

# **Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan**

**Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview  
Transcripts**

*Prepared by:*

**United States Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Mid-Pacific Region**



**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation**

**March 2014**



# Contents

	Page
<b>Elected Officials and Local Government.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Industrial/Agricultural/Utility .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Non-Government Organization.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Private Landowner .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Recreational    61</b>	

*This page left blank intentionally.*

# Elected Officials and Local Government

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Elected Officials/Local Government

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Some familiarity with the project, the county is supportive of the concept, but the project cannot come with significant regulatory impacts on landowners, municipalities, or timber industries.</p> <p>Questions asked: How is the county responsible for mitigating the lack of quality habitat for the Central Valley? How did the North State counties get included in this?</p> <p>3 years.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We will be engaged to the extent of regulatory issues (Safe Harbor), anyway to stop the county or landowners from paying a dime.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 2</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 2</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 3</p> <p>Public Outreach – 5</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 6</p> <p>Pilot Plan – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p><b>Lowest:</b></p> <p>Fish Health and Genetic- The county has been involved in salmonids supplementation for a long time, working on this issue with The Nature Conservancy and Farm Bureau. We held a genetic conference with NOAA, NOAA has the genetic issues down.</p> <p>Habitat- Habitat has already been assessed.</p> <p><b>Highest:</b></p> <p>Policy and Regulatory- The issues are very political, there is major opposition to Safe Harbor provisions. It looks like it will take congressional action. North State counties don't have the same political leverage that the Central Valley has.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Unsure, we are still trying to observe what is going on.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 1</p> <p>Public Outreach – 2</p> <p>Pilot Plan – 3</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 4</p> <p>Habitat – 5</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p><i>No response provided.</i></p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p><i>No response provided.</i></p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<p>An intimate and focused group with the landowners.</p> <p>Sending lots of notices and updates.</p> <p>Include large timber companies, large landowners (PG&amp;E), and the land grazing industry.</p>
<p>10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?</p>	<p>City of Dunsmuir and Mt. Shasta</p> <p>Randy Akana at Siskiyou County</p>
<p>11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?</p>	<p>Email</p>

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<i>No response provided.</i>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	You have to fix the Safe Harbor issues before you can have the county's support. The Central Valley will have to pay for it, the county and its residents will not be paying for it.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Elected Officials/Local Government

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>I wasn't familiar before initial contact; I did talk to Curtis Knight beforehand. I haven't been tracking the study for that long, just a couple weeks</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>I could be involved, but I am not an expert. If I don't have an opinion that is valid then I won't express it.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 3  Pilot Plan – 3  Policy and Regulatory – 4  Fish Health and Genetics – 3  Fish Passage Technology – 4  Habitat – 5</p>
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Public Outreach – So far, a good job is being done of getting everyone informed and getting them to attend the meetings.   Highest: Habitat – This could cause problems for getting the fish up or down stream.</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Changes would depend on if they are more familiar with the issues.
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	Public Outreach – 1 Policy and Regulatory – 2 Pilot Plan – 3 Habitat – 4 Fish Passage Technology – 5 Fish Health and Genetics – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Public Outreach – It is important to calm paranoia of the public from Government. Need to get the knowledge out as fast as possible and calm fears.  #6: Fish Health and Genetics – It is still important, but it just the least important. Someone has to be at the bottom.
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	No idea.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	1. Continue with emailing like already being done 2. Get the Lake Head Community Development Association involved, through the media, radio, newspaper, fish periodicals.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Forest Service, State Parks
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	I can't recall the names, but fish periodicals are popular up in Shasta, need to look into it. Resort Business Association on Shasta Lake.
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<i>No response provided</i>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	How successful has something like this been in the past? What kind of fish in the lifecycle? How cold does the water need to be for the fish? Worried about how low the Sacramento River is right now. Concerned that the fish would be too small and the predators in the delta would get to them.

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Elected Officials/Local Government

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>I am somewhat familiar, at least one meeting I attended in the past, studying the feasibility of the project. Heard about the study a couple years ago</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>To the extent that it has an effect on the County</p>
<p>3. I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>4. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 4                      Habitat – 4                      Fish Health and Genetics – 5                      Policy and Regulatory – 5                      Pilot Plan – 5                      Fish Passage Technology – 6</p>
<p>5. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest:                      Public outreach- this should be doable if done right, as the area isn't heavily populated so you should be able to reach everyone.                      Habitat- This project is in pristine areas, it is not urban.                      Highest: Fish Passage Technology: Raising Shasta dam, not a proven technology for Klamath, how will that impact this project, consistently truck and hull.</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
6. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Not significantly
7. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	Public Outreach – 1 Habitat – 2 Policy and Regulatory – 3 Pilot Plan – 4 Fish Health and Genetics – 5 Fish Passage Technology – 6
8. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Public Outreach – Getting the people involved with the Government is very important.  #6: Fish Passage Technology – The scientist will get it figured out and then relay the info to the public.
9. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes – Probably reverse them all.
10. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	Have to come up and meet with the interested parties: Timber, Tribes, City Government ... what a cup of coffee would buy.
11. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Supervisor Brandon Criss (McCloud area)
12. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
13. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	NCTV 15, non-profit TV station with website, good forum for us to get information out, McCloud, Dunsmuir, Weed.
14. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	Good luck.
15. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

