33.12.2 Transcript of Sacramento, California Public Hearing – September 11, 2013
BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Wednesday, September 11, 2013, commencing at the hour of 1:11 p.m., at the Cal Expo Quality Inn & Suites, 1413 Howe Avenue, Sacramento, California, before me, Vicky L. Benson, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, empowered to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant to Section 2093(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, the following proceedings were had:

--ooo--

MS. DENNING: All right. Welcome everybody. Last night, I said, "I'll make this quick to make sure we conserve time for all the people that we had. We had about 150 people at the Redding hearing. But tonight -- or this afternoon, I guess I can wax on for a long time. But instead of boring you, I'll be brief. You know, this hearing is really about what you think and feel about the project. It's not about hearing from us; it's about us hearing from you.

Just as some background again, the Congress authorized studying raising the Shasta Dam in 1980 and in 2004 legislation. We're evaluating three dam heights and multiple reservoir alternatives.

The purpose of this project is to increase the fish survival and also to improve water supply reliability throughout large portions of the state of
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California.

We released the draft feasibility report that documented the -- sort of the physical, environmental, economic and financial feasibility of the project back in February of 2012, and we released the preliminary draft environmental impact statement at that time, too.

And hopefully, that will help with the review of the public draft that we released a couple of months ago. And that's what we're here commenting on today is that public draft EIS.

The final EIS and feasibility report is scheduled to be completed by the end of next year, so just over a year from now.

Ultimately, the decision to be made and document in the record of decision will be a recommendation from the Secretary of the Interior of the Congress as to whether or not to raise Shasta Dam, how high and how to operate it.

That recommendation is our responsibility as Congress gave us the direction to study this project. If the secretary is recommending no action report, there would be a concluding -- no action alternative, we would issue a concluding report at that time.

The secretary may recommend an action alternative. That alternative at this point must be
the alternative with the highest net economic benefits.
We can identify other alternatives.

We may be able to justify another alternative
based in part on what we hear as we review the --
listen to your comments. But it still has to have a
positive economic benefit.

Congress would make the ultimate decision
after reviewing the information that we provide through
the secretary as well as their constituents, you and
other members of the public.

The information gathered during this comment
period is critical for reclamation to develop a good
project, for the secretary and Congress to understand
the impacts and benefits and your perspectives on those
impacts and benefit.

I encourage you to be candid, to be
respectful of my team in carrying out their role, and
to be mindful of the time while making your comments.
And I just wanted to thank you for being here today.

And, Pete, I think we have one commenter.

MR. LUCERO: So, I'm the hearing officer. My
name is Pete Lucero. And we will be opening the
hearing now. We are currently in session. I will be
repeating some of what Michelle said, but I wanted to
go through this particular information.
Welcome to this public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. This hearing is being held in accordance with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

This is the second of three public hearings. We had one last night in Redding. This one, of course, is our second, and we have a third tomorrow in Los Banos.

I’ll be serving as the hearing officer. I’ve got with me Katrina Chow, who is the program manager, project manager for this project and, of course, Michelle Denning, who is the chief planner for the region.

We’re accepting oral or written comments on the DEIS. To provide oral comments, you should have completed a speaker's card, which is this small piece on the bottom of this larger paper you received. Fill out your name, provide it to the front desk, and they’ll bring it up to here so we can call you in order of which you signed up.

And if you want to make a written comment, of course there's several ways to do that. One is the top of this card. You can fill this out here or at home. This is self-addressed here. Just mail it in to us.
Otherwise, you can e-mail your comments, fax your
comments in. All the instructions for that is on this
piece of paper.

You've got till September 30th to provide
comments for the DEIS, so I would encourage you to make
those comments as soon as possible.

So, I'd like to explain what happens next
after this conclusion of this hearing segment of the
process. All the comments will be reviewed and will be
considered. A final Environmental Impact Statement
will be prepared, which will include all comments
received and responses to those comments.

The final EIS and final feasibility report
will be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget
before, being circulated for a 30-day public review
period after which the Secretary of the Interior will
issue a record of decision for, one, a determination of
consistency with the National Environmental Policy Act
and, two, a recommendation to Congress to approve a
preferred alternative or a no action alternative.

