumed to continue in place until 2018 or until completion of the revised water control manual, which is anticipated to complete one year prior to completion of construction of the JFP. A permanent re-operation study addressing these concerns is currently being scoped, and will include the appropriate level of environmental analysis, agency, stakeholder and public coordination and documentation.
187	187-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
187	187-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment # 12-1.
187	187-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
188	188-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
189	189-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
190	190-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
191	191-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
191	191-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
191	191-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment # 12-1.
191	191-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
192	192-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
192	192-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
193	193-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
194	194-1	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comments #151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
194	194-2	Water Quality – Very few activities are planned near or within the water of Folsom Reservoir that would affect water quality. To protect water quality, all construction activities will conform to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that will keep construction runoff out of the reservoir. The dispersion of suspended sediment at in-water construction sites will be controlled through the use of sediment curtains or other means. Visitors will not observe any water quality changes along recreational site shorelines and beaches.
194	194-3	Air Quality - All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of the EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented in the air quality permit to be issued by the Air Quality Management District. The soils and rocks for the Auxiliary Spillway site area have been tested for asbestos and no asbestos is present. Testing of soil near MIAD has shown the possibility of minor amounts of asbestos mineral, but at levels well below regulatory standards. Nevertheless, dust control measures will be implemented to prevent dust issues as part of construction work. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
194	194-4	Transportation Impacts – It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. The amount of truck traffic anticipated for this project on City streets will not affect movement of emergency vehicles nor cause major damage to City roadways. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR and Section 3.1 of the Draft EIS/EIR for more information.
194	194-5	Visuals – The proposed project will not cause any permanent changes to the views of residents who currently can see the reservoir. See Section 3.7 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional discussion regarding impacts to visual resources resulting from the currently proposed Preferred Alternative.
194	194-6	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
194	194-7	Noise – Existing daytime noise levels at Briggs Ranch are higher than the City of Folsom noise standards primarily due to traffic along East Natoma Street. However, projected daytime construction noise impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementing mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.10.3. The construction noise analysis did take into account topographic features and atmospheric conditions when estimating noise impacts at noise-sensitive receptors. It was noted in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR that under certain atmospheric and wind conditions, the noise levels could be higher than those projected for each noise-sensitive receptor at night. No excavation or hauling will occur during nighttime hours; however, drilling and concrete for spillway work on the main concrete dam could occur 24 hours a day. There are not sensitive noise receptors in the area. Therefore, the projected construction nighttime noise impacts would be further reduced.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
194	194-8	Recreation post construction – There would be no changes to recreational use of Folsom Reservoir following completion of the proposed project. There would be no additional flooding of recreation sites resulting from this project. Any flooding that could occur would be the same as what is occurring today as part of normal reservoir operations.
194	194-9	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
194	194-10	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
194	194-11	Public utilities – The proposed project will not damage any water supply pipelines. There is one pipeline that will need to be moved out of a construction zone. This pipeline will be moved in a manner that minimizes any disruption to water supply. See Section 3.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR for additional information.
195	195-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
195	195-2	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point will remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
196	196-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR
196	196-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment # 12-1.
197	197-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR
198	198-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR
198	198-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment # 12-1.
199	199-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR
199	199-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment # 12-1.
199	199-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR
200	200-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
200	200-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
201	201-1	Noise and Transportation- Noise production is a recognized outcome of any construction project, including projects that involve transport of materials. The noise impacts due to the Folsom DS/FDR action is discussed in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The Partner Agencies will follow county noise standards. Also see Section 4.3.10 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Prior to onset and changes in construction, the Partner Agencies will keep residents informed through appropriate communication methods (such as websites, news media and flyers) of activities producing noise. The Project Agencies working with

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		their construction contractors will be preparing and implementing a traffic management plan, outlining proposed routes that would avoid residential areas, such as Briggs Ranch (See Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.9 Transportation and Circulation and see section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information).
202	202-1	Noise - Existing daytime noise levels are higher than the City of Folsom noise standards primarily due to traffic along major secondary roads around Empire Ranch. Noise – Existing daytime noise levels are higher than the City of Folsom noise standards primarily due to traffic along major secondary roads around Empire Ranch. However, projected daytime construction noise impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementing mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS/EIR Section 3.10.3. The construction noise analysis did take into account topographic features and atmospheric conditions when estimating noise impacts at noise-sensitive receptors. It was noted in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR that under certain atmospheric and wind conditions, the noise levels could be higher than those projected for each noise-sensitive receptor at night. No excavation or hauling will occur during nighttime hours; however, drilling and concrete for spillway work on the main concrete dam could occur 24 hours a day. There are not sensitive noise receptors in the area. Therefore, the projected construction nighttime noise impacts would be further reduced.
202	202-2	Air Quality - The prevailing winds for the region are from the south and southwest, although it is recognized that there are times when winds can blow from the north. All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of the EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented in the air quality permit to be issued by the Air Quality Management District. The soils and rocks for the Auxiliary Spillway site area have been tested for asbestos and no asbestos is present. Testing of soil near MIAD has shown the possibility of minor amounts of asbestos mineral, but at levels well below regulatory standards. Nevertheless, dust control measures will be implement to prevent dust issues as part of construction work. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
203	203-1	Residential Property Values - Neither CEQA nor NEPA requires an analysis of project impacts on residential property values. This is because: (1) potential project impacts on residential property values represent an economic impact, not an effect on the physical environment; and (2) estimating prospective property value impacts of a proposed project may involve an impermissible degree of speculation due to the wide range of issues that affect property values. Please see Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. As described in Chapter 2 and 4 of the Final EIS/EIR, Folsom Point would remain open for recreation during the peak season; therefore, there would be no impacts to property values from the closure of Folsom Point.
