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Table 33.12-1. Individuals Providing Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement During Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments Provided on Behalf of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROW</td>
<td>Brown, Curtis</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURG</td>
<td>Burgin, Greg</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS2</td>
<td>Cassano, Eric</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWIN</td>
<td>Stokely, Tom</td>
<td>California Water Impact Network and California Environmental Water Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVI</td>
<td>Davison, Matt</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMART2</td>
<td>Martinez, David</td>
<td>Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARR</td>
<td>Farr, Larry</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Shasta Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOTR3</td>
<td>Evans, Steve</td>
<td>Friends of the River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN</td>
<td>France, Jeanne</td>
<td>Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARD</td>
<td>Gardener, Nick</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARR</td>
<td>Harral, Jerry</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLT</td>
<td>Holt, Buford</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOP</td>
<td>Franklin, Robert</td>
<td>Hoopa Valley Tribe (senior hydrologist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORK</td>
<td>Horkey, Sue</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comments Provided on Behalf of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOPL1</td>
<td>Joplin, Catherine</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAV</td>
<td>Kravitz, Kenwa</td>
<td>Winnemem Wintu Cultural Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAV</td>
<td>Leavitt, Colleen</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIG</td>
<td>Leigh, Craig</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALO</td>
<td>Malone, Linda</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARE</td>
<td>Marek, Ed</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCNEI</td>
<td>McNeil, Walt</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUND</td>
<td>Mundt, David</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>Preston, Michael</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE</td>
<td>Rider, Rex</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHAP</td>
<td>Schappell, Bill</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR2</td>
<td>Jones, Harold</td>
<td>Sugarloaf Cottages Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEL2</td>
<td>Seely, Geenie</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISK</td>
<td>Sisk, Caleen</td>
<td>Chief of Winnemem Wintu Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLBOA2</td>
<td>Doyle, Matt</td>
<td>Shasta Lake Business Owners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR2</td>
<td>Harkradr, Anna</td>
<td>Read by Michael Tichera from Shasta Marina Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE</td>
<td>Wade, Russ</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATK</td>
<td>Watkins, Greg</td>
<td>Councilman of the City of Shasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILL2</td>
<td>Williams, Peggy</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013, REDDING, CALIFORNIA

6:18 P.M.

--OOO--

MR. LUCERO: Thank you Michelle. You may hear a repeat of some of the stuff that Michelle just said. I apologize for that. We're going to go on the record now, and this hearing is now in session.

Hello and 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 the requirements of the National Environment Policy Act. Tonight, we are holding the first of three public hearings. Additional hearings will be held in Sacramento on Wednesday, September 11th, and Los Banos on Thursday, September 12th.

Again, my name the Pete Lucero. I am the regional public affairs officer and the hearing officer for this hearing. At the table with me is, of course, Ms. Denning. We have Mr. Person who is the area manager for the Northern California area office, and Katrina Chow who is our project manager for this project. Also with us today is Allen Rose who will be taking the notes and recording every word that's being said at this hearing today, so mind yourself.

Today we're accepting oral and written comments...
on the Draft Environment Impact Statement. To provide oral comments, you should have completed one of these cards and turned it in to Mary in the back. This bottom piece of this card is what you would turn in to make a comment tonight orally. The top of this card can be used for written comments. I'd also advise you that even though tonight is a night where you can present written comments, we have other ways to present those comments as well through email, fax, or by letter, and that information is on the comment card.

So I want to take a moment just to explain what happens next. After the conclusion of the 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 the 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 Interior will issue a recommended decision for one: A determination of consistency with the National Environmental Policy Act; and two, a recommendation to Congress to approve the preferred alternative or no action.

The hearing will proceed in this manner.
speakers will be called to the microphone in the order
they showed up -- or signed up, excuse me. If I call your
name and you aren't present, you'll moved to the end of
the speakers list. Since we have about 30 people signed
up to comment, about an hour and a half in this hearing,
we're going to give everyone about three minutes to make
their comments. If you have extensive comments, please
summarize them orally and submit the rest in writing.
When it's your turn, please clearly state your name and
affiliation, and spell your first and last names. You
will see there's a microphone in front for you to do that.
Please speak clearly so your comments can be
captured accurately. Time will be kept, and you'll be
alerted when your three minutes are up. If you look at
the board over there, we have a timer. You'll see the
green, yellow, and eventually the red light come on. When
the red light comes on, unfortunately your time is you up.
Before we begin taking public comment, I'd like
to acknowledge any elected officials in the room. And I
have a list here:
Brenda Haynes from Congressman Doug LaMalfa's
office is here. Thank you, Brenda, for showing up.
From the County of Shasta, we have Les Baugh.
Thank you, Les. And we have Supervisor Bill Schappell.
Thank you, Bill.
From the City of Shasta Lake, we have Mayor Larry Farr. Thank you, Mayor, for coming.

