

A

(b) Disclose and describe all points of redirection where the foreign water will be diverted in Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

(c) Disclose and describe the daily amounts of foreign water that will be diverted and used in Auburn Ravine at specific points of diversion as a result of the proposed project during all water year types. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

(d) Disclose and describe the seasons of diversion (and storage) at all point of diversion in Auburn Ravine where the foreign water will be diverted and used as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

(e) Disclose and describe the purposes of use and places of use at all points of diversion in Auburn Ravine where the foreign water will be diverted and used as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

B

(f) Disclose and describe the water rights held by all diverters in Auburn Ravine that will divert foreign water as a result of the project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

C

(g) Disclose and describe the mandatory daily minimum streamflow requirements below all points of diversion in Auburn Ravine to protect and keep in good condition threaten steelhead species, fall-run chinook salmon species and other aquatic species and their habitat where the foreign water will be diverted as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS;

(h) Disclose and describe whether the mandatory daily streamflow requirements below all point of diversion in Auburn Ravine will protect and keep in good condition threaten steelhead, fall-run chinook salmon and other aquatic species and their habitat where the foreign water will be diverted as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS. In the event there are no mandatory daily flow requirements below all points of diversion in Auburn Ravine to protect and keep in good condition threaten steelhead species and their habitat, fall-run chinook salmon species and their habitat, and other aquatic species and their habitat,

B. No additional diversions from Auburn Ravine would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1.13, Auburn Ravine.

C. There are currently no legally mandated minimum streamflow requirements in Auburn Ravine. Because the project, as modified, will not adversely affect Auburn Ravine, will not alter existing diversions from Auburn Ravine, and will not increase the number of existing diversions from Auburn Ravine, the EIS/EIR need not provide the requested information in order to fully account for the impacts of the proposed action. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1.13, Auburn Ravine.

instreamflow studies must be conducted below each point of diversion to determine said mandatory daily flow conditions before the project is approved and implemented;

C

(i) Disclose and describe whether all points of diversions in Auburn Ravine are screened to prevent the entrainment and loss of threaten steelhead and chinook salmon juvenile fish and other aquatic species where the foreign water will be diverted as a result of the proposed project. This information was not disclosed in the draft EIR/EIS. Fish screen studies must be conducted at all points of diversions in Auburn Ravine to determine whether fish screens should be installed and maintained to prevent the entrainment of threatened steelhead species, fall-run chinook salmon species, and other aquatic species as a result of diverting foreign water from all diversions in Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project;

B

(j) The draft EIR/EIS failed to disclose and describe valid water rights at all points of diversion in Auburn Ravine where foreign water will be diverted as a result of the proposed project. The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe the number of riparian diverters in Auburn Ravine that will divert and use foreign water as a result of the proposed project. Riparian diverters cannot legally divert and use foreign water from a different watershed based on claim of riparian rights. Disclose and describe the number of riparian diverters who will attempt to divert and use foreign water in Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project. Disclose and describe the manner in which the USBR and PCWA will prevent riparian diverters from diverting and using foreign water.

(k) The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe whether the USBR and PCWA have filed a petition with the State Water Resources Control Board to amend their water rights to divert foreign water into Auburn Ravine. This writer believes that the USBR and PCWA should file a petition with the State Water Resources Control Board to amend their water rights to divert foreign water into Auburn Ravine.

D

(l) The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe whether there are full time daily gauging devices below each point of diversion in Auburn Ravine where foreign water will be diverted and used as a result of the proposed project. Full-time gauging devices are very important for

D. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.13, Auburn Ravine.

compliance purposes so that diverters only divert the amount of water that they have rights to, and also to monitor daily streamflow conditions (and also mandatory daily flow requirements) to protect steelhead species and their habitat; fall-run chinook salmon and their habitat; and other aquatic species and their habitat. The draft EIR/EIS must be amended to include full-time gauging devices below all points of diversion in Auburn Ravine to insure that diverters only divert the amounts of water they are entitled to, and also to monitor daily flow conditions that protect steelhead species and their habitat; fall-run chinook salmon and their habitat; and other aquatic species and their habitat.