# Industrial/Agricultural/Utility

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Moderately familiar, we are a major landowner within the McCloud and Sacramento watersheds. Also we are participants in the McCloud CRMP; CRMP has had presentations on this program. Been tracking the study since maybe a year or 2 ago, there was a meeting (Reclamation and NOAA had representatives present) in Mt. Shasta. First heard about this project in newspapers or press releases, meeting or through CRMP</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We will be very interested in understanding the process and will be very interested in the results, but do not intend to be involved in any of the day to day.</p>
<p>3. I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 1            Habitat – 2            Fish Health and Genetics – 3            Fish Passage Technology – 4            Policy and Regulatory – 5            Pilot Plan – 6</p>
<p>5. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Public Outreach – Don't think that public outreach is that hard, it is easy enough to hold public meetings and try to bring people in. Doing it is the easy part. Habitat surveys as well. Can be achieved outside policy and can be achieved easily.</p> <p>Highest (2):</p> <p>Pilot Plan- this seems the most difficult because it includes everything.</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – This will be the most difficult. It is not that Reclamation couldn't just define and comply with those particular permits, but then the issue of regulation as it applies to a decision to do this is incredibly complex. This is our concern. On one side, this would be incredibly difficult. Fish passage technology seems incredibly difficult based on what has been read and heard in meetings. Seems very complex, to do it would be very complex.</p>
<p>6. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Do not think that they would change. Think this would represent forest land owners pretty well.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>7. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 1</p> <p>Pilot Plan – 2</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 3</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 4</p> <p>Habitat – 5</p> <p>Public Outreach – 6</p>
<p>8. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>Policy and regulatory – A stumbling block for forestry; this area needs the most discussion and communication about how it would be taken care of.</p> <p>Public outreach – Something that is relatively easy to accomplish. Has been done successfully with the groups that have interest.</p>
<p>9. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>10. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<p>Having face-to-face meetings, would need to be focused meetings outside general meetings. Decision makers need to understand exactly what the issues are. Our peer groups would get together and talk one on one with decision makers.</p>
<p>11. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?</p>	<p>No other groups, other folks that have interest are aware of the process and have opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>12. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?</p>	<p>Both email and regular mail. Updates should be provided if anything materially different occurs, if there is no progress there is no need for an update.</p>
<p>13. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?</p>	<p>McCloud CRMP is a group of landowners, regulators, interested parties in the McCloud river that has been in place for 20-25 years. This would be a prime candidate for information dispersal. Some members of this group are people we will be talking to, but as a group itself it is important.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>14. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?</p>	<p>Two important issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are we going to do to avoid added regulatory restrictions that come with the reintroduction of salmon?</li> </ol> <p>This adds Federal regulation on top of State regulations. Private issues are not taken into consideration. In McCloud, there are already regulations for forestry. For places with anadromous fish population, there are. The introduction of anadromous salmonid fish, there are even more stringent regulations for forestry practices. NOAA has discussed a habitat conservation plan or Safe Harbor or 10J experimental population designation; so far none of this has been sufficiently answered. This needs to be discussed with the landowners before anything is signed or supported. Nothing to do with Federal regulation, all State regulation. Federal agencies are doing this project, and then State regulations kick in and take over.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The economics and effectiveness of the whole program, going to spend this money but unknown effectiveness and success rate of this whole project.</li> </ol> <p>Concern over the economics and efficiencies of trapping and transporting fish long distances, reintroducing them, capturing juveniles and releasing them. This requires incredible costs. Do not even know if it is feasible technologically. Always want people to evaluating this, want to know cost and success rate. Whole reason to do this is to ensure the survival of these runs.</p>
<p>15. Do you have any questions for me?</p>	<p>No</p>

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Probably when the biological opinion was rendered (2009) and the initial goal of restoring salmon habitat was discussed, they talked about getting fish back into historic spawning regions.</p> <p>We've been involved with the McCloud River CRMP since before its inception.</p> <p>Have been following the Shasta Dam raise issues since at least 1998. I've been personally involved with it since the initial issue was talked about.</p> <p>Also, because we are an industrial forest company, we get news from the California Forestry Trade Association.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>Primarily keeping informed of what's going on and providing input where and when we can of what we think of the project.</p> <p>We have McCloud CRMP meetings at least twice a year and there are representatives from NMFS and Reclamation present.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 1            Public Outreach – 3            Fish Health and Genetics – 3            Pilot Plan – 4            Fish Passage Technology – 4            Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Habitat – This work has been done again and again by foresters, PG&amp;E, many others. There is a fair amount (of research and data) already out there, whether it is accessible is another issue. We have gotten summary reports from PG&amp;E during our CRMP meetings. CalTrout and the Nature Conservancy have scientific research.</p> <p>Highest: Policy and Regulatory – From our standpoint, I do not think that the Federal government understands the impact of introducing endangered species. You put a listed fish into the upper McCloud and all the private timber land becomes subject to ASP (anadromous salmon), in addition to State forestry practices rules, and CEQA (we cannot take a listed species). Even if there is some sort of safe harbor/experimental status (temporary) we are concerned about getting saddled with rules that we weren't subject to before. Fishing clubs and Native American concerns about re-introducing a listed species into the river. Fishing businesses are concerned about how this will affect the business.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Private timber companies would have somewhat similar views. The forest service would have different issues, the Policy and Regulatory side would change with it. There are a lot of conflicting laws and regulations that need to be sorted out.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 1  Policy and Regulatory – 2  Pilot Plan – 3  Fish Health and Genetics – 4  Fish Passage Technology – 5  Habitat – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1. Public Outreach – Ranking the importance of communicating what is going on, this ought to be your top priority.</p> <p>#6. Habitat – Most people already know that this is a good trout stream and that salmon and trout are salmonid species. This area is pretty well known to the fishing community for the high habitat quality.</p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>They might, others may put policy and regulatory higher. There may be other reasons for other things higher on the list to communicate to the public. Issues may change on other rivers because the stakeholders are not involved with the McCloud CRMP (they would receive less information).</p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meetings and being involved with stakeholder groups like the McCloud River CRMP</li> <li>2. Using workshops for larger general public and interest groups. In 2009, I went to a workshop in Chico, it was good. You get the predictable comments and attendees, but then it is a forum for them to bring up their points.</li> <li>3. Print media/online news. Different generations like print and online news. Letters to the stakeholders.</li> </ol>
<p>10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?</p>	<p>Not in our organization, beyond that all the other people involved in the McCloud CRMP.</p>
<p>11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?</p>	<p>Print mail and email</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Information for the McCloud and the Upper Sac is handled through the River Exchange in Dunsmuir, putting together an IRWM (State water bond money that funded watershed assessment and planning).
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	I think that the fish reintroduction plan is a waste of taxpayer money. They will spend millions or billions and we do not know if this will succeed or not. I think that this is an issue between hatcheries/wild fish people.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

**Category:** Business Landowner

**Tier:** Primary

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>First learned about proposal from a Fish and Wildlife biologist at least two or three years ago, within the last year there has been a lot more information through public meetings and presentations where NMFS and Reclamation were presenters.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>Minimally as possible, do not want additional sanctions or regulations imposed. We are already FSC certified so physical habitat is of very good quality and would like to preserve current practices as they are; these practices have created a good habitat for salmon reintroduction. Would like to use the reintroduction of salmon as an experiment and a validation of the efficacy of the current forestry practices. Timberland owners should not have to go through an additionally restrictive permitting process if salmon are reintroduced.</p> <p>Concerns: A HCP (habitat conservation plan) if needed for regulatory relief is an untimely and expensive process that would be a huge burden for any affected landowner. With this salmon reintroduction, there should be coverage assured for landowners so that HCP's aren't necessary. A Programmatic HCP undertaken by lead agency is a possibility, but the best alternative would the designation of an Experimental Population under current forest practices.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Plan</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>1. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>6. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>7. Habitat</li> <li>8. Pilot Planning</li> <li>9. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>10. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Health and Genetics – 1          Public Outreach – 2          Pilot Planning – 3          Fish Passage Technology – 4          Habitat – 5          Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Fish Health and Genetics – Technically, this is pretty easy to do; assessing the health of fish in streams is routine work.</p> <p>Highest: Regulatory – The time and money that it takes to achieve ESA relief makes the policy and regulatory part most difficult. Dealing with multiple State and Federal statutes and regulations, will be adding additional regulatory issues on top of already strict regulation. ‘Take’ permission would be the most difficult to get, thus an Experimental Population designation would clear the way for expanded cooperation.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Fairly confident that 6 will stay the same for everyone, broad consensus.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 1          Habitat – 2          Fish Passage Technology – 3          Pilot Planning – 4          Fish Health and Genetics – 5          Public Outreach – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1: Policy and Regulatory – Going to have to spend 90 percent of your time dealing with the policy and regulatory issues.</p> <p>#6: Public outreach – This is implied with this question</p>