City Council of Shasta Lake, we have Greg Watkins. Greg, thank you very much for showing up.

And the Tribal Chief of the Winnemem Wintu, Caleen Sisk. Thank you very much.

If I've missed anyone who's an elected official please raise your hand to be acknowledged. Yes, sir?

MR. BURGIN: Vice Chair of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe in Northern California here representing my people.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, and your name, sir?

MR. BURGIN: Greg Burgin, Junior.

MR. WATKINS: May I also introduce Pam Morgan, City Council, City of Shasta Lake.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, appreciate that, Pam.

So for the remainder of hearing, we'll start taking public comment, and I'm going to begin with federal, state, and local elected officials. And first up -- well, standby.

We will proceed in the order of speakers as I mentioned before, and if you wish to provide comments and have not submitted a speaker card, please, again, go see Mary in the back. With that we're ready to start, and
what I'll do is invite the elected officials up first, and then after that I will invite two to three people to get in queue to make their public comment for the rest of the meeting.

So first you up will be Mr. Schappell.

MR. SCHAPPELL: Good evening, everybody. My name is Bill Schappell. I represent District 4.

I am going to be kind of brief. I was an owner/operator of a resort on Shasta Lake for 25 years, so obviously my concern is in that area. My area of concern is what is going to happen with the businesses on Shasta Lake, and what is going to happen to the community itself of Lakehead.

For myself, I don't -- I see it as being dismal, okay. I think that there's a lot of things that need to be addressed. The EIS is one of them, but from an economic standpoint the mitigation of the business loss needs to be addressed, and the mitigation of how we're going to reform this lake as it gets higher on the ramps. Currently, Shasta Lake has inadequate ramps when the lake goes down past, say, 100 feet, 75, 100 feet. But if we're going to talk about high pull downs, you're going to have ramps that are going to run down about 200 feet. We have inadequate traffic and roads and everything to get in there.
The economic losses also to Shasta County because of the interruption of the businesses and how they are going to be located. I am worried about Lakehead as a community as a whole. I don’t see that people are going to build bridges going across Doney Creek and Charlie Creek. Those expenses of cutting roads into those houses that are going to be there, I think, are going to be absorbed. It’s going to be cheaper to buy the properties out on the other side.

They have four sites that they considered in this. Two of them are sites in Shasta. The other two I’d like to see some flowcharts from the Bureau of Reclamation. I have not been able to get them yet on expenses, how the water storage would be. In other words, the performance of the raising the dam, of any dam, base it on the yield factor, how many years we’re going to have that yield factor, and what the costs are going to be. I’d like to see those figures that are being presented with Sites and also Shasta.

I’m going to bring up an old one, and I don’t even know the possibility of it. Auburn got stopped years ago in the ’60s, and Auburn was an excellent location. I am not sure exactly what happened. One of the things I did hear was it was on an earthquake fault, but almost everything we’ve got in California is on an earthquake
fault. So I'd like to see a road address of that and the yield of that. And if it's a possibility from an engineering standpoint, go back and address the Auburn site.

I think that the revenues lost to Shasta County and also Lakeshore area, all those need to be mitigated factors, and it's not currently for the businesses, okay. They need to be mitigated factors for the people that have those businesses, that operated them for years, that put their heart, backbones, sweat, and tears into these businesses. It's not easy up there, okay. And for them to have to walk away is going to be an economic loss and emotional loss for everybody.

So what I am asking for the bureau tonight is that let's consider the four sites that we have that you guys considered originally, possibly Auburn dam, with the yield factors of the water we're going to get for the money we're spending. And also what we're going to be able to achieve. How many years are we going to get that water? How many years are we going to get in the 18.5 feet. Is it going to be 5 out of 10, 3 out of 10? The benefits, so that percentage of benefit --

Thank you very much. I'm done.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, Supervisor Schappell. Next up is Mayor Farr.
MR. FARR: Since you put this back in this position, I assume you want it left in that position, so I shall leave it that position.