I am requesting that all of the information and data that was cited in the above comments are disclosed, described, and evaluated by Surface Water Resources, Inc in the CEQA and NEPA document.

**D****Protection Measures - Monitoring**

The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe the mitigation measures that will protect and keep in good condition threatened steelhead species and their habitat (all life stages), chinook salmon species and their habitat (all life stages) and other aquatic species and their habitat (all life stages) as a result of diverting foreign water into Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project. Amend the draft EIR/EIS to include protection measures for: threatened steelhead species and their habitat; fall-run chinook salmon species and their habitat; other aquatic species and their habitat.

The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe the monitoring measures that will monitor the protection of threatened steelhead species and their habitat (all life stages), chinook salmon species and their habitat (all life stages) and other aquatic species and their habitat (all life stages) as a result of diverting foreign water into Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project. Amend the draft EIR/EIS to include monitoring measures for: threatened steelhead species and their habitat; fall-run chinook salmon species and their habitat; other aquatic species and their habitat.

The draft EIR/EIS is deficient without protection and monitoring measures that will protect and keep in good condition threatened steelhead species and their habitat (all life stages), chinook salmon species and their habitat (all life stages) and other aquatic species and their habitat (all life stages) as a

4

From BBalocchi 5308362062 to 1-916-286-0957 at 12/10/2001 12:33 PM 006/007

result of diverting foreign water into Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project.

**Middle Fork Project**

E

The Middle Fork Project is licensed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Middle Fork Project is part of the whole project. The draft EIR/EIS did not disclose and describe the operational changes at the Middle Fork Project dams, reservoirs, and diversions. The draft EIR/EIS must be amended to include all operational changes at all dams, diversions, and diversion within the Middle Fork Project area. Also, the draft EIR/EIS must include the mandatory daily streamflow requirements to protect wild trout and other aquatic resources below all dams and diversions at the Middle Fork Project as a result of the proposed project.

Consultation with at least one federal agency indicates that the mandatory daily streamflow requirements at the Middle Fork Project dams and diversions are very poor. Consequently the draft EIR/EIS should disclose and describe the conditions of the fishery and other aquatic species resulting from the proposed project based on the results of studies.

The draft EIR/EIR must also disclose whether changes at the Middle Fork Project for the proposed project must be approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, by amendment to license.

**Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS**

F

The draft EIR/EIS failed to provide full disclosure to the public as shown and stated above in my comments. The USBR and PCWA must prepare a new supplemental EIR/EIR that provides full public disclosure to the public regarding the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the human environment of Auburn Ravine as a result of the proposed project.

Please note my mailing address. Please forward copies of the final EIR/EIS documents to me, including the new supplemental EIR/EIS documents. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to you.

5

DBG-10-01 MON 12:46 PM BBalocchi 5308362062

P. 6

E. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.8, Ralston Afterbay.

F. All comment letter authors were added to the project mailing list and received notification of the availability of the Final EIS/EIR.

From BBaiocchi 5308362062 to 1-916-286-0957 at 12/10/2001 12:33 PM 007/007

Respectfully Submitted

Signed by Bob Baiocchi

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Baiocchi, Consultant  
P.O. Box 1790, Graeagle, CA 96103  
Bus Tel: 530-836-1115  
Fax: 530-836-2062  
E-Mail: baiocchi@psln.com

cc: Interested Parties

6

DEC-10-01 MON 12:46 PM BBaiocchi 5308362062

P. 7

L-265

Dec 10 01 05:41p

p. 1

# Montecielo

SPECTACULAR  VIEW HOMESITES

December 10, 2001

City Council Members  
City of Auburn  
1225 Lincoln Way  
Auburn, CA 95603

American River Pump Station Project  
Draft EIS/EIR Comments  
Surface Water Resources, Inc.  
2031 Howe Ave, Suite 110  
Sacramento, CA 95825

VIA FACSIMILE AND HAND DELIVERY

RE: Maidu Dr. Access for Proposed American River Pump Station  
and Creation of Recreation and Parking Facilities

The Draft EIR on behalf of this project does not adequately address the many issues and concerns of neighboring property owners, particularly with regard to vehicular traffic, "trip-end" impacts, air quality including noise, fire, and public health and safety of those considered to be in the "urban interface" area, or specifically the residential neighborhoods and Skyridge School affected by the Maidu Dr. access proposal. My concerns are relevant for all neighborhoods impacted by a similar proposal.