Question	Response Notes
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	No
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A series of redundant efforts, including face and phone time with individual stakeholders and public groups. Face time is the most important. Bring stakeholder groups together (have groups separated by interest, ie timber, environmental, recreational groups would meet separately), have face time and a conversation about concerns and decisions have been made. Need people to feel involved and that their input has been received and considered. Biggest potential for public outreach miscommunication is to ask for opinions and then produce a report that misinterprets their input, an appendix at end of a report that dismisses people's opinions is not an effective outreach strategy.</li> <li>2. Agencies need to have better public meetings, with someone standing in front of the group and explaining what they are doing. Often times, public meetings are scheduled to present certain topics but when you get there, there are only poster boards that do not convey the message effectively to the public. These are a cop out from agencies that want to deal with the public as little as possible. People need to be heard.</li> <li>3. Go to great lengths to communicate with and keep legislators in the loop, they are likely to be advocates.</li> </ol>
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Executive staff in Oregon – Busy and don't know much about California, but at least reach out to them.</li> <li>2. Campbell and John Hancock Timber management.</li> <li>3. Pacific Forest Trust</li> <li>4. KARE (Kalamath Alliance for Resource and Environment)</li> <li>5. Upper Sacramento River Exchange (umbrella for whitewater rafting, fishing, environmental stakeholders)</li> <li>6. Railroad and Caltrans (Union Pacific Railroad and I-5 runs parallel to river)</li> </ol>
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email is fine

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Area newspapers, regional radio stations, website that could post
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	It is very important that we avoid a 'no good deed goes unpunished' scenario. Hope that our tree farm won't be penalized for the careful stewardship used for the last 15 years, that has created a beneficial habitat for the reintroduction of salmon; a 25-ft no-cut is another part of regulatory relief. Not only would there be an Experimental Population, but there would be an experimental maintaining current forest practices. Should be an experiment that highlights benefits of good forest management. There are Chinook surviving in habitats that are worse than the Upper Sac and McCloud that are doing quite well.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	Familiar with project and intend to monitor and participate. Got attention in 2009, when BO was issued, maybe even before that.
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	<p>First of all, we see ourselves providing data. Because of relicensing, we have completed many studies on the lower McCloud River. There is extensive research available from us that will help Reclamation's efforts to evaluate the re-introduction of anadromous salmonids. There are roughly 11 studies related to habitat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Habitat mapping compilation for river below McCloud dam</li> <li>2. Relationships between for flow and habitat (for resident and anadromous species) (i.e., instream flow studies)</li> <li>3. Water temperature monitoring</li> <li>4. Relationships between flow and water temperature (i.e., SNTMP model)</li> <li>5. Spawning gravel mapping</li> <li>6. Sediment transport dynamics</li> <li>7. Existing fish population sizes, species, distribution</li> <li>8. Benthic macroinvertebrate communities studies</li> <li>9. Effects of flow and temperature on sensitive species (i.e., foothill yellow-legged frog)</li> <li>10. Hydrology studies</li> <li>11. Water quality studies</li> </ol>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 1          Public Outreach – 2          Policy and Regulatory – 3          Pilot Planning – 4          Fish Passage Technology – 5          Fish Health and Genetics – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Habitat – Because there is so much habitat data available.</p> <p>Highest (2):</p> <p>Fish Passage – Chinook salmon passage is fairly complex; there are real issues with regard to capturing the juveniles.</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – Fish health and genetics issues are tough. Any fisheries biologist can produce a list of diseases and parasites that trap-and-haul salmon can potentially introduce to resident fish. Of particular concern, is the IHN virus. We are unaware of any studies that evaluate the potential impact of the IHN virus on Lower McCloud River resident fish. This virus alone has the potential to ruin the world class Lower McCloud River trout fishery.</p> <p>Also, there potential regulatory issues associated with water quality - trucking water with IHN virus upstream into upper reaches may violate the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>And, if anadromous fish are introduced above McCloud dam in the Upper McCloud River, the potential exist for the IHN virus to spread to the Upper and Lower McCloud River, McCloud Reservoir, Iron Canyon Reservoir, Pit River's Pit 5 by-pass reach, Pit 6 reservoir and Pit 7 reservoir. We need to learn more about this potential contamination.</p> <p>Fish health and genetics issues cannot just be solved with money as they are very complex.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Some of them would not rank the fish health and genetics as highly because they are not as aware of the potential significance of the problem. A lot of the groups would rate habitat issues as a bigger challenge or difficulty because they are not aware of the degree that habitat assessment has already been done on the Lower McCloud River in the last 5 years. It should be noted that the work has not been done in the Upper McCloud</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Passage Technology – 1            Habitat – 2            Fish Health and Genetics – 3            Pilot Planning – 4            Policy and Regulatory – 5            Public Outreach – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1: Fish Passage Technology – This will be difficult to communicate because it is complex            #6: Public outreach – This will be the easiest.</p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public meetings</li> <li>2. Electronic communication-mail with website access (information on website)</li> <li>3. Steering committees comprised of these members</li> </ol>
<p>10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?</p>	<p>PG&amp;E, Stillwater Sciences, McCloud river CRMP, White Water Boating Community, representatives of angling community, and resource management groups</p>
<p>11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?</p>	<p>Email and website links, posting documents on a website is the most efficient communication channel</p>
<p>12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?</p>	

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	We are an enthusiastic participant in a number of successful anadromous fishery restoration programs in California, including restoration projects on Battle Creek and Butte Creek. The company is pleased with the accomplishments achieved through these projects, and has a strong desire to continue working with NOAA Fisheries and other Federal and State agencies and non-governmental organizations to expand and build upon these successes.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