The hearing will proceed in this manner.
Speakers will be called to the microphone in the order
which they signed up. And today I have a speaker,
Mr. MacNeil.

Mr. MacNeil, being that we have an hour and
44 minutes left in the day, you have an hour and 43 minutes to make your comment, unless someone else chooses that they would like to come up and make their comment.

So with that, we'll go ahead and call our first speaker. Mr. MacNeil?

MR. MACNEIL: Sure. Being --

MR. LUCERO: If you don't mind, sir, would you please state your full name and your affiliation.

MR. MACNEIL: Sure.

MR. LUCERO: And also spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. MACNEIL: My name is Steve MacNeil.

That's M-a-c-N-e-i-l. And I'm a landowner in Lakehead, California, have a home right on the shoreline.

One of my concerns, and many of my neighbors', is that raising this dam is going to cause a lot of future problems for us. Obviously, we would lose our property.

The discussion of reimbursement, we're very concerned about. From all we've heard thus far, you know, it's some kind of flat line, across-the-board dollar amount per square foot of land, okay, which is -- I understand that perhaps that the Fed's idea that this is how they would do it to consume the land
and reimburse us for the years of heritage of our property.

One of my concerns also is with a lot of the local business owners, that raising the dam from the minimum to the maximum heights are going to wipe out their locations. They’ve talked about either reimbursing them for their losses or perhaps moving marinas up.

Water recreation has been part of our family since I was born, and my dad since he was born, and we believe it’s a great family value getting out together and enjoying nature and being able to share that with others and bringing other people into that environment. It makes for a good solid family household as opposed to sending your kids off somewhere for a summer like that.

That’s just a couple of my concerns. Another one is the future for the landowners and the business owners. How are they going to be reimbursed for the next ten or twenty years of operation?

The lake levels as it has been now -- which to the best of my understanding, it’s only been full 20 percent of the time since the dam’s inception. Okay? Managing the water, I understand it’s important for all of the state.
Now, raising it 10 feet, it would have to be full to make use of those gains. All right? Twenty percent of the time doesn't seem much of a justification, if it's only full 20 percent of the time after this project, especially with the costs. The dam isn't quite paid for yet, to my understanding, from when they built it. It's a long-time process. I understand that. It's a very expensive project.

Okay. I also believe that there are better alternatives. I'm sure you folks are probably looking into them. There are lots of little hills and valleys all the way down the valley where water storage can be done on a smaller basis but on a much greater scale than I think we do it now.

I just think this is being looked at because it's a simple approach perhaps for feasibility to increase water for the gross population, which we have a lot of it in this state.

Personally -- my interest is personal. Maybe it's selfish. But I think there are a lot of people that are going to be affected by this up in the Northern California area, that it will never recover.

Those would -- the management, the recreational areas of the lake and the forest areas, the campsites that will be, you know, gone, I've heard...
nothing about forest clearing for that 18 feet of land.

It's 330 miles of shoreline at full pool.

Okay? At full pool, there's not one spot of Shasta lake you can't enjoy. As a paddle boater, recreational boater, as a swimmer, all of it is accessible.

We have roads, bridges, the railroad has no problem. Anything. It has been for many years. That's all going to change. They've saved seven bridges. A couple of railroad bridges would have to be rebuilt, moved or modified or raised. Okay? Depending on their locations, that means no access to much of the shoreline of the lake. And if the trees aren't cleared and new roads made through those areas, there would still be no access.

You know, it sounds like it's going to be turned into just a huge reservoir where they aren't concerned with the public needs and wants and enjoyment.

I also understand that there's a lot of other federal laws in place. I don't represent the Winnemem Wintu Indians. I'm aware of them and their concerns. But I do care about concerns for Native Americans that have property there and rituals and areas.

And I just want to make sure that all of this gets noted and that the board of the interior realizes...
that we have these concerns, you know, as public and as
a group, as a neighborhood, as a county, as a city, as
a state, and that it's important, and it matters.