My name is Larry Farr, F-A-R-R, and I have the honor of currently serving as the Mayor of the City of Shasta Lake.

The City of Shasta Lake thanks the Bureau of Reclamation for opportunity provide oral comments to draft EIS for the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. We will also be providing more detailed questions and comments in a letter in the next few weeks.

The City of Shasta Lake is located immediately south and east of the Shasta Dam complex and is literally and figuratively the gateway to the dam. Shasta Dam Boulevard, also known as SR 151, is the main access roadway from Interstate Highway 5 to the dam and serves as a main thoroughfare through downtown Shasta Lake. The north-south access to the facility is Lake Boulevard. The roadways intersect at the western edge of the city and form a loop to the dam complex and the Centimudi boat ramp and back.

The City of Shasta Lake exists largely because of the construction of the dam. It's predecessor organizations, the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District and the Summit City Public Utility District, were created
The city shares a symbiotic relationship with the dam because of these connections. The city's raw water supply is drawn through face of the dam outside of the left and front with intakes at 950- and 750-foot levels. The water is pumped to the city's water treatment plant above the dam to the east, and in turn, the city supplies treated water to the Bureau of Reclamation at the Shasta Dam complex. Because of its proximity to the dam, the configuration of the existing roadways and interrelationship of water and power services, and city is extremely concerned about the overall impact this massive construction project will have on the city and its citizens.

By nearly every measure currently in place in the state of California, the City of Shasta Lake is considered a disadvantaged community. The median income of the city is less than 65 percent of the threshold of the designation of a disadvantaged community. The City of Shasta Lake has serious concerns regarding the socioeconomic impacts of the project, particularly with respect to the impact of tourism and recreational use activities. The project proposed will shut down the dam to tourism for the duration of the project. Additionally,
Centimudi boat ramp will be impacted and will need to be reconstructed to accommodate the additional impound.

Currently, thousands of visitors annually visit the dam to take -- excuse me, contribute to tourism and utilize the boat ramp and docking facilities at Centimudi and Digger Bay. So sanctioning of the tourism and closures of the boat ramp will result in lost revenue to the local stores, service stations, and supermarkets. The majority of this economic disruption will be borne by the City of Shasta Lake.

It is our belief that the City of Shasta Lake will bear a disproportionate share of the negative impacts associated with reduced air quality, increased traffic flow, and degradation of streets and roadways.

Consequently, the city will be reaching out to the bureau at an appropriate time in the future to discuss possible mitigation measures to offset these disproportionate impacts.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide oral comments.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Greg Watkins, please.

At the last meeting we heard quite about the 29 homes that would be inundated, and we had one business owner who stood up and said, "You're going to just buy me out from my business." And the bureau said the only thing we can do is buy the property from you. And I think that the bureau needs to really address the people that currently have private residences and private businesses.

And since the bureau has no ability other than paying money, you need to say in the -- in the NEPA document, that we are asking Congress to come up with a special act that says we will -- to the best of our ability, we will find Forest Service land or government land that will make those homes and those businesses whole at an elevation 18 feet higher. And it will take an act of Congress, and you just need to right up front say we will do everything we can to repay all the private businesses in tourism around the lake.

The second thing I noticed at the meeting last week, or the last time you had the meeting, probably nine to one people were against raising the dam. And that kind of surprised me. But at the same time, I would contend that most of the people in the Redding area, once the dam was raised 18 feet, they'd never know the water level was 18 feet higher or not.

But I think what we should be asking for, the
people here should be looking at the tourism. We should be asking the bureau that 600,000 acre-feet that you're going to impound with this additional level, how is it going to be managed? Right now there's a lot of talk, well, we're going to increase the cold water pool; we're going to make more salmon come up the river. What we ought to be asking as local citizens, let's take that 600,000 acre-feet and keep it for recreation until after Labor Day. Then it will benefit our area, and then you can send the water down.

There's a lot of talk about the cold water pool, and there's a lot of debate whether there is any scientific basis behind that. We do know that a federal judge mandated it, but we don't know if it's sound science. And I think that we should not be cowtailing to the fish and to cold water assuming they can make it to Rod Bluff or wherever it is. We ought to be looking at recreation on Shasta Lake, and we ought to be seeing what we can do to improve it.