*This page left blank intentionally.*

# Non-Government Organization

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Environmental/ NGO

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Maybe around last November. Prior to interview, had had a meeting with representatives from DWR, NMFS, and Reclamation who were all working on developing the RFP for the consultants for the study. Reached out to get input on thoughts on associated fish issues.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We see ourselves and the anglers as stakeholders for this project. Protect, reconnect, and sustain fisheries around North America. Interest in Salmon and Trout especially. Have worked historically on this issue in a range of ways: advocating for restoration of river habitats around California, engaging in policy making processes that are germane to fish's long-term success (CVFPP, FERC, etc). Our perspective on the Central Valley watershed complex is that it is a complex system rimmed by Sacramento and other rivers, interested in everything going on in that as it pertains to fish.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 1          Habitat – 2          Fish Health and Genetics – 3          Pilot Planning – 4          Policy and Regulatory – 5          Fish Passage Technology – 6</p>
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Public Outreach – Not that many people are stakeholders in the region, relatively unpopulated regions. Have existing structures Upper Sac IRWM, CRMP, water talks, Siskiyou water network. People are already used to getting information through these channels</p> <p>Highest :</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – These have multiple parts that are more and less difficult. Because there are not many winter run fish to use, finding winter run fish to be your test case will be the hardest.</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – There is no existing system that successfully moves juvenile fish out and around a dam system as large as Shasta. New technology, even if you develop new designs it will be hard to implement and test these designs</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Someone else up to speed would highlight the exact same issues. If you weren't as up to speed or did not have background in fish then the answers would be different. People would think that the up transportation would be difficult, emphasize FERC, flows, might not catch subtly of outreach description.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 1                      Fish Passage Technology – 2                      Pilot Planning – 2                      Fish Health and Genetics – 4                      Habitat – 5                      Public Outreach – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1: Policy and regulator – People not wanting endangered species in their backyard. Especially if there is no plan to get them out. If you have a good plan, this can be turned around quickly. McCloud is controlled by large organizations, have generally all been wary of any activity that goes on in the region. McCloud CRMP has tight reigns on what goes on in that area, this is going to be a sensitive topic.</p> <p>#6: Public outreach – This is implied with the question.</p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Top 3 would be the same among all NGOs. Depending on what you consider peers, there are other fish related NGOs that are well informed, river related NGOs. Other NGO's position would depend on experience.</p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Targeted meetings one on one</li> <li>2. Presentations for the existing water networks in the region</li> <li>3. Regional meetings that move around</li> </ol> <p>Use the existing networks IRWM Upper Sac, Siskiyou water network, McCloud CRMP</p> <p>Any of the large landowners- individual meetings would be both effective and appropriate.</p> <p>Agencies- one on one communication.</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	<p>Cal-Trout</p> <p>Tribes in the greater region: Winnimem Wintu, Pit River, Shasta Nation</p> <p>Other regional non-profits: The River Exchange, Shasta County RCD (Resource Conservation Districts, State sponsored non-profits)</p> <p>Individual major landowners</p> <p>Timber interests, such as Sierra Pacific Industries</p>
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	<p>Great to get project updates via email with links to public/drafts, have semi-regular in-person interview when there are developments (once or twice a year), would make sense to have a technical review committee made up of designees from interested stakeholder groups (bring in technical review, free resource, stakeholder input and buy-in)</p>
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<p>Create a new technical review committee made up of designees from interested stakeholder groups (bring in technical review, free resource, stakeholder input and buy-in)</p>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<p><i>No response provided.</i></p>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<p>No</p>

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Environmental/NGO

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Very familiar. I have been tracking the issue for a number of years. We brought the issue of the reintroduction of fish up during the start of the McCloud Dam Relicensing (2005/2006). We first heard about this specific project in Spring (2013) when talking with NMFS and Reclamation.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We would like to be as involved as possible. We are involved with both the public and also with NMFS and Reclamation. We have a lot of knowledge of the area, in May we toured NMFS and Reclamation around the area.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 3  Habitat – 3  Pilot Planning – 3  Policy and Regulatory – 5  Fish Health and Genetics – 6  Fish Passage Technology – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p><b>Lowest:</b></p> <p>Habitat – There has already been a lot of work done on the rivers that they are considering. For the most part, the water quality in these habitats is good for trout year-round. It will be good for salmon seasonally. I don't see this as a huge uncertainty or difficulty.</p> <p>Public outreach – Not all that difficult to do, but very important. We've already helped by hosting the WaterTalk program. These happen 5 or 6 times a year, are open to the public, 30-40 people showed up. We are happy to help with public outreach</p> <p>Pilot Planning – Not that difficult to do. As long as it is transparent, it should be pretty straightforward.</p> <p><b>Highest:</b></p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – I think that disease is a big issue with a lot of uncertainty, like what kind of diseases get brought up with anadromous fish species. Who these fish are is one of the critical questions. One of the primary causes of the project is to provide a 3rd type of winter run Chinook. The benefits of the projects are much reduced if the genetically viable winter run doesn't exist.</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – One of the biggest challenges will be the juvenile collection part of it and depends on where collection happens. If they use a small tributary, should be easy. A juvenile collection on a larger part of the river will be a lot more expensive and difficult.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>Probably not too much. Most people recognize that these are difficult issues.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Pilot Planning – 1            Public Outreach – 2            Policy and Regulatory – 3            Habitat – 4            Fish Health and Genetics – 5            Fish Passage Technology – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1: Pilot Planning – Transparency is very important. Being open with information. Being clear about the roles, timeline, and specifics of the pilot planning.</p> <p>#4, #5, #6: Fish passage, fish health, and habitat-communication point is important, but not from the public's point of view. This issue is more for the experts to sort out.</p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>No one would argue with the importance of the pilot planning and regulatory issues</p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spending time in the area. Many regulatory folks aren't very familiar with the area. We have tried to push looking at all different reaches to reintroduce the fish (historical habitat), these are natural spring areas that create a good fish habitat. Need a good sense of the geography. Board of supervisors meetings, 1 on 1 with the supervisors, having meetings out in the field taking tours with local folks- getting on the ground and looking around.</li> <li>2. Engage foresters. Need to have a good sense of the local politics, timber interests are a big landowner base. Their big concerns are about these fish being experimental fish (reducing regulation). One thing timber guys continue to point out that is that there are more strict State forest regulations when there are anadromous fish in the watershed.</li> <li>3. Unique private landowners along the McCloud. Regulatory agencies are doing a good job coming to the McCloud CRMP meetings; these are good for discussing the project concerns.</li> </ol>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	The River Exchange (Upper Sac, a little on the McCloud), Siskiyou County Supervisors
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email and website
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Local Newspapers (Mt Shasta Herald, Siskiyou Daily News, Redding Record Searchlight)
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<p>We have been pretty clear with the fact that we are a fish group; supportive of this project but have concerns that fit within the pilot program. This is an important issue we should be talking about. This is not to criticize where this project is going; there are other issues that have to be thought about as well.</p> <p>Fish above rim dams are a big deal; we understand the pressures on these fish, especially with climate change and decreasing habitat below dams.</p> <p>Need to take a broader look at this: Central Valley salmon recovery plan and, in particular, the number of resources we have available. Juvenile collection will be extremely expensive (initial capital and annual costs) will take resources away from other fish projects that may be more beneficial. We do not want the trap and haul program to take all the resources.</p> <p>Do think that one way we have started to think about this is, if it is really focused on winter run with a population in the main stem, Battle Creek, then then potentially a third population of winter-run Chinook above Shasta, maybe this gets thought of an experimental population. It will be hard to really create a lot of fish this way, but maybe we can create some genetic viability this way.</p> <p>Maybe there are smaller rivers that could be used to do this experiment with a focus on where the cold spring water is. Winter-run evolved to spawn in cold spring water, primarily spring sources in the Upper McCloud. The pilot study should focus on these spring areas above Shasta Dam, such as the Upper McCloud, Hat Creek, Fall River, etc. These may be more sustainable cost wise in the future.</p>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Environmental/NGO