And I think all of those need to be made sure
and put into a perspective that they look at and
realize it's not just water. There's more to it.
There are a lot of people and a lot of families that
are going to be affected and for many future
generations.

My dad has property on the water as well. If
he wanted to leave it to me, well, that's not possible
anymore if it's raised. Those fellows with marinas and
cabins right on the lakefront have people year after
year come back and enjoy the area. Unavailable
anymore, let alone their income for next year and the
year after.

It's hard. Especially for a little town like
Lakehead will probably go away. You know, with a
little bit of income for folks that own a little store,
they rely on the 500 people a year that come there to
spend a little for their survival, their way of life.
It may be simple. But what it provides, you know, to
the families that come there is immeasurable.

I just want to make sure that they understand
that there are a lot of people who want to present that
to them and make sure that this isn’t purely an economical status, because there’s more to it than that.

Thank you. I don’t have much more to say.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. MacNeil. Is there anyone else in the room who would like to speak today? Yes, sir. Will you state your name, spell your name and your affiliation?

MR. EVANS: Steve Evans, S-t-e-v-e, S-v-a-n-s, representing Friends of the River here in Sacramento. I spoke last night, so I didn’t sign up. But since there’s plenty of time, I wanted to mention a few things that I ran out of time last night in the Redding area meeting.

First of all, involves the bureau’s environmental analysis in the draft EIS and the presentation of the information from that analysis to the public.

There’s a good example right back here in the room where you have a poster that notes how many acre feet of total additional volume is provided by each proposed raise of the dam: Six feet, twelve feet, eighteen and a half feet.

Those are misleading numbers at best, because we know that if you raise the dam, Shasta Reservoir
will not fill every year. It won't fill most years. So the total additional volume for each version of the dam raise is really misleading.

What we should be presenting to the public at every opportunity is the estimated firm yield, which is the amount of average water that the reservoir enlargement could provide.

And based on my review of the BIS, that's no more than 133,000 acre feet depending on the -- at the maximum reservoir enlargement. That's considerably less water to meet all the needs that you're saying that this project will meet.

Another problem with the analysis is that some of your analytical tools are, at best, crude. And I don't even want to get into detail, but you're using a model to determine impacts on flows called CalSet 2 (phonetic.) And the inadequacies of that model are well known.

For one thing, it at best provides average flows on a monthly basis, which is too crude to really identify the impacts of the flow changes that enlarging the reservoir upstream will have on the downstream flows.

And I've been researching materials and studies on flow impacts on the Sacramento River.
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ririan and aquatic ecosystems. And it seems pretty
clear the scientific consensus is the CalSet 2 flow
model is -- just cannot really estimate the impacts on
that. So that's a major problem.

I also wanted to bring up the issue of
climate change. One of the things that you hear
repeated often is that with global warming and climate
change, we'll be -- California will receive less
precipitation as snow and more precipitation as rain.

And that may be true, although that's based
on models. And models are models. They're not
actually accurate predictions of future events.

But the other part of that assessment is that
overall, the climate will be dryer. That means that we
actually won't be receiving likely more rain. And
therefore, it decreases the -- or makes it clear that
the cost effectiveness of building more storage will be
reduced.

In other words, we're proposing to build a
lot of very expensive projects -- well, not a lot, but
some very expensive projects for what could be very
little additional water.

This project is now, Christ, pretty close to
over a billion dollars. It likely will be more than
that. And at a maximum firm yield of 133,000 acre
And as Tom Stokely from the Water Impact Network brought up last night, even if we accept the bureau's estimates of the number of salmon young that will -- the survival that will be increased from the dam raise by providing cold water, the actual returns of those salmon young as adults are so infinitesimal, are so little that we're talking about thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars for the return of one adult salmon.

So I think a lot of the reasoning behind this project needs to be reexamined. And we'll be submitting detailed comments by the deadline. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Evans. Are there any other ones who would like to speak?

Hearing no, we will go into recess and reconvene if someone decides they would like to speak.

Thank you.