203	203-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
203	203-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
203	203-4	Traffic - It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The project agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
203	203-5	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
204	204-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
204	204-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
205	205-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
206	206-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
206	206-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
206	206-3	Air Quality - All construction projects involving large equipment produce air quality emissions. Chapter 3.3 of the EIS/EIR describes the types of emissions possible for this project. Reclamation has already initiated discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on emission controls and mitigation requirements. All construction work will comply with the air quality emissions requirements, that have been established to protect human health, and as presented in the air quality permit to be issued by the Air Quality Management District. Also see Section 4.3.11 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
206	206-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
206	206-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
207	207-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
207	207-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
208	208-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
208	208-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
209	209-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
210	210-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
210	210-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
210	210-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		The Draft EIS/EIR was made available to the public in several manners, such as on CDs and in hard copy form at local libraries and to those who requested a copy, in addition to being accessible on the internet. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
211	211-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
211	211-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
212	212-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
213	213-1	The Project Partners appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
214	214-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
214	214-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
215	215-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
216	216-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
217	217-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
218	218-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
219	219-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
219	219-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
220	220-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
221	221-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
222	222-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
222	222-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
223	223-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
224	224-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
225	225-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
226	226-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
226	226-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
226	226-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
227	227-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
228	228-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
228	228-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
229	229-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1 Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment # 203-1.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
229	229-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
229	229-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
230	230-1	Recreation Parking – Although we sympathize with the parking problems in your shopping center, Reclamation and CDPR do not have the authority to control illegal parking on private property. Generally, the responsibility lies within the property owner.
230	230-2	Geology and Soils/High Groundwater – The proposed project will not increase groundwater levels in the area. No actions are being proposed that would increase groundwater recharge.
230	230-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
231	231-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
231	231-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement and will continue to keep the public informed throughout the construction phases. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
231	231-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
231	231-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
232	232-1	Agency Responsibilities and Cost Allocation – The EIS/EIR stated that the Dam Safety responsibilities are those of Reclamation and Flood Damage Reduction actions those of the Army Corps of Engineers. The Joint Federal Project (JFP) Auxiliary Spillway addresses both Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction issues and addresses the missions of both agencies. The seismic and static upgrades to the concrete dam and earthen structures are Dam Safety issues and are the responsibility of Reclamation. Any dam raise would be a Flood Damage Reduction measure and thus the responsibility of the Corps. Cost allocation is not an EIS/EIR issue, therefore, not discussed. The allocation of costs between the two agencies is conducted under a separate processes within each of the agencies Congressional authorities. The Corps costs are more fully described in the PAC Report.
232	232-2	Costs of Alternatives – Costs and the benefits of the alternatives are not required in an EIS/EIR. The EIS/EIR addresses the environmental impacts of the alternatives and assumes that cost justification is documented elsewhere. Costing of the alternatives and the presentation of benefits is discussed in supporting documents for the Folsom DS/FDR actions. The Corps costs are more fully described in the PAC Report.
232	232-3	Flood Control Reservation – Flood control reservation is an operations feature and discussed in the Water Control Manual; it is not an issue for this EIS/EIR. This EIS/EIR addresses the construction impacts related to hydrologic, seismic, static, and security concerns for the Folsom Facility. This project will not change the flood control reservation nor operations. Changes to the Water Control Manual will be addressed under a separate project. The updated Water Control Manual will include variable flood storage space, analysis for

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		forecast based operations, new flood release schedules, and a plan component for potential repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of the revised Manual. Development of the manual will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency, and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.
	232-4	Folsom Reoperation – The Folsom DS/FDR project addresses hydrologic, static, seismic, and safety concerns for the Folsom Facility. The authorization for the Folsom Modifications Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-feet to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modifications Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process and is not linked to the Folsom DS/FDR. Therefore, in this EIS/EIR, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation. The Water Control Manual will not need to be revised to construct this project.
	232-5	As described in the PAC Report, the originally authorized Folsom Dam Raise Project included improvements to the temperature control shutters as part of the ecosystem restoration component of the project. The Selected Plan (Refined Authorized Project) described in the PAC Report does not recommend any changes to this element of the authorized project, which is analyzed in the 2002 Long Term Feasibility Study/EIS/EIR. Supplemental environmental analysis, coordination and documentation would be completed if needed for this feature in the pre-construction, engineering and design phase of the project. Temperature control shutters are not addressed in this EIS/EIR.
232	232-6	Security – The costs for security upgrades are outside the scope of the NEPA process.
233	233-1	See Response to Comment #12-1. Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
233	233-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
234	234-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
235	235-1	See Response to Comments #12-1 and #203-1.
235	235-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
236	236-1	Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety or dam security objectives, as described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
237	237-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
238	238-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
239	239-1	Dam Road Closure – The closure of Folsom Dam Road is addressed in the EIS for the Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction, an action which is not related to the Folsom DS/FDR actions.
239	239-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
239	239-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
240	240-1	The originally proposed Folsom DS/FDR actions are described in Chapter 2 and summarized in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIS/EIR. The revised Folsom DS/FDR project, including the proposed construction schedule, is described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR. The complexity of the project requires a comprehensive project description. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
241	241-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
242	242-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
243	243-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
243	243-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
244	244-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
245	245-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
246	246-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
247	247-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
248	248-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
249	249-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
249	249-2	Noise - Noise production is a recognized outcome of any construction project, including projects that involve transport of materials. The noise impacts due to the Folsom DS/FDR action is discussed in detail in Section

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The City of Folsom, and Sacramento, El Dorado, and Placer counties have noise ordinance measures that limit the amount of construction noise during the daytime and at night. The Project Agencies will be required to meet those levels and will implement mitigation measures to ensure that noise standards are met. Also see Section 4.3.10 in the Final EIS/EIR.
249	249-3	Residential property values – See Response to Comment #203-1
249	249-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
249	249-5	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
250	250-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
251	251-1	Noise - Current noise levels (i.e., levels without the project) do exceed the City of Folsom transportation noise standards along many of the major secondary roads in Folsom. However, construction truck traffic noise impacts along the proposed truck hauling routes were estimated to increase less than 2 dBA in 2009 (when peak truck traffic would occur) and less than 4 dBA over current conditions. These noise level increases are considered perceptible by most people but are within the noise ordinance levels. Therefore, traffic noise mitigation measures will not be required. Also see Section 4.3.10 in the Final EIS/EIR.
251	251-2	Air Quality – See Response to Comment #202-2
251	251-3	Transportation – A transportation management plan will be developed that will address construction traffic patterns and limitations. Any damage to city streets as a result of construction traffic will be addressed with the City's traffic engineers.
251	251-4	Bridge Traffic Noise – Noise impacts as a result of use of the proposed Folsom Dam Bridge are presented in the Corps 2006, American River Watershed Project Folsom Bridge Draft SEIS/EIR, May 2006. The Folsom DS/FDR project is not directly related to that project. See Section 4.3.13 in Chapter 4 of the EIS/EIR.
251	251-5	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
251	251-6	Trail Access – Currently, there is no direct means of walking between Beal's Point to Folsom Point. When the new Folsom Dam Bridge is opened, a trail may be established using the new bridge, but that project is not part of the Folsom DS/FDR project.