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>Quite familiar. Following project since 2009 BO, have been waiting for it to happen ever since. Have consistently inquired as to progress of project. Heard through NMFS and Curtis Knight at CalTrout that there have been more active conversations lately.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>Very important project to us. Very interested in project, would really like to see it going forward. Whether I am directly involved, or a colleague is unclear.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Health and Genetics – 1  Pilot Planning – 2  Habitat – 3  Public Outreach – 4  Policy and Regulatory – 5  Fish Passage Technology – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest:            Fish Health and Genetics – I think that this is a binary question. Either the fisheries agencies are going to make a call or the project will not go forward. This is an internal issue for NMFS, DFW that they are going to have to resolve before progress can be made. A geographically distinct population is more important than a genetic distinct population. If they are going to reestablish population above Shasta, goal should be to have those populations have fidelity to that region versus the goal of having them be a genetically distinct population.</p> <p>Highest:            Fish Passage Technology: Hardest because of the specifics, not talking about whether capture and transport works in the abstract, but how it would work in this actual case moving fish around Shasta and Keswick. Believe that volitional passage is very challenging at Shasta. Downstream capture would be the most difficult, particularly with fluctuating lake levels, Recreation conflicts at Lake Shasta, and other species. Given potential high flows in Sacramento and McCloud, design will be difficult, but not impossible.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>People may get wrapped up in the genetics issues, other folks may think that it is not as easily resolved. The pilot plan is something that will be done after a lot of background work; issues will work themselves out in a practical way. There will be a lot of concerns about the ESA in relation to a pilot plan, and that may affect opportunities.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 1            Policy and Regulatory – 2            Pilot Planning – 3            Fish Passage Technology - 4            Habitat – 5            Fish Health and Genetics – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	<p>#1. Public outreach – Planning a public outreach plan is important. This is being seen in the broader range of area, specific to Siskiyou and Shasta County as well. Issues in the area, such as the Klamath relicensing, settlement agreement, dam removal have been very contentious. Discussions have become more strident over the last several years; management of these discussions will be challenging.</p> <p>#6. Public doesn't really care about the genetics part. Some people are interested in seeing populations expanded. They are more interested in having salmon back in general, versus a specific genetic strain of salmon.</p>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	<p>Generally same rankings. People may not emphasize public outreach as much if they weren't as aware of or involved with other local fisheries discussions that are going on.</p>
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	<p>In general, having meetings, being local, keeping things positive and informal is a good thing.</p> <p>1. Message conveyed should be clear and well thought out. The questions that stakeholders will ask need to be anticipated and the answers should be clear.</p> <p>2. Finding local champions is very important. Champions can be individuals, NGO organizations, any local government or chambers of commerce. Very important to talk about economic benefits to local residents and businesses. We can continue to have robust fishing and improve employment opportunities by having local people involved in project (construction, biological). Need an emphasis on hiring local.</p> <p>3. Engage local recreation businesses and fisheries NGOs (Whitewater and other local entities). Convey the message that there are economic benefits and improve support for project.</p>
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	<p>California Water Impact Network. Northern California Council Federation of Flyfishers.</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Frequently. Regular email updates (at least 4x a year) send out information about what is going on- it is important to get the sense that the project is ongoing, important, and to keep the project in the public eye. Send the updates to everyone: public, FERC, PG&E, etc.
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<p>1. A number of fish websites/chatrooms, if they can publish updates on their website that would be a good resources. Choose a couple of them carefully. There can be all kinds of unproductive chatter. Going to have to go and find who will support this- ask Curtis Knight.</p> <p>2. Chamber of Commerce websites: Mt Shasta, Dunsmuir. They may not support it. American Whitewater has a great website.</p> <p>3. CSPA website.</p> <p>4. Caltrout website</p> <p>5. Trout Unlimited- go for big headline things on website</p> <p>6. Northern California Federation of Flyfishers. The federation is significant.</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?</p>	<p>We supports this publicly and probably more vocally than anyone else. TU and Caltrout are not equivocal in support, just different support way. This is a really important issue for us, we made sure that fish reintroduction was big issue in McCloud-Pit relicensing, that the State Water Board addressed this issue.</p> <p>Some anglers are against any changes in the McCloud, think that it is "perfect now, why would you change it". Part of the concern that some folks have is that if flows are increased to support salmon or steelhead, it will become more difficult to fish. This is an access issue, not a regulatory issue. Flows will change, but fishing will not necessarily change (see video on Caltrout website regarding good fishing quality on the Pit after flow increases from FERC relicensing).</p> <p>NMFS and Reclamation have to get together with CA Dept of Fish and Wildlife and figure out how the to manage the angling part.</p> <p>PG&amp;E is against it because releasing more flow in river would cost them power and money to study. Good resource State water board website-  <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_is_sues/programs/water_quality_cert/mccloudpit_ferc2106.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_is_sues/programs/water_quality_cert/mccloudpit_ferc2106.shtml</a>&gt; Water rights-&gt;Water quality certifications for FERC projects in state. page on McCloud-Pit relicensing letters provides links to CEQA scoping documents, matters related to certification that discuss fish reintroduction- get a good idea of what people are saying.</p>
<p>14. Do you have any questions for me?</p>	<p>No</p>