--000--
Responses to Comments from Steve Evans on Behalf of Friends of the River

FOTR4-1: Comment noted.

FOTR4-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”
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**FOTR4-3:** Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

**FOTR4-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-4, “Best Available Information,” and Master Comment Response DSFISH-2, “Other Fisheries Models and Tools.”

**FOTR4-5:** As described in the Climate Change modeling appendix, the central tendency projection for the watershed above Shasta Reservoir is for slightly increased precipitation during the 21st century. To account for the uncertainty in future precipitation, the EIS used a wide range of both wetter and drier climates to evaluate the sensitivity of enlarged Shasta to climate changes. With regard to the effects of climate change on net economic benefits from both urban and agricultural economic activities, an enlarged Shasta results in positive net economic benefits compared to the existing reservoir and these benefits tend to be larger under drier climates (see figures 3-142 through 3-145 in the Climate Change Modeling appendix). However, it is important to remember the sensitivity analysis does not address the “cost effectiveness” of an enlarged Shasta. That assessment requires more detailed analyses and methods not used in the Climate Change Modeling appendix. Please refer to Master Comment Response CC-1, “Climate Change Uncertainty and Related Evaluations,” and Master Comment Response GEN-4, “Best Available Information.”

**FOTR4-6:** Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest,” and Master Comment Response COST/BEN-3, “Increased Water Supply Reliability under Action Alternatives.”

**FOTR4-7:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**FOTR4-8:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**FOTR4-9:** Comment noted.

*Responses to Comments from Steve MacNeil on Behalf of Self*

**MACNEIL-1:** Comment noted.

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

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

**MACNEIL-4:** Comment noted.
MACNEIL-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”


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

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

MACNEIL-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-11, “Inundation Zone/Reservoir Buffer.”

MACNEIL-11: A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

MACNEIL-12: Please refer to Master Comment Response RBR-2, “Reduced Public Access Around Shasta Lake.”

MACNEIL-13: Thank you for your comment on the DEIS for the SLWRI, we appreciate your time in responding to the document. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

MACNEIL-14: Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” identifies impacts from inundation of Traditional Cultural Properties and Sacred Land Filings, which include Winnemem Wintu places of traditional, ceremonial, and sacred uses. See “Impact Culture-2” in Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” Section 14.3.4, “Mitigation Measures,” for
“CP1,” “CP2,” “CP3,” “CP4,” and “CP5,” are identified as significant and unavoidable, with no feasible mitigation identified.

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

MACNEIL-15: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MACNEIL-16: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MACNEIL-17: As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” inundated recreation facilities and associated utilities would be relocated before demolition to the extent practicable. Section 2.3.8 also states that scheduling and sequencing of recreation facility relocation or modification construction activities will strive to minimize or avoid interruption of public access to recreation sites.

MACNEIL-18: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

MACNEIL-19: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
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APPEARANCES

STAFF:
Ms. Michelle Denning, Regional Planning Officer
Mr. Brian Person, Manager of the Northern California Area Office, Manager at Shasta Dam
Ms. Katrina Chow, Project Manager
Mr. Pete Lucero, Public Affairs Officer, Mid-Pacific Region
Mr. Louise Moore, Public Affairs Specialist
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2013, LOS BANOS, CALIFORNIA
6:41 P.M.

MS. DENNING: Good evening, I am Michelle Denning, the Reclamation Regional Planning and Hearing Officer. The hearing is now open.

Does anyone wish to make any comments for the record? No one wishes to make a comment, so we'll recess the hearing. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MS. DENNING: The hearing is adjourned.

(Hearing adjourned at 8:01 p.m.)
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33.13 Comments Submitted After the Comment Period and Responses

This section contains copies of comment letters (and any attachments) from comment letters submitted after September 30, 2014, listed in Table 33.13-1. As noted previously, each comment in the comment letters was assigned a number, in sequential order (note that some letters may have more than one comment). The numbers were then combined with an abbreviation for the local agency (example: KAMP-1).

Responses to the comments follow the comment letters, and are also numbered, corresponding to the numbers assigned in the letters. The letters and associated responses are sorted alphabetically by abbreviation and appear in the section in that order.