251	251-7	Transportation – There are no plans to close any access to Briggs Ranch or current surface streets associated with Briggs Ranch under the Folsom DS/FDR project. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information. A transportation management plan will be developed that identifies routes.
251	251-8	Transportation – See Response to Comment #251-7.
251	251-9	Noise – The locations for noise monitoring during construction have not been identified at this time. These locations will be addressed in a Noise Mitigation Plan to be developed for the project. Also see Section 4.3.10 in the Final EIS/EIR.
251	251-10	Air Quality – The locations of air quality sampling stations have not been identified at this time. These locations will be addressed in the air quality emissions permit granted for this project.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
251	251-11	General Construction – All loads entering and leaving the construction areas will be covered and secured to minimize road debris. All hauling of excavated materials will be conducted within the boundaries of Folsom Reservoir and city streets will not be used.
252	252-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
252	252-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
253	253-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
253	253-2	Transportation - It is recognized that construction projects involve increased transport of materials to the construction site. The partner agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
253	253-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
254	254-1	Transportation – See Response to Comment #253-2. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
255	255-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
255	255-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
256	256-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
257	257-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
257	257-2	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
258	258-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
259	259-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
260	260-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
261	261-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
262	262-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
263	263-1	Facility Management Plan Project Segmentation – If the comment regarding the “Facility Management Plan” is in reference to the future plans for revision of the current/interim Reservoir Water Control Manual, the EIS/EIR does recognize that there is a need to revise the Manual, with or without this project. Revision of the Manual is neither a direct outcome nor a requirement of this project. Until the Manual is revised, the reservoir must be operated consistent with the current Manual. The Folsom DS/FDR actions, in themselves, will not cause a reoperation of Folsom operations. The development of the revised operations manual will be a lengthy, comprehensive process involving Reclamation, the Corps, DWR, SAFCA, and numerous water agencies and power users. An EIS/EIR will be developed concurrently with the formulation of a revised operations manual that will describe the impacts, if any, of the reoperations proposals.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
263	263-2	<p>Vegetation and Wildlife Inundation – The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that could potential flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation.</p> <p>The Folsom DS/FDR actions will not result in any direct changes in operations of Folsom Reservoir causing additional habitat inundation from what currently happens. The future determination of revisions to the Reservoir’s Water Control Manual and the preparation of an accompanying EIS/EIR will address any re-operational changes that could result in additional inundation effects. This is an action separate from the Folsom DS/FDR. Please see Section 2.5 for information on mitigation measures, and Section 3.6 for information on vegetation and wildlife impacts.</p>
263	263-3	<p>Recreation Facilities Inundation - The Folsom DS/FDR actions will not result in any direct changes in operations of Folsom Reservoir causing additional inundation to recreational facilities from what currently happens. Repair of any recreational facilities as a result of current operations is the responsibility of State Parks. The future determination of revisions to the Reservoir’s Water Control Manual and the preparation of an accompanying EIS/EIR will address any re-operational changes that could result in additional inundation effects. This is an action separate from the Folsom DS/FDR.</p>
263	263-4	<p>Recreation Impacts to Future Users - The Folsom DS/FDR actions will not result in any direct changes in operations of Folsom Reservoir causing additional inundation to recreational facilities from what currently happens. Repair of any recreational facilities as a result of current operations is the responsibility of State Parks. The future determination of revisions to the Reservoir’s Water Control Manual and the preparation of an accompanying EIS/EIR will address any re-operational changes that could result in additional inundation effects. This is an action separate from the Folsom DS/FDR.</p> <p>The Draft EIS/EIR used current, available information on park visitor use received from CDPR. Data included paid use and free use of the FLSRA facilities. Specific data visitors by foot, bicycles, and horseback was not available. Beeks Bight and Doton's Point would not be affected by construction; therefore, there would not be conflicts with American with Disabilities Act at these locations. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete description of the project and the project footprint map.</p>
263	263-5	<p>Section 2.1, and more specifically, Tables 2-1 through 2-7 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR provide an overview of the dam safety and flood damage reduction measures evaluated as part of alternatives development. The tables also provide a rationale for the elimination of the measures that were not carried forward for further analysis. The potential for a new upstream storage facility, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR). Upstream storage was eliminated because it would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new reservoir upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety, dam security, or flood control needs of the Folsom facilities. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom</p>

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
264	264-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
265	265-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
266	266-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
266	266-2	Air Quality – See Response to Comment #206-3.
266	265-3	Noise – See Response to Comment #249-2.
266	265-4	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
266	265-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
267	267-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
268	268-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
269	269-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
270	270-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
270	270-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
271	271-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
272	272-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
273	273-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
274	274-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
274	274-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
275	275-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
275	275-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
276	276-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
277	277-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
277	277-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Response to Comment #72-2
277	277-3	See response to comment #12-1. Also, the Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
278	278-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
278	278-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
278	278-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
279	279-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
280	280-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
280	280-2	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
281	281-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
281	281-2	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
282	282-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
283	283-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
283	283-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
283	283-3	Residential Property Values - See Comment to Response #203-1.
283	283-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
283	283-5	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
284	284-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
285	285-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
286	286-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
286	286-2	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
287	287-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
288	288-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
289	289-1	Fuseplug Operation - Since the gate failure which you are referring to, Reclamation has modified critical gate elements to make them stronger. Additionally, Reclamation implemented various maintenance procedures and installed automated maintenance devices to ensure reliable operation of the gates. The function of the fuse plug is to save the dam from overtopping and subsequent failure during extreme hydrologic events. The fuse plug would only be operated during these extremely rare hydrologic events, and only after the downstream levees have overtopped causing major flooding and damage to the Sacramento metropolitan area.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		If Reclamation was doing a dam safety only project, they would use a fuseplug design (dirt berm). Under the the Joint Federal Project, a permanent 6 submerged tainter gate structure is proposed that would address both flood damage reduction and dam safety. For more information see the description of Alternative 1 in Chapter 2 of the
290	290-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
291	291-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
292	292-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
293	293-1	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
293	293-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
293	293-3	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
294	294-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
294	294-2	There would not be an additional 186,000 people using the streets; these would be the same 186,000 using the streets today. See Response to Comment #253-2.