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Tier:** Secondary

**Category:** Environmental/NGO

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	Reasonably familiar. Yes. Through coalitions
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	As a coalition, highly involved. In terms of the association, involved in flow aspects for anadromous species, maintaining or improving.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 1            Public Outreach – 2            Fish Health and Genetics- 2            Fish Passage Technology – 4            Policy and Regulatory – 5            Pilot Planning – 5</p>
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	<p>Lowest: Habitat – Easy to assess by going out to see it.            Highest: Pilot Planning – Getting everyone to agree on the overall plan is difficult.</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Fish health defer to CalTrout and California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	Fish Passage Technology – 1 Pilot Planning – 2 Habitat – 3 Fish Health and Genetics – 4 Public Outreach – 5 Policy and Regulatory – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Fish Passage Technology – For the public, this might be the most difficult to get agreement and understanding on.
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	That the general public doesn't understand how policy and regulations work. It's inside baseball. Unsure which would change.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	Interviews and public meetings. Agenda topic: ways to partner with different subgroups for outreach meetings get additional ownership from other groups. Create partnerships.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Chris Shuttes, Tribes
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	PG&E FERC Licensing Website
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	Interest in flow conditions, meet multiple resources objectives. Collection facilities and what they will look like, not creating any impediments for biological or recreation.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	I've been tracking it the whole time
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	I will track activities.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 3  Pilot Planning – 3  Habitat – 6  Fish Health and Genetics – 6  Fish Passage Technology – 6  Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest:</p> <p>Outreach – People are very interested and concerned about this, so people will be available.</p> <p>Pilot plan: put fish in a truck and drive around Shasta has been proposed</p> <p>Highest:</p> <p>Regulation – Endangered species will require a new level of regulatory requirements for all timber activities.</p> <p>Genetics – Adequate long term science needs to be dedicated to the subject.</p> <p>Fish passage – Pacific North West situations are different than the Central Valley. Columbia river cannot be compared to the Sacramento river. Reclamation's problem that fish passage technology is going to be huge, hot issue. Who is going to pay for it?</p> <p>Habitat – Is habitat suitable? Will endangered species of Red Band trout be compromised [with the reintroduction of salmon]?</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>They would all sixes because this thing is a huge issue.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Health and Genetics – 1</p> <p>Pilot Planning – 2</p> <p>Habitat – 3</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 4</p> <p>Public Outreach – 5</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	<p>1. Fish health and genetics: What is the viability of species taken from Butte, Mill, Deer, and Battle Creek? Has the habitat been fully restored in the Central Valley to meet the restoration goals in the valley?</p> <p>6. Policy and Regulatory: A long list of other agencies are working on this, making this least important for the Reclamation.</p>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	No.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	<p>1. 1 on 1 meetings with stakeholders.</p> <p>2. Engage outside University peer reviewed input (ie UC Davis), include experts in the field.</p> <p>3. There needs to be more factual information distributed to stakeholders.</p> <p>4. State and all Federal agencies need to be united in their message</p>
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Post on Reclamation website, NMFS/NOAA recovery plan website
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	Consistent message between State/Federal agencies is needed. For example, Reclamation has publically stated that there will be no flow change for this restoration activity. NFMS/NOAA states that there will be a flow re-evaluation.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

*This page left blank intentionally.*

# Private Landowner

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Native American Tribes

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>I was not really aware.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>I see myself as possibly involved; I have discussed fish passage on the Klamath in the past.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 4                      Fish Passage Technology – 5                      Public Outreach – 5                      Pilot Planning – 5                      Fish Health and Genetics – 6                      Habitat – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	Lowest: Policy and Regulatory – <i>No response given.</i>  Highest: Habitat and Fish Health and Genetics – Worried about the difficulty of the fish living in a new environment.
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Possible if they are more informed than I am.
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.  1. Fish Health and Genetics  2. Fish Passage Technology  3. Habitat  4. Pilot Planning  5. Policy and Regulatory  6. Public Outreach	Public Outreach – 1  Fish Passage Technology – 2  Pilot Planning – 3  Policy and Regulatory – 4  Habitat – 5  Fish Health and Genetics – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Public Outreach – You need public approval so getting the word out is most important.
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes, possibly.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	<i>No response provided.</i>
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Bill _____, he attends regional water board meetings for the tribe.
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<i>No response provided.</i>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<i>No response provided.</i>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Landowner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	I read a newspaper article in the last month
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	Possibly, as I have a background in biology.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 2                      Policy and Regulatory – 3                      Fish Passage Technology – 3                      Fish Health and Genetics – 4                      Public Outreach – 6                      Pilot Planning – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	<p>Lowest:</p> <p>Habitat: It's been done many times, ex: Fish bulletin #94 from Dept. Fish and Wildlife</p> <p>Highest:</p> <p>Public Policy – The whole concept is going to be the most difficult to get everything together.</p> <p>Public Outreach – Going to get so many opinions, and hard to get a consensus.</p>
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes, they would change according to their backgrounds.
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Pilot Planning – 1</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 2</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 3</p> <p>Habitat – 4</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 5</p> <p>Public Outreach – 6</p>
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	<p>#1: Pilot Planning – This needs to be dissected and torn apart by the public.</p> <p>#6: Public Outreach – This should be number 1 but you're not going to get everyone to listen.</p>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	I think so.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	More public meetings like the one in Lakehead, hold Mt. Shasta (and McCloud) meeting, Redding Meeting, cover all the locals.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	SweetBriar Camp (Cabin HOA), CalTrout, Sacramento River Preservation Trust, and older/retired DFW biologists.
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<i>No response provided.</i>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	It is a waste of money to do this. When it has been tried it's been particularly successful with hatchery fish, but it has been unsuccessful with wild fish. You need to either remove the dam or build a river around the dam for the salmon to figure it out, a diversion river on a bend of the river to trap the salmon coming downstream.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Tier:** Influencer

**Category:** Native American Tribes

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>I have been very involved; I was part of the law suit that changed the Biological Opinion. I have had limited involvement since Reclamation took over the project, having issues getting in contact with Sue Fry.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>I see myself as highly involved.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Passage Technology – 1            Fish Health and Genetics – 1            Policy and Regulatory – 4            Public Outreach – 6            Pilot Planning – 6            Habitat – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest:</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – I don't want genetics to deter the return of the fish, but we have nothing to compare the genetics of the fish since there are no historical McCloud river fish left. It is unknown if the New Zealand fish are Winter or Spring Run. The fish are still in a state of decline even with all the knowledge we know about them and the New Zealand fish are the only fish that should be used, as they are the historical fish in the area.</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – The technology is already out there just need to put it in place.</p> <p>Highest:</p> <p>Habitat – Habitat restoration is needed, the flows will increase and this will compete with Shasta Dam Raise.</p> <p>Policy and Regulation: If the Yurok or Hoopa Valley tribe took the lead on introducing the fish, how would that affect regulation?</p> <p>Pilot Planning: The fish were tested and it was determined that they are not from McCloud. A question is that the New Zealand fish are not endangered, so how would that affect the project?</p> <p>Public Outreach: California has gone from a salmon state to an agricultural state, the fight is either over water or fish. California needs to be a salmon state, as it has the best estuary options in the whole United States.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>My peers would agree with the answers.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Fish Health and Genetics –1</p> <p>Habitat – 2</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 3</p> <p>Pilot Planning – 4</p> <p>Public Outreach – 5</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>