Table 33.13-1. Individuals Providing Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement After the Comment Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPO</td>
<td>Caporale, John</td>
<td>Caporale, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>Esselen Tribe of Monterey County</td>
<td>Brennan, John Polomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORN</td>
<td>Horne, Adele</td>
<td>Horne, Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMP</td>
<td>Kampa, Richard</td>
<td>Kampa, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVE</td>
<td>Silvers, Dean</td>
<td>Silvers, Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33.13.1  John Caporale

From: John Caporale <jcaporale@gmail.com>
Date: July 4, 2014 at 1:12:34 PM PDT
To: <kchow@usbr.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Shasta Dam Raise

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

Dear Ms. Chow,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposal to raise the height of Shasta Dam by 6.5-10.5 feet.

Although the USBR draft feasibility study found such an undertaking would be "technically and environmentally feasible," as well as "economically justified," this project could require more than $1 billion in taxpayer funds and there is significant evidence that runs contrary to your findings.

Furthermore, these large projects rarely meet budget projections often running to massive cost overruns.

My main concern is that raising Shasta Dam would provide a small benefit at a great cost.

Briefly put, raising Shasta Dam would provide a small benefit at a great cost.

If plans are approved to raise Shasta Dam by 18.5 feet, which USBR found to be the most economical option, statewide water storage capacity would expand by only 1.5%. The creation of 76,000 acre-feet of firm yield would add less than 0.2% of agricultural and urban water use per year in California.
Dams don’t create water – they merely capture rain and snow melt – and the firm yield reliably produced on an annual basis depends on annual rainfall. The dam has only reached full capacity about 12 times since its creation. The hypothetical firm yield of water produced from the 6.5-foot raise ranges from 20,000 to 72,000 acre-feet. The hypothetical firm yield of the 18.5-foot raise is 71,000-148,000 acre-feet. In comparison, if farmers producing low-value alfalfa were to conserve a mere five percent of the water they consume, it would save nearly one million-acre feet of water. Conservation is a much better alternative.

Another stated objective of raising the dam is to “increase survival of anadromous fish populations in the upper Sacramento River.” Ironically, Shasta Dam prevents Chinook salmon from reaching the cold-water streams where these fish naturally breed. Funds would be better spent building a fish ladder around Shasta Dam.

An analysis conducted by Golden Gate Salmon Association and the Natural Resources Defense Council found that the target salmon population put forth by state and federal government is only at 20% of historic populations. Why not invest instead in salmon restoration, an alternative which would provide a better long-term solution without exacerbating the problem it purports to solve?

Beyond the negative economic and ecological effects of raising Shasta Dam, please also consider the cultural damage a higher dam would inflict.

The Winnemem Wintu Tribe, the same people who lost much of their traditional homeland and many historic, cultural and sacred sites when Shasta Dam was built in the 1930’s and 40’s, would see an additional 39 sacred sites flooded, including Puberty Rock, a major ceremonial initiation site. A crucial aspect of the tribe’s ability to practice their culture and religion would be lost.

Raising Shasta Dam also violates the McCloud River’s designation as a federal Wild & Scenic River. So, not only would many Winnemem sacred sites be flooded and a Wild and Scenic River compromised, a variety of small businesses and families would be displaced.
Response to Comments from John Caporale


CAPO-2: The SLWRI DEIS does not include evaluations related to economic feasibility because it is not required under NEPA. Accordingly, the DEIS does not identify a “most economical” alternative. As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-2, “Comments Related to the SLWRI Feasibility Report,” evaluations related to economic feasibility were included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report.


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

CAPO -6: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses,” and Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

CAPO -7: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

CAPO -8: Please refer to Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

33.13.2 John Polomo Brennan on Behalf of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County

From: John Brennan <jb96094@gmail.com>
Date: November 14, 2013 8:54:47 AM PST
To: <sbry@usbr.gov>, <comments@usbr.gov>, The River Exchange <mail@riverexchange.org>, <winneemewintutribe@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments on raising Shasta dam from the Esselen Tribal Engineer

Attached please find subject comments.