295	295-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
296	296-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
297	297-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
298	298-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
299	299-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
300	300-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
300	300-2	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
300	300-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
301	301-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
301	301-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to comment # 151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
301	301-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
301	301-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
301	301-5	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
302	302-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
302	302-2	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
302	302-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
302	302-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
303	303-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
303	303-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
304	304-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
305	305-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
306	306-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
307	307-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Construction truck traffic noise impacts along East Natoma Street were estimated to increase less than 2 dBA in 2009 (when peak truck traffic would occur) and less than 4 dBA over current conditions. These noise level increases are considered perceptible by most people, but within noise ordinance threshold levels. Section 3.10.2.2 summarizes the results of the transportation noise impact analysis. The partner agencies will develop a transportation management plan that will include input from city traffic engineers. The plan will provide guidelines on preferred traffic routes, route restrictions, and time of day restriction on using certain routes. Transportation contractors will be required to adhere to the plan. See section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
307	307-2	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment # 203-1.
308	308-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
309	309-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
310	310-1	Habitat Inundation – The Folsom DS/FDR actions will not directly change current operations and thus there will not be inundation of habitat beyond what happens currently. There is a proposal to revise the interim Water Control Manual, but it is not know at this time whether any reoperation of the facility would result in additional inundation.
310	310-2	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report Mitigation - As a federal facility, the project agencies are required under federal law to coordinate with US Fish and Wildlife Service mitigation requirements. Mitigation would be based on the impact analysis for the project which was completed in conjunction with USFWS. The ultimate project mitigation for oak woodlands will be coordinated with USFWS.
311	311-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
311	311-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
311	311-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312	312-1	The dredged material and or the spoils excavated from the approach channel will be incorporated into one or more of the modifications, stockpiled in an area designated for stockpiling, or the material will be used as fill in a contractor use area. The material will not be placed in a manner or location that has not been described in the EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
312	312-2	Both options, including an earthen raise and concrete parapet walls, are still being considered for the raise portion of the project. The Corps will not make a final decision on which option will be selected for construction until more detailed design information is available. Supplemental environmental compliance documentation will be completed as necessary.
312	312-3	The Corps has determined that the 3.5-ft raise will not increase surface water elevation above current operations. Therefore, new embankments are no longer a part of the Preferred Alternative.
312		Partner Agencies have determined that Folsom Point would remain open during construction and would therefore reduce the recreation impacts discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR. Borrow areas around Beal's Point have been removed from consideration under the preferred alternative (See Chapter 2 of Final EIS/EIR). All damaged areas will be restored as discussed in Section 2.5 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312		Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312	312-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312	312-5	The locations for all potential staging areas have been identified. All staging areas had to be identified early in the process in order to survey them for biological and cultural resources, and to determine, in general, if they were suitable for project purposes. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR contains a description of the project and maps outlining the contractor use and staging areas, and other construction zones. Section 2.5 in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR provides the mitigation measures for the project. DPR will be provided an opportunity to review the Recreation Mitigation Plan for the project prior to construction.
312	312-6	Granite Bay Mitigation – At present, the Project Agencies do not plan to use the Granite Bay recreation area for construction staging. The Corps will not make a final decision on which raise alternative will be selected for construction until more detailed design information is available. Once a design is chosen, supplemental environmental compliance documentation will be completed as necessary to analyze the impacts related to that design. Appropriate mitigation measures cannot be developed until a final design is determined, and the impacts are known.
312	312-7	The existing parking lot at MIAD will most likely fall within the enlarged footprint of MIAD. As described in the Draft EIS/EIR, if the parking lot is damaged or inaccessible after construction, then Reclamation will replace the parking lot "In kind". It is more than likely that one or more of the designated staging areas for the work at MIAD will be utilized for parking and access to MIAD for recreational activities. Reclamation will coordinate with DPR on the location and configuration of a post-construction parking lot if mitigation is necessary.
312	312-8	The two proposed staging areas downstream of the Right Wing Dam that were in the vicinity of the American River Water Education Center and the new DPR facilities have been removed from consideration due to environmental considerations. Please see Section 2.2 of the Final EIS/EIR for additional information.
312	312-9	The impact of closing the Folsom Dam Road, which included the closure of the Observation Point parking lot, was analyzed in the Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction EIS. The impacts of that action are not discussed in this environmental document for this project, and no mitigation is proposed. Any mitigation related to the

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		closure of the Observation Point for this project would be considered an “Enhancement”, which is not authorized under the Safety of Dams Act. The status of Observation Point is now considered to be an “Existing Condition”, which does not require Reclamation or the Corps to mitigate for the loss of that area for public use.
312	312-10	Once all of the borrow material has been excavated at any borrow site, the area will be recontoured as closely as possible to its original condition. Reclamation will partner with DPR to discuss how the area will be recontoured; however, Reclamation is not authorized under the Safety of Dams Act to provide enhancements.
312	312-11	There are no plans under the Preferred Alternative to use Granite Bay or to take borrow from the vicinity of Granite Bay.
312	312-12	Once all of the borrow material has been excavated at any borrow site, the area will be recontoured as closely as possible to its original condition. Reclamation will partner with DPR to discuss how the area will be recontoured; however, Reclamation is not authorized under the Safety of Dams Act to provide enhancements.
312	312-13	Nearly all of the vegetation located within the band of elevation that the reservoir normally fluctuates in, up to 480.5 ft, has been lost over the 50 years that the reservoir has been in operation. Since there will be construction occurring year-round, the majority of the in-reservoir haul routes are located above 466-ft elevation to allow for construction traffic when the reservoir elevation is above, at, or below 466 ft. The haul routes to the borrow areas are generally from 425 to 466 ft to allow for borrow activities. In order to have access to all of the construction sites year-round, it has been necessary to establish haul routes in areas that have been vegetated. All habitat impacts from the construction of haul routes has been quantified and mitigation has been developed per the USFWS recommendations in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report (See Appendix E of the Final EIS/EIR).
312	312-14	Reclamation may permanently stockpile 500,000 cubic yards of material at Dike 7. If feasible, the area will re-contoured to be stable and consistent with adjacent areas; however it is highly likely that the amount of material deposited at Dike 7 will limit the ability of Reclamation and the Corps to return the area to its original configuration. Reclamation and the Corps believe that it will be problematic to re-vegetate the area once construction is complete, due to the depth and nature of the material stockpiled at the site.