Question	Response Notes
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Fish Health and Genetics: Regulations should not stop the return of the salmon, you have to figure out which salmon you are going to use first.  #6: <i>No response provided.</i>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	No
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	The best way is by having a plan for the landowners to review and getting the landowners to participate in the regulatory process.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Cow Creek Ranchers Association, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Washington Fisheries Commission.
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Tribal websites
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	You should establish a tribal relations roundtable as the tribes don't just take from the fish, they give back too.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Landowner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	I was not really familiar prior to contact.
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	If needed, I would be able to spread information to the other landowners.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 2                      Policy and Regulatory – 3                      Fish Passage Technology – 3                      Fish Health and Genetics – 3                      Pilot Planning – 5                      Habitat – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	<p>Lowest:</p> <p>Public Outreach: There are lots of tools already out there to get the information out, media, newspapers, etc.</p> <p>Highest: Habitat: How does the addition of salmon affect the habitat of the other fish and aquatic species already in the water?</p>
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes, the issues are very political and everyone has an opinion.
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Public Outreach – 1</p> <p>Habitat – 2</p> <p>Pilot Planning – 4</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 5</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 5</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 6</p>
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	<p>#1: Public Outreach – You need to reach out to the public to see if the project should even go forward, how the community will be involved, or how they will fit it into the program.</p> <p>#6: Fish Health and Genetic – It's all in the science and they will know what to do.</p>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes, the issues are very political and everyone has an opinion.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	The best way to engage is through more public communication of the goals of the project.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	City of Dunsmuir Fish Planning Program
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Cabin Owners Association list serves.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<i>No response provided.</i>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	How does this affect trout fishing, and overall effect on aquatic life in the rivers? There is one quarter of the fish/aquatic life from before the spill, many species have never returned. How does this impact local fisheries and current DFW plans? How does this fit with the dam raise and the twin tunnels? What will happen to water levels/flows?

*This page left blank intentionally.*

# Recreational

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>I received an email from Reclamation PR person a couple weeks ago, I may have gotten one sooner. I started paying attention to the issues once the meeting was coming up.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We are a landowner, so we are interested to see what happens to the land and the water rights and will follow the project closely.</p>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 1            Public Outreach – 2            Pilot Planning – 3            Fish Health and Genetics – 4            Fish Passage Technology – 5            Policy and Regulatory – 6</p>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Habitat – A lot of this work already and surveys have been done for the EIS for Shasta Dam Raise. If those surveys don't go as far up the river as this study site, then this could be a different question.</p> <p>Highest: Policy and Regulatory – It is will be difficult to reintroduce fish into these areas that they haven't been in since Shasta Dam was built. If they are willing to put in a Safe Harbor Act, then this item could go down on the difficulty scale. We will be opposed if it will affect the raising of Shasta Dam.</p>
<p>5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>My peers would score this in a pretty similar way.</p>
<p>6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Policy and Regulatory – 1          Fish Passage Technology – 2          Pilot Planning – 3          Public Outreach – 4          Fish Health and Genetics – 5          Habitat – 6</p>
<p>7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?</p>	<p>#1: Policy and Regulatory – In terms of difficulty, you are going to have a hard time depending on whether these fish will be protected or not.</p> <p>#6: Habitat – This project is not going to need as much public input in terms of habitat, as biologists will be doing the work in the field.</p>
<p>8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?</p>	<p>The high and the low rankings would be the same; the ones in the middle may change.</p>
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emails with links to the project website</li> <li>2. Regularly update project website</li> <li>3. Hold public meetings in an area where there is a concentration of water service providers (maybe in Los Banos)</li> </ol>

Question	Response Notes
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Westlands Water District public affairs, San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority.
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Continue to get emails
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	<i>No response provided</i>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	We have reservations about this, this is a problematic program. The program sounds very expensive, labor intensive, not going to provide any water supply benefits, only detriments.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	No

*This page left blank intentionally.*

**Tier:** Primary

**Category:** Business Landowner

Question	Response Notes
<p>1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar were you with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?</p>	<p>We have been overseeing outside counsel involved in the FERC relicensing of McCloud Dam, including the multi-party flow settlement, as well as tracking the salmon reintroduction issues for the McCloud River Club for several years. We have been engaged in salmon conservation statewide for other philanthropic interests, as well for several years.</p>
<p>2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?</p>	<p>We see the project through the lens of our work in conservation philanthropy and grant making. We see ourselves as involved in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a landowner along the lower stretch of the McCloud River, anything that happens is of concern. There is a particular concern about the fishing conditions.</li> <li>2. We have concerns about salmon conservation both locally and globally</li> </ol>
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 2</p> <p>Fish Health and Genetics – 3</p> <p>Public Outreach – 4</p> <p>Policy and Regulatory – 5</p> <p>Fish Passage Technology – 6</p> <p>Pilot Planning – 6</p>
<p>4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.</p>	<p>Lowest: Habitat – This is routine work that people already have the skills and training to execute. Habitat methodologies that agencies apply to many different watersheds around the country will be used. Whereas, by contrast, a pilot planning study takes a lot more information and there are multiple stakeholder perspectives that you need to synthesize.</p> <p>Highest (2):</p> <p>Fish Passage – Chinook salmon passage is fairly complex; there are real issues with regard to capturing the juveniles. Information from expert Dr. Peter Moyle (UC Davis) has expressed real concern about the viability of trap and haul, his opinion is valid.</p> <p>Pilot Plan – it will be challenging to put together a plan that satisfies the ESA and also will result in meaningful recovery of fish. (To date, no runs of salmon in CA have ever come off of the endangered species list despite many well-intentioned efforts.) It would be better to allocate limited public resources to areas where salmon have the best opportunities to survive and thrive. It will also be challenging to successfully address the concerns of the myriad stakeholders in the region, as these can be at odds with ESA requirements and/or with one another. Pilot project design is about trying to address complex issues as well as adhere to regulation and laws. There is an existing flow settlement as part of McCloud-Pit dam. The flow settlement has already been through multi-year, multi-party process and eventually a set of flows was settled upon. This was difficult enough to get done, changing any aspect of the settlement will be unwelcome.</p>

Question	Response Notes
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	No, I do not think so. Folks in different fields may have different opinion but within peer group the scores would be the same.
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	Pilot Planning – 1 Policy and Regulatory – 2 Fish Passage Technology – 2 Habitat – 4 Fish Health and Genetics – 5 Public Outreach – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	<p>#1: Pilot Planning – For this, it is important to communicate a high level, clear message about pilot planning, communicating clearly what it is trying to do and what it is not doing. Stakeholders in Shasta Region (and above) are very knowledgeable about fish and the proposed reintroduction technology, will want details. People are savvy and well versed, and are aware that there is consensus among experts that trap and haul will not work. A lot of candor around it is important.</p> <p>#6: Public outreach – This is the least important with regards to how the question was framed. People will care that the agencies carry out comprehensive outreach, but will be far less concerned with that than the content of the messages about the pilot project itself.</p>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	They would report the same level of importance.