ESSE-1
The Esselen People stand opposed to this project based on the unmitigatable adverse impacts to Native American Cultural Resources protected under NEPA section 106.

John Polomo Brennan

Choose a life fully lived, walk close to the edges, take risks, follow your bliss. There are no mistakes, only lessons. Remember and apply them.

ESSE-2
Please change my email address to jb96094@gmail.com
Mr. Katrina Chow  
Project Manager  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Planning Division  
2800 Cottage Way  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1893  

Comments from the Esselen Tribal Engineer re the DEIS for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation  

Dear Ms. Chow:  

ESSE-3: The current reservoir behind Shasta Dam impinges on sacred Native American Cultural Resources by drowning them and preventing access to them for ceremonial purposes.  

ESSE-4: The proposed project not only continues the above travesty, but will severely impact current accessible Native American Cultural Resources which are protected under NEPA section 106. [The proposed mitigation measures cannot in any way compensate for the loss of these sacred sites which are used to this day by our cultural brothers in the Winnemem Wintu Tribe and other California Tribes.  

ESSE-5: It may be difficult for non-native people to comprehend the value we place on our cultural resources. Please bear in mind that our Peoples have been in this region for over 6,000 years. Over those millennia we have developed deep personal relationships with the lands which sustained us and which we call home.  

ESSE-6: To flood these sacred lands and to offer the pitifully inadequate mitigations is akin to flooding the Sistine Chapel, or the Dome of the Rock, or the Wailing Wall, and offering free scuba lessons and equipment to Christian Catholics, Muslims and Jews so they can visit their sacred sites.  

ESSE-7: The loss of access to these sites created by the proposed project is not mitigatable. It, in fact, is another subtle form of cultural genocide. The People of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County stand opposed to the losses of Native American Cultural Resources and therefore stand opposed to the proposed project.  

Sincerely,  

John Brennan, PE  
Tribal Engineer  
Esselen Tribe of Monterey County  

JPB/Es  

Cc: Celeen Sisk Franco  

Response to Comments from John Polomo Brennan on Behalf of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County  

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

ESSE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response MAILINGLIST-1, “Addition to the Mailing List.”  

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

ESSE-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-11, “Cultural Resources and NEPA.”

ESSE-6: Thank you for sharing your history. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process.

ESSE-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-11, “Cultural Resources and NEPA.”

ESSE-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”
33.13.3 Horne, Adele

From: Adele Horne <adelehorne@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 31, 2014 at 11:47 AM
Subject: Please don't raise the Shasta dam
To: kchow@usbr.gov

Dear Ms. Chow:

I am writing to urge you to stop plans to raise the Shasta dam, because of the destruction this would cause of natural sites that are sacred to the Winnemem Wintu people. I believe that in this era of grave peril to our shared inheritance, the natural world, one of our best hopes for survival as a society is to learn from the rootedness of indigenous peoples to the land they and their ancestors have inhabited. We need to learn to become careful stewards of the land, to try to rectify the environmental destruction we have caused. If we contribute to the destruction of Winnemem Wintu culture by destroying their access to sacred cultural sites, all of us will have lost a cultural heritage that has the potential to point the way to a more balanced and harmonious relationship with nature. We cannot afford to do this. For the sake of today’s children and future generations, please do not raise the Shasta dam.

Sincerely,

Adele Horne

2276 Fair Oak View Terrace

Los Angeles, CA 90039

Response to Comments from Adele Horne

Response to Comments from Richard Kampa

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

Dear Ms. Chow,

I write to you as someone who has great respect for the Winnemem Wintu, who have lived along the McCloud River for thousands of years. Since 1969, I have been reading about these people and their struggles. The McCloud River is a place that I have hiked along and also appreciated. Therefore, I am strongly against the raising of the Shasta Dam, knowing of the destruction that it would cause to the Winnemem’s cultural heritage, sacred spots and healing sites. There is also the enormous damage that it would do to the larger habitat. SILVE-1