And one of the other things we're looking at is 100,000 cubic yards of rock is going to have to come through the City of Shasta Lake. That's a lot of rock on those main highways there, and I think the bureau should be looking at an offsite source, maybe on the lake that could be barged to the dam. There's no reason that all
that rock and all that aggregate has to be hauled by
trucks through the City of Shasta Lake.

So we'd like the bureau to look at the ways that
they can minimize the impact during construction and at
the same time increase the benefit to tourism with the
additional water that you would store. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Watkins.

Chief Sisk.

MS. SISK: I am Chief Sisk of the Winnemem Wintu
Tribe. My name is Caleen, C-A-L-E-N, last name is
S-I-S-K, Sisk.

The comments for us starts back in 1941, 1937,
when Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
and later the Bureau of Land Management somehow, through
an act of Congress, got all of our land away from us and
never gave nothing back through this special act.

promised to moved or cemeteries to a land to be held in
trust for us forever for free, and somehow that land ended
up with the Bureau of Land Management who says they don't
hold land for Indian people and they don't hold
cemeteries.

So we're still dealing with the effects of the
beginnings of Shasta Dam and Shasta Lake project. And we
now find that we are unrecognized, and you tell us we're
unrecognized. And somehow, I feel like you're responsible
SISK-2
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for us being unrecognized because your never carried out
the act of Congress. The land was never set up for --
like land to live on was never given. No arm was provided
to reestablish our villages, our places, or homes. The
cemetery that was moved did not end up in trust for
Indians. It's in government trust, but it's not for us.
So every time we bury somebody there, we are going against
the policies of the Bureau of Land Management because they
don't allow burials.
So there's a lot of confusion and a lot of chaos
that's happening because of this lake, and now I am
wondering, 18 and a half feet higher, there are more
burials that will have to be moved. So do we trust you?
Where will you put them? Will there be another place
that's given and not really given?

There are many things of justice that have to
happen to the Winnemem Wintu people. There were 26
cemeteries that were moved, and now they are in BLM's land
holdings. And we're kind of wondering, where is the BIA
this time. They were sitting with you guys in 1937,
1938. They actually helped pass the law, 1941. And now
the BIA has, like, dropped the ball because now they say
we are unrecognized.
The other concern that I have is the fish. You
say that the raise in Shasta Dam is for fish restoration.
Yet in the plan, there is no plans for fish passage to get the fish passed the Shasta Dam. All you’re talking about is more cold water down the Sacramento. That has already proven to fail fish. They need access to the high mountain waters, and to get by them, this plan needs to address that. If it’s really for fish, then because there’s already a biological opinion in the mandate to get the fish above this dam, you’re going to raise it higher with no plans to get them around. And the same for the water that’s coming down the McCloud. The dam there, there’s no plans for fish passage past that dam.

The other issues that I have are the dikes. You know, where we live now is above the dam, but if you raise the dam, then there will be dikes placed around different parts of the lake.

The tribal water rights have never been adjudicated, and it’s time that we kind of sit down and do that because there needs to be a benefit coming back to the tribes for the lands that were taken, because at this point in time they have been stolen.

MR. LUCERO: Excuse me, Chief Sisk, your time is up. You can submit those --

MS. SISK: Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much. Are there any other elected officials that would like to speak?
Now, I am going to start calling the public, and we would ask that the first three stand in queue. Our first speaker is Rex Rider. Following Rex will be Steve Evans, and following Steve will be Craig Fowler Leigh.

Please remember to speak clearly, state your name, and spell your name. Thank you very much.

MR. RIDER: My name is Rex, R-E-X, Rider, R-I-D-E-R.

We have a cabin up on Shasta Lake, Camel Creek, Lot Number 5. My dad bought this cabin in 1963, so we’ve been up there for 50 years. Our cabin happens to be one of the lower cabins closer to the water. And even if it comes six and a half feet, 10 and a half probably puts it about deck level. So we would be inundated with water.

It doesn’t sound like much compared to some of the other people, but think of it as a family compound, someplace your family goes every summer. And you can’t believe how fun it’s up there. We’ve listened to Merle Haggard put us to sleep at night up there. We have had my dad pulled out in a helicopter. We have had a trolley roll down the hill. We sit on the dock -- on the dock, excuse me. We play Rummikub. We enjoy each other’s company. It’s a family bonding event.

Now, I’m 62, and my kids have enjoyed and learned from us as I learned from my dad. And now their kids, my
nephews and nieces and their kids, are enjoying it. And
we have another generation. You know, my granddaughter,
Lydia. I got a niece coming