312	312-15	Reclamation and the Corps designed proposed haul routes to avoid as much vegetation as possible. For habitat that could not be avoided, Reclamation and the Corps are mitigating per the USFWS recommendations in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report (See Appendix E of the Final EIS/EIR). Once construction has been completed, it may be feasible to leave reduced-width haul routes in place that could be converted to formal bike paths by DPR. Reclamation and the Corps cannot create or pave new bike paths, as that would be considered an improvement, which is not permitted under the Safety of Dams Act.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		Additionally, the project agencies have determined that Folsom Point would remain open during the peak recreation season; therefore impacts to Folsom Point addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR would be reduced.
312	312-16	The location of the base and camera are sited to maximize security of the dike areas. Reclamation has positioned the base of the towers to avoid interfering with the trails on top of the dikes to the extent possible. The visual impact of the placement of the base and camera to the overall viewshed of the reservoir is minimal and unavoidable. Reclamation has consulted with DPR on the placement of the base and camera at Beal's Point. The placement of the rest of the cameras will be determined by Reclamation's security office. If there is an opportunity for some flexibility in the placement, then Reclamation will consider DPR's preferred location for the equipment.
312	312-17	The width of the opening will be determined by Reclamation's security requirements. The space between the security features will allow for bicycle, equestrian and foot traffic.
312	312-18	Power for the upgraded security features will be supplied through buried power lines.
312	312-19	The intensity of any lighting associated with the security upgrades will need to meet with all security requirements; however, Reclamation will fully consider the use of the lowest intensity that meets these requirements. All lights will be directed downward to the extent practical.
312	312-20	Reclamation and the Corps have worked to avoid or minimize project impacts to all resources within the project footprint. Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative. As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, recent refinements to the project description have resulted in certain impacts associated with Alternative 3 to be substantially reduced compared to those identified in the Draft EIS/EIR. Those project refinements and impact reductions are largely in direct response to comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR. The 7-ft, and the 17-ft raise alternatives are no longer being considered, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312	312-21	There are no plans under the Preferred Alternative to increase reservoir level beyond current operations. Therefore, there will be no impact to vegetation surrounding the reservoir. Until a decision has been made to implement the 3.5-ft raise, and a subsequent environmental document is produced, existing conditions for the project includes inundation up to 480.5 ft in elevation. The project as currently described, without a dam raise, will not have impacts above 480.5 ft. To a large extent, the area up to 480.5 ft is denuded due to normal reservation fluctuations. Mitigation measure Bio-8 has been removed from the EIS/EIR contingent upon the Corps decision regarding the 3.5-ft raise
312	312-22	Reclamation is considering all mitigation lands, including purchasing lands contiguous with the Folsom Lake SRA.
312	312-23	Reclamation will continue to coordinate with DPR and other agencies as appropriate, to determine which areas on Reclamation-owned lands will be selected as mitigation sites.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
312	312-24	Reclamation will continue to coordinate with DPR and other agencies as appropriate, to determine which areas on Reclamation owned land will be selected as mitigation sites. Mitigation for this species is not being proposed by either agency to occur within Folsom Lake or contiguous areas.
312	312-25	Both options, including an earthen raise and concrete parapet walls, are still being considered for the raise portion of the project. The Corps will not make a final decision on which option will be selected for construction until more detailed design information is available. Supplemental environmental compliance documentation will be completed as necessary.
312	312-26	While the exact locations for placement of all of the security upgrade features is not yet determined, the general location of the feature is provided in the EIS/EIR and is addressed accordingly. This approach is adequate and appropriate for a programmatic level of planning and analysis, recognizing that, as the commentor points out, supplemental environmental documentation will be completed at more detailed levels of project planning. The locations of the features are generally determined by their function, which limits the flexibility of their location. Reclamation spent considerable time analyzing the impacts of the security upgrades to environmental resources, visual resources, recreation, and aesthetic resources. The impacts from the security upgrade features to environmental resources are minimal and after mitigation, will be reduced to a less than significant level. Reclamation is confident that their assessment of the impacts as related to the security upgrades, is accurate and comprehensive.
312	312-27	The Preferred Alternative will not include a raise of the reservoir water elevation beyond that of current operations. Therefore there will be no impact to visual resources.
312	312-28	Reclamation does not concur with the need for improved entrances for Beal's Point and Granite Bay. Those areas would be filled to capacity regardless of whether or not the project was constructed, and any modifications to the site that would allow for increased traffic capacity would be considered an improvement for existing conditions and not necessarily for project impacts. In order to mitigate many of the issues described above, Reclamation has scheduled construction on the Right Wing Dam, and Dikes 4 through 6 during the off season for recreation from approximately mid-September to May 1. If it is determined that construction needs to run concurrently with the peak recreation season, Reclamation will work with their managing partner to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the impacts associated with construction. See Section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
312	312-29	Campground Noise Sensitive Receptor - It is anticipated that during the more than two years of construction activities at Beal's Point that construction noise impacts will be significant, as acknowledged on page 3.10-26 of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, since the issuance of the Draft EIS/EIR, the Bureau of Reclamation plans to restrict excavation activity to the daytime (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) and to reduce materials processing operations. Therefore, the projected construction daytime and nighttime noise impacts will be further reduced. In addition to the noise mitigation measures presented in Section 3.10.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the following additional mitigation measures will be evaluated for the campground area:

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limit excavation activities to off-season periods as much as possible. · Locate construction staging areas and materials processing as far from the campground as feasibly possible. · Locate the access and egress for haul trucks as far from the campground as feasibly possible. · Design the construction site to minimize haul trucks from backing up to minimize backup alarm noise. <p>Work with the Contractor's noise consultant to strategize on noise control measures to minimize construction noise impacts for campers.</p>
312	312-30	<p>As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, Reclamation and the Corps have recently "optimized" the project and substantially reduced project impacts to all resource areas in part by sequencing construction so that no two recreation areas are being impacted at the same time, construction has been scheduled for periods when recreation levels are lowest, and both agencies are committing to mitigating to the extent of their respective authorities.</p> <p>As presented in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/EIR, Reclamation and the Corps have reassessed all project-related impacts as a result of the recent project changes to decrease impacts. Mitigation measures are currently being developed to mitigate for those impacts. Reclamation is considering DPR's comments and suggestions, as well as the public's comments in the reformulation of the mitigation measures. The final mitigation measures will be included in the Record of Decision for each action by Reclamation and the Corps.</p>
312	312-31	This document only discusses lands that fall within the project footprint. The lands described above do not occur within the project footprint, or directly influence the project in any measurable way, and therefore, they are not included in the EIS/EIR for discussion.
312	312-32	See response to comment # 312-30.
312	312-33	See response to comment # 312-28.
312	312-34	The Preferred Alternative will not increase reservoir water elevation beyond current operations. Therefore, there will not be an impact to recreation facilities beyond current conditions.
312	312-35	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
312	312-36	<p>The only FLSRA recreation area with a concessionaire in the vicinity of construction is Beal's Point. With the recent determination that Beal's Point will remain accessible during peak recreation season (i.e., the time when concessionaire is active, there will be no impact).</p> <p>Reclamation will provide DPR with a construction schedule to assist the concessionaires in the management of their business.</p>
313	313-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
313	313-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
313	313-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
313	313-4	Residential Property Values – See Response to Comment #203-1.
313	313-5	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
313	313-6	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
314	314-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
314	314-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
	315-2	The current and projected traffic volumes on E. Natoma are provided in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Projected traffic on the haul road north of the property is approximately 100 round trips of haul trucks during the phases of construction of the Auxiliary Spillway. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR presents the phasing of construction work. Also see Section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 Topical Responses of the Final EIS/EIR.
	315-3	Potential construction noise levels near Elvies Lane and Natoma Street would be similar to those estimated for East Natoma Street (noise-sensitive receptor 1) as presented in Draft EIS/EIR. Construction noise levels will be higher during construction activities (stockpiling of borrow material) occurring near Dikes 7 and 8. The Project Agencies will be required to adhere to noise standards at the federal property boundary. See Section 3.10 of the Draft EIS/EIR for allowable increases in noise levels. Construction noise will be evident at these properties. Also see Section 4.3.10 in the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-4	Air Quality – See Response to Comment #206-3.
315	315-5	The testing of soils for asbestos has occurred in the project area. Soil and rock in the Auxiliary Spillway to Dike 8 areas do not contain asbestos. Soil and rock east of Dike 8 has shown to possibly contain minute amounts of asbestos, well below regulatory standards. See Section 3.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Section 4.3.11 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-6	As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, the Corps cannot select the type of raise to be constructed until more detailed design information is available. Therefore, the potential impacts of a raise are unknown at this time. After the type of raise is selected, the Corps will complete supplemental environmental compliance documentation, as necessary.
315	315-7	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-8	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-9	Visuals – Lots at this location will have direct views of haul roads and haul trucks, stockpiles of excavated materials and the staging of construction equipment.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
315	315-10	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-11	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
315	315-12	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
316	316-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
317	317-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
318	318-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
318	318-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
319	319-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
320	320-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
320	320-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
321	321-1	The purpose and need for this project is provided in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The project is needed to address dam safety and hydrologic concerns and to provide better flood protection for the greater Sacramento area. Construction activities will not be occurring for all years in one particular project area, but will be phased over the entire project. Appropriate noise mitigation measures presented in Section 3.10.3 will be implemented to minimize construction noise impacts.
322	322-1	The purpose and need for this project is provided in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The project is needed to address dam safety and hydrologic concerns and to provide better flood protection for the greater Sacramento area. Construction activities will not be occurring for all years in one particular project area, but will be phased over the entire project. Appropriate noise mitigation measures presented in Section 3.10.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR will be implemented to minimize construction noise impacts.
323	323-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
323	323-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
324	324-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
325	325-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
325	325-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
325	325-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
326	326-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
327	327-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
327	327-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
328	328-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
329	329-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
330	330-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
331	331-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
332	332-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
333	333-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
334	334-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
334	334-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
335	335-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
336	336-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
337	337-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
338	338-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
339	339-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
340	340-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
341	341-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
342	342-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
342	342-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
343	343-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
344	344-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
345	345-1	Geologic evaluations of soil and rock conducted by Reclamation geologists have shown that there is no serpentine rock or asbestos bearing rocks within the area proposed for excavation of the Auxiliary Spillway. Soil and rock that may contain minute amounts of asbestos may exist east of Dike 8. Dust abatement measures will be employed for disturbance of soil at all construction sites including activities east of Dike 8. Section 3.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR discusses the potential presence of asbestos in soil and rock and includes mitigation measures to be employed should asbestos bearing rock be encountered. The testing of soils for asbestos has occurred in the project area. Soil and rock in the Auxiliary Spillway to Dike 8 areas does not contain asbestos. Soil and rock east of Dike 8 has shown to possibly contain minute amounts of asbestos, well below regulatory standards. See Section 3.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Also see Section 4.3.11 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
345	345-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
345	345-3	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comments #72-2 and #121-3.
346	346-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
347	347-1	Hydrology Existing Conditions – Flood control planning is not the scope of this EIS/EIR. The Folsom DS/FDR EIS/EIR addresses construction of required changes to the Folsom Facility, some of which address flood damage reduction issues. There are a number of documents, including those referenced in the comment, that describe flood control planning for the region. The data cited in the comment does not reflect the effects of the Auburn cofferdam failure. Concur that releases of 130,000 cfs was not required. Suggested Replacement text in the Corps PAC Report is as follows: In February 1986, major storms in Northern California caused record flood flows in the American River basin. Due to the failure of the Auburn Dam cofferdam, Folsom officials released 130,000 cfs. Unprecedented high outflows from Folsom Dam and Reservoir, together with high flows in the Sacramento River, caused water levels to rise above the design freeboard of levees protecting the Sacramento River area.
347	347-2	Corps - Concur. Generally, the PMF event is extremely rare such as 1/105 to 1/104. Statistical gurus have dissuaded us from estimating or labelling events beyond the 1/200 using the unregulated frequency curves developed for the American R basin. At this time, several interested parties are trying to develop a method for determining the frequency for extreme events. Suggested replacement text is as follows: Recent estimates indicate that a frequency of flood approximately the same size as a PMF would have a recurrence interval somewhere between 1 in 7,100 and 1 in 22,000 years. between 1 in 105 and 1 in 104. At this time, several interested parties are trying to develop a method for determining the frequency for such an extreme event on the American River. For dam safety purposes, the PMF event is necessary for sizing the spillway to prevent dam overtopping where the consequences of failure are significant.
347	347-3	Design Flood Calculation -The Corps typically analyzes the flood damage reduction performance of their projects in their engineering reports. However, the minimum project requirement is to meet the local non-federal sponsor's goal of 200-yr design flood protection for the Sacramento area.
348	348-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
349	349-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
349	349-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
350	350-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
351	351-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
352	352-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
353	353-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
354	354-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
355	355-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Also see Response to Comment #12-1.