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

Question	Response Notes
<p>9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For landowners, direct, 1-on-1 communication and outreach is best. It is important to really try to find out specific concerns and questions. In some cases, specific concerns may not actually be affected by the study and best to deal with these early in the process.</li> <li>2. Interagency communication and coordination should be improved. Agency coordination has not been great between agencies, have not been well coordinated in terms of timing and rolling things out together. For example, Shasta Dam may be raised- would this affect the fish passage? FERC relicensing comes out first and then this comes out?</li> <li>3. It is important to communicate with the tribes through early and often through direct 1-on-1 communication.</li> <li>4. Conservation organizations have really good handle on whole issues and could help point to key, important points of contact for these issues. They have a holistic view.</li> </ol>
<p>10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?</p>	<p>Wild Salmon Center          UC Davis fishery biologist          CalTrout          CRMP Members          The Nature Conservancy (preserve on the McCloud River)          Representative from Hearst          PG&amp;E          Trout Unlimited</p>
<p>11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?</p>	<p>Email/electronic communication is good;          Hard copies of documents for some folks as email reception can be limited in the area.</p>
<p>12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?</p>	<p>CalTrout has a regular series of meetings about fish and water issues in the area; this would be a natural fit, depending on the timing.</p>

Question	Response Notes
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="906 226 1446 348">1. There is a concern that the reintroduction study will have a harmful impact on the multi-party settlement on the McCloud-Pit dam (FERC).</li> <li data-bbox="906 365 1446 789">2. From a conservation and public funding perspective, there is a concern is that the trap and haul method is not the best use of public funding for salmon, has never been tested with salmon in the region. There are other projects that are less risky and have clear benefit for salmon, such as the Battle Creek restoration effort .Also, the Salmon Stronghold Initiative that works to ensure that salmon populations that are already in healthy condition stay that way. Limited funding so these conservation projects are better use of public money.</li> <li data-bbox="906 806 1446 898">3. UC Davis fishery biologist has concerns about effectiveness of trap and haul technologies.</li> <li data-bbox="906 915 1446 1037">4. If salmon are still going to be reintroduced, Upper McCloud will provide longer, colder stretches of habitat than the Lower McCloud.</li> </ol>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

**Tier:** Secondary

**Category:** Business Owner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	No, I have just seen emails and have talked to someone at CalTrout about it
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	Unknown at this time.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Pilot Planning – 2          Fish Health and Genetics – 3          Fish Passage Technology – 3          Habitat – 4          Policy and Regulatory – 5          Public Outreach – 5</p>
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	<p>Lowest: Pilot Planning – From previous experience, doing the planning was easy but doing the implementation was harder.</p> <p>Highest: Public Outreach – Based upon past experiences with other projects, little outreach was done.</p>

Question	Response Notes
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes, their scores would change. Which scores would change is unknown; it would be based on their involvement or lack thereof.
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	Fish Health and Genetics – 1 Public Outreach – 2 Fish Passage Technology – 3 Habitat – 4 Policy and Regulatory – 5 Pilot Planning – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#1: Fish Health and Genetics – The program will be replacing the fish already in the targeted areas, in a system that's been intact for several years.  #6: <i>No response provided.</i>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Yes. <i>No response provided.</i>
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	The best way to engage stakeholders/landowners would be to get them all together at the table at once and hear their answers as a group.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	River guides, Springs Rivers, and those involved with recreation.
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	Fall River Conservancy
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	<i>No response provided.</i>
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
 Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
 Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

**Tier:** Secondary

**Category:** Business Owner

Question	Response Notes
1. Prior to my call, to what extent were you familiar with the project? How long have you been tracking the study/When did you first hear of the study?	I hadn't heard of it at all prior to contact
2. How do you see yourself involved in this project?	I will monitor the project.
<p>I'm going to ask two sets questions that are based on six of the key task areas identified for the study. These are the six categories contained in the factsheet I sent to you from Reclamation's website. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	
<p>3. First Question: Each of these tasks is unique and has different degrees of difficulty to research or conduct. This can be due to technical, policy, political or financial perspectives. If you were to place a SCORE of how you personally felt the difficulty of each task was on scale of 1 to 6, with 6 having the highest level of difficulty, what would be your answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fish Health and Genetics</li> <li>2. Fish Passage Technology</li> <li>3. Habitat</li> <li>4. Pilot Planning</li> <li>5. Policy and Regulatory</li> <li>6. Public Outreach</li> </ol>	<p>Habitat – 1          Fish Health and Genetics – 2          Fish Passage Technology – 2          Public Outreach – 2          Pilot Planning – 4          Policy and Regulatory – 5</p>
4. Follow-up: Ask why one was scored the lowest and another the highest.	<p>Lowest: Habitat – Trinity River can be used as the model for this project, Mt. Eddy feeds the Upper Sacramento and Trinity River and the last 5 miles of Upper Sacramento and Trinity look the same.          Highest: Policy and Regulatory – Politics.</p>

Question	Response Notes
5. Do you think the SCORES would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	Absolutely, anyone with a club on the other side of Shasta Lake will oppose this; they aren't going to want the regulations on fishing due to a new species being introduced.
6. Our second question uses the same list of tasks, but we want you to RANK each category – from first place to sixth place – in terms of their communication/engagement/informational importance.  1. Fish Health and Genetics 2. Fish Passage Technology 3. Habitat 4. Pilot Planning 5. Policy and Regulatory 6. Public Outreach	Public Outreach – 1 Pilot Planning – 2 Habitat – 3 Policy and Regulatory – 4 Fish Health and Genetics – 5 Fish Passage Technology – 6
7. Why did you pick your #1 and #6?	#6: Fish Passage Technology – We know technology just have to pick which one we want to use.  #1: <i>No response provided.</i>
8. Do you think these RANKINGS would change among your peer group? If so, which ones and why?	I don't know.
9. What are your thoughts on the three best ways we should engage landowners, agencies and other interest groups in the study?	Outreach staff, landowners, and stakeholders could get together at a campground on the McCloud or Upper Sacramento with recreational games/activities and get on the water and float down the river with the landowners.  There should be more media outreach, for example there could be stories in the paper on the background and important players.  Meet with the McCloud River CRMP.
10. Are there others in your organization, other groups or individuals we should include in our outreach?	Winnemen Wintu and Yurok Tribe
11. How would you like to receive information about this project in the future?	Email
12. Can you suggest any newsletters, websites, forums or other existing communication channels that should receive information about fish reintroduction into the upper watershed?	San Francisco Chronicle outdoor writer

Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation  
Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan  
Attachment C – Shasta Dam Fish Passage Evaluation Interview Transcripts

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response Notes</b>
13. Is there anything else that you'd like us to know?	I hope this project isn't connected to Westlands and getting Shasta Dam raised, as a way for Reclamation to show that some salmon are making it over the dam and the dam raise isn't affecting fish numbers.
14. Do you have any questions for me?	<i>No response provided.</i>