To date, there has been very little publicity with regard to the adverse impacts of the Pump Station Project, especially by the news media and specifically regarding the recreational area parking and its impacts. This has now created overall skepticism and a loss of credibility for the proponents of the plan. In addition, the recently released DRAFT EIR appears to contain gross understatements and must be challenged.

For example, in the Executive Summary of the EIR Draft, the Transportation and Circulation Section on page 35 states,

"Use of the public river access sites would generate additional seasonal traffic through the area. Roadway capacity and LOS would not be impaired; **however concentrated seasonal travel along Maidu could result in neighborhood concerns. Because few homes front on Maidu Dr., this impact would be less than significant.**" Less than significant! This statement is so negligent of basic issues, and undermines the integrity and accuracy of the rest of the report. I have immediate concerns with regard to the following:

Subdivision Site: 580 Riverview Drive • Auburn, CA 95603  
Office (530) 823-7476 • Fax (530) 888-0619

DEC-10-01 MON 4:40 PM

P. 1

Specific comments addressed on following pages.

City Council Members  
and American River Pump Station Project  
December 10, 2001  
Page Two

1. TRAFFIC

A

A. Maidu Drive provides access to almost an entirely residential neighborhood, as well as Skyridge Elementary School. The fact that most of the homes do not front on Maidu is totally irrelevant. Most homes in all neighborhoods back up to the main access street and front onto their individual neighborhoods! In addition, the rear yard is where most American families enjoy the outdoor use of their home. All of the nearby subdivisions off Maidu Dr. will be greatly impacted by the sight, sound, and air quality of the vehicles accessing the proposed construction sites and recreational parking and facilities. **There will also be a loss of Peace and Quietness that everyone is entitled to enjoy under the law.** The Bureau of Land Management and the Auburn State Park Recreation Area should have provided the recreational parking and access years ago, not after the area has now been totally developed with residential housing.

B. Maidu Dr. dead ends or loops back to the older section of Riverview Dr., which also either dead ends, weaves through other rural streets or leads back through the Montecielo Subdivision. The point is the road configurations surrounding Maidu Dr. could create real traffic and parking problems outside the proposed park unless more thorough traffic studies and mitigation can be made prior to a final EIR, not after.

C. The following traffic impacts have been totally ignored and need to be addressed::

- a. The increased traffic and unknown transient vehicles regarding the safety of children in the Skyridge School area, especially close to the rural area and proposed park.
- b. Off-Site parking violations and disturbances encroaching into adjacent neighborhoods when the parking lot is full.
- c. Impacts from recreational vehicles, boats, rafts, camping, etc., noise and possibly bumper to bumper traffic.
- d. How will you monitor unsafe and illegal activities will occur as a result of opening these lands How will you maintain Maidu Dr./ with regard to road debris, maintenance, and all the problems dealing with the recreational public when accessing through a quiet neighborhood?
- e. The entire South Auburn area is almost exclusively residential housing with very few convenience stores and services. Auburn-Folsom Rd. to Douglas Blvd. is also almost exclusively lower density residential. It seems public park access would be more appropriate near highway service areas and not in established residential areas.
- f. What traffic impacts will occur if rafters decide to use this area over already existing river access sites?
- g. On page 33, the report mentions there will be 54 heavy pieces of construction equipment and 50 workmen traveling Maidu Dr. during the course of construction. The number of men seems to be very low considering the scope of the proposed work. How was that number determined and were multiple trips factored?

B

A. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.

B. Please refer to Response L-95.I.