356	356-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
357	357-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
358	358-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
359	359-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
360	360-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
361	361-1	The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers appreciate the comment reflecting support for the project.
362	362-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
363	363-1	Alternatives Formulation – As described in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS/EIR, a number of alternatives to the proposed project were evaluated as part of the project planning process. These include identifying alternative reservoir locations. Due to population growth and land use issues, there is no viable location for a downstream reservoir. In addition, this alternative would not address Reclamation's dam safety objectives.
364	364-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
365	365-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
366	366-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
367	367-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
368	368-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
369	369-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
370	370-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
371	371-1	Socioeconomics Business - See Response to Comment #12-1
372	372-1	Public comment period extension request. A 4-day extension was granted for the public comment period. Also see Section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information on public involvement.
373	373-1	Climate Change – Upgrades to the Folsom Facility are being considered to address potential runoff concerns due to increased rain precipitation in the watershed. Operation of the project is not expected to have a notable effect on the global climate change issue.
374	374-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
375	375-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
376	376-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
377	377-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
377	377-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2. Also see Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		Final EIS/EIR for more information.
377	377-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 in the Final EIS/EIR.
378	378-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
379	379-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
379	379-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
380	380-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
381	381-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
382	382-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
383	383-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
384	384-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
385	385-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
386	386-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
386	386-2	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1
386	386-3	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
387	387-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
388	388-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
389	389-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
389	389-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
390	390-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
391	391-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
392	392-1	NEPA/CEQA Significance Conclusion – The project agencies disagree with the City's conclusion that there is a NEPA or CEQA obligation to analyze impacts to a less than significant level. Under NEPA, the only

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		requirement is disclose the level of significance. Under CEQA, agencies are required to explore means of reducing impacts to less than significant, but in some instances it is not possible to reduce an impact(s) to a level less than significant. In such cases, CEQA require the approving agency to carefully weigh the benefits of the project against the acceptability of any unavoidable significant impacts from the project. This evaluation occurs during the decision-making process, after the EIR is complete. Relative to NEPA, the acceptability of any adverse impacts associated with the proposed project/action is also addressed in the decision making process, as part of the Record of Decision.
392	392-2	<p>Water Supply Relocation - During this phase of the project, Reclamation will coordinate with the City of Folsom to address specific concerns regarding delivery of water as stipulated with the current Reclamation/City of Folsom water contract; outages will be limited to short city-approved durations or other means to deliver water will be incorporated.</p> <p>Also note that the Corps PAC Report contains the following information: Reclamation operates and maintains the existing aboveground raw water pipeline (Natomas pipeline) that provides water from Folsom Reservoir to the City of Folsom and California Department of Corrections water treatment plants, and water for the Corps resident office fire protection system. The pipeline is 42 inches in diameter, and is approximately 2,800 feet long from where the pipeline exits the dam at Adit 4 to the Folsom standpipe. The aboveground raw water pipeline is made of American Water Works Association C200 welded steel with a coal tar enamel interior lining. The chute alignment for the auxiliary spillway would cross a portion of the aboveground water pipeline. It would extend from an existing anchor block on the dam side of the chute to an anchor block on the far side of the chute. A new steel pipeline bridge, about 180 feet long, would be constructed to span the auxiliary spillway chute to support the 42-inch pipeline. The pipe relocation would be constructed, and then cut into the pipeline at each of the anchor blocks, limiting the disruption of water supply to the amount of time needed to make the change over at the anchor blocks. The chute would be excavated beneath the relocated pipeline after its completion.</p>
392	392-3	Borrow impacts to Fish Habitat - Fish habit along the shoreline where borrow is planned is marginal at best. Any excavation of borrow would occur when the reservoir was low and thus the shoreline dry. No impacts to fish are expected.
392	392-4	Folsom Oak Mitigation - Impacts to habitat, including oak woodland, are being addressed through the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report process with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. All oak trees potentially impacted will be on federal property and not within the jurisdiction of the City of Folsom. Please see Appendix E of the Final EIS/EIR.
392	392-5	As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, the raise type, earthen or parapet wall, is still being evaluated by the Corps. Once selected, the raise type will be addressed in a supplemental document. The supplemental document will address maintenance of a parapet wall, if that option is selected by the Corps. The Corps intends to adopt the Final EIS/EIR to satisfy the requirements of NEPA for the flood damage

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		reduction features of the proposed action (JFP, 3.5' raise and emergency gate replacement) that would be accomplished under the Corps' Folsom Dam Modifications and Folsom Dam Raise Projects. A Record of Decision (ROD) for the flood damage reduction only features of the Selected Plan (3.5' Raise and emergency gate replacement) would be completed separate from the Joint Federal Project ROD, and would be completed in the preconstruction, engineering and design phase of the project.
392	392-6	Traffic volumes of proposed routes are provided in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIS/EIR. The project agencies will comply with all federal and state regulations and policies when transporting equipment and materials to the site. This will include keeping truck traffic to designated truck routes. The project agencies will work with City transportation officials in the designation of those routes. See Section 4.3.9 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
392	392-7	Blasting will be a daily routine while the excavation of the spillway occurs. The Project Agencies will notify the community at the start of blasting periods, but will not provide daily notices. All work would occur on federal property and therefore, blasting permits from the city are not required; however the Project Agencies would follow all federal requirements for blasting.
392	392-8	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
392	392-9	Recreation Trails - The project will not affect trails at Granite Bay. The Project Agencies will work with DPR in addressing trails near construction sites. Trails will either be temporarily closed, or rerouted, as necessary to protect public safety.
392	392-10	The Folsom DS/FDR project will not affect current operations. Reservoir levels will remain as they currently are operated to provide for flood control, water supply, hydropower, fish and wildlife, water quality and navigation. The reservoir is not operated for recreation purposes.
392	392-11	Due to safety concerns, it will not be possible to have foot traffic and haul traffic in the area between Folsom Dam Road and Folsom Point during the periods of excavation and transport. The proposed pedestrian trail route along the southern boundary of the reservoir will need to wait until completion of construction work. The haul road will be regraded to serve as a portion of that trail at the completion of haul work.
392	392-12	A coffer dam at Dike 8 is no longer being proposed. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for a description of the revised project.
392	392-13	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
393	393-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
394	394-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
395	395-1	Dam Release Impact to Downstream Facilities – The Folsom DS/FDR project will not change the manner in

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		<p>which releases are allowed from the reservoir. Only a change in the Water Control Manual can result in such changes. Therefore, the Folsom DS/FDR project will have no effects to downstream facilities beyond what currently can happen under the Water Control Manual. Please see Section 4.3.7 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.</p> <p>The authorization for the Folsom Modification Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-ft to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modification Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process. Therefore, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements in this EIS/EIR. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.</p>
396	396-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
397	397-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
398	398-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
399	399-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
400	400-1	Existing Conditions Operations – The Project Agencies appreciate El Dorado County Water Agency’s interest in current and future reservoir operations as operations relate to water supply. The authorization for the Folsom Modification Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-ft to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modification Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process. Therefore, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements in this EIS/EIR. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.
401	401-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
401	401-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
401	401-3	Air Quality – See Response to Comment #206-3.
401	401-4	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
401	401-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
402	402-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
402	402-2	Vegetation and Wildlife - See Responses to Comment #151-2. See Section 4.3.12 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
402	402-3	Air Quality - See Response to Comment #206-3.
402	402-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
402	402-5	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
403	403-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
403	403-2	Transportation – See Response to Comment #203-4
403	403-3	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
403	403-4	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
404	404-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		Final EIS/EIR.
405	405-1	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
406	406-1	Air Quality - See Response to Comment #206-3.
407	407-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
407	407-2	The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
407	407-3	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
408	408-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
409	409-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
410	410-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
411	411-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Please see Response to Comment #12-1 regarding the economic analysis for the Folsom DS/FDR. The Partner Agencies have complied with both NEPA and CEQA regulations regarding public involvement. For more information, please see the Topical Response for Public Involvement in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
412	412-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
413	413-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
414	414-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
415	415-1	Water Quality - The Stormwater Pollution Prevention and Water Quality Management plans will include a requirement to notify water agencies of any release into the reservoir that could affect water quality.
415	415-2	Water Supply - The Folsom DS/FDR project will not result in the reduction of water supply to M&I users. Please see response to comment # 93-1 for more information on development of a new flood control manual

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		for Folsom Dam and Reservoir.
415	415-3	Water Supply Infrastructure - The Folsom DS/FDR project will not affect the infrastructure of EID. There no longer is a plan to increase the surface elevation of the reservoir. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for more information.
416	416-1	Air Quality Conformity and Mitigation - The Project Agencies have engaged discussions with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District on measures to reduce emissions and address Conformity. Also see Section 4.3.11 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. A conformity demonstration memorandum will be provided to USEPA prior to identification of the Preferred Alternative in the JFP Record of Decision.
416	416-2	Future NEPA Compliance - The Final EIS and RODs will state where future NEPA compliance will be necessary in order to complete the overall project.
416	416-3	Updated Flood Management Plan - The Corps of Engineers will provide USEPA with a copy of the updated flood management plan and associated NEPA document, when available. The authorization for the Folsom Modification Project directs the Corps to change the variable flood storage space at Folsom Lake from the current interim operation of 400,000 acre-ft to 670,000 acre-feet to a 400,000 acre-feet to 600,000 acre-feet (400/600) permanent variable flood space operation once the Folsom Modification Project has been implemented. The Corps, with coordination by Reclamation, will develop a new flood control manual for Folsom Dam for implementation prior to completion of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway. The new flood control manual feature is currently being scoped as a parallel process. Therefore, operations are analyzed and disclosed based upon current operational requirements in this EIS/EIR. The parallel flood control manual development and study will include variable flood storage space, including analysis of forecast based operations, new flood release schedules and a plan component for repayment of potential water supply losses resulting from implementation of this flood control manual. This parallel study will be a collaborative process with the appropriate level of environmental analysis, public, agency and stakeholder coordination, and appropriate NEPA/CEQA documentation.
416	416-4	Clear Project Definitions and Responsibilities - The Project Agencies concur on the need for three separate RODs, one for Dam Safety, one for the JFP, and the third for Flood Damage Reduction, as stated in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS/EIR.
416	416-5	NEPA Process Coordination - The Project Agencies have been active in coordinating Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report requirements with US Fish and Wildlife Service and conformity compliance with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.
417	417-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
418	418-1	Auburn Dam – The potential for an upstream storage facility, including Auburn Dam, to meet the objectives of the Folsom DS/FDR was evaluated early in the alternatives assessment process (see Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS/EIR) and was eliminated because an Auburn Dam would not meet project purpose and needs. Construction of a new facility upstream of Folsom Reservoir would not address the dam safety or dam

Comment No.	Response No.	Response
		security objectives of the Folsom facilities. There is an immediate need to upgrade the Folsom facilities which can be accomplished under current authorities. Also see Section 4.3.6 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
419	419-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
420	420-1	<p>The Draft EIS/EIR included alternatives that had the potential for increasing that reservoir surface elevation that also could potentially flood property immediately adjacent to the reservoir. However, neither Reclamation nor the Corps are considering actions that would result in an increased reservoir water elevation. Therefore, your property would not be inundated or subject to take under the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Based upon additional engineering analysis since the Draft EIS/EIR was published, the Corps has concluded that with optimization of all elements of its Selected Plan, including the 6STG auxiliary spillway, emergency spillway gate modification, and a 3.5-ft facility raise, an increase to maximum reservoir water surface elevation beyond current dam crest elevation is not anticipated in order to provide for flood damage reduction benefits. The future maximum reservoir surface elevation with the Corps' Selected Plan would not exceed the existing federal property take line for a 200-year flood design event. The anticipated lower maximum water surface elevation for all flood events, inclusive of a PMF event, eliminates the risk that surrounding properties or habitat would be flooded beyond that which occurs under existing conditions. Consequently, no property takes, flowage easements, or additional small scale impoundment features such as dikes or berms beyond the existing take line are planned as part of the Corps' Selected Plan. The 3.5-ft raise of the Corps' Selected Plan will undergo further design during pre-construction, engineering, and design phase and, if needed, addressed through a supplemental NEPA/CEQA document.</p>
421	421-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
422	422-1	Barging Alternative - The barging of material between the spillway site and Folsom Point was considered early during alternative development process. Barging is no longer being considered due to the short distance between the spillway and Folsom Point, normal reservoir fluctuations would make loading/off loading difficult, it would result in double handling of material, has recreational conflicts, and potential water quality control issues. Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
423	423-1	Socioeconomics - See Response to Comment #12-1.
424	424-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
425	425-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.
426	426-1	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR. Also please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete project description as the new Folsom Bridge is not part of this project.
426	426-2	Please see the Topical Response for Recreation in Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/EIR.