I am sure that you’re aware of The “New York Times” article of May 7, 2014 (‘Tear Down “Deadbeat” Dams). While many would argue that Shasta is not yet a “deadbeat dam,” its construction and continued existence has certainly has been destructive to the historic McCloud River salmon runs and to the Winnemem Wintu culture. SILVE-2

Therefore, it would seem that the least that could be done to help both the salmon and the Winnemem Wintu would be to STOP the raising of the Shasta dam, install fish ladders, and then bring back the genetic descendants of McCloud River salmon (from the Rakaia River of New Zealand’s South Island, where they were transported in the early 1900s). SILVE-3

Thank you,

Dean A. Silvers

Response to Comments from Dean Silvers


SILVE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam,” and Master Comment Response CR-8, “Native American Connection to Salmon.”
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33.15 Acronyms and Abbreviations

2008 Long-Term Operation BA  Reclamation 2008 Biological Assessment on the Continued Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP
2008 USFWS BO  USFWS 2008 Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on the Proposed Coordinated Operations of the CVP and SWP
2009 NFMS BO  NMFS 2009 Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion on the Long-Term Operations of the CVP and SWP

ABA  Architectural Barriers Act
ADA  Americans with Disabilities Act
ANN  Artificial Neural Network
ARB  Air Resources Board
ARFP  Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan
ARPA  Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
BDCP  Bay Delta Conservation Plan
BIA  U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM  U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
BMP  best management practice
BO  Biological Opinion
Cal/EMA  California Emergency Management Agency
CALFED  CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Cal Fire  California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans  California Department of Transportation
CCR  California Code of Regulations
CDFW  California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQ  Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA  California Environmental Quality Act
CFR  Code of Federal Regulations
cfs  cubic feet per second
CMS  comprehensive mitigation strategy
CNEL  community noise equivalent level
COA  Coordinated Operations Agreement
COS  carry-over storage
CP Comprehensive Plan
CRMP coordinated resource management plan
CVHJV Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture
CVP Central Valley Project
CVPIA Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CWA Federal Clean Water Act
dB decibel
dBA A-weighted decibel
DEC Design, Estimating, and Construction
DEIR Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Delta Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DWR California Department of Water Resources
EIR environmental impact report
EIS environmental impact statement
EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA Federal Endangered Species Act
ESU Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FAC Reclamation Manual, Directives and Standards, Project Planning and Facility Operations, Maintenance, and Rehabilitation
FHA Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise
GCM global climate models
GHG greenhouse gas
GIS geographic information system
IAH International Hydropower Association
IL4 Incremental Level 4
IMPLAN IMpact analysis for PLANning
IOS Interactive Object-oriented Salmon
IRA Inventoried Roadless Area
L_{da} day-night noise level
L_{eq} equivalent noise level
L_x statistical descriptor
L2 Level 2
LEDPA Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
LRMP Land and Resource Management Plan
M&I municipal and industrial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>million acre-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Master Comment Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT CO2e</td>
<td>metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>megawatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph</td>
<td>miles per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVD</td>
<td>North American Vertical Datum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS</td>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Notice of Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NODOS</td>
<td>North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA</td>
<td>National Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>National Rivers Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAN</td>
<td>Oncorhynchus Bayesian Analysis model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFA</td>
<td>Office of Federal acknowledgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHV</td>
<td>Off-Highway Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORV</td>
<td>outstandingly remarkable value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>Office of Valuation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G</td>
<td>Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBPP</td>
<td>Red Bluff Pumping Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Renewable Electricity Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Record of Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Reasonable and Prudent Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Renewables Portfolio Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWSP</td>
<td>Refuge Water Supply Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacEFT</td>
<td>Sacramento River Ecological Flows Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSO</td>
<td>Shasta County Sheriff’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>single-event (impulsive) noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLWRI</td>
<td>Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTTG</td>
<td>Sacramento River Temperature Task Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRWQM</td>
<td>Sacramento River Water Quality Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STNF</td>
<td>Shasta-Trinity National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAP</td>
<td>Statewide Agricultural Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>State Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>temperature control device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Act</td>
<td>Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United State Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQMT</td>
<td>Water Operations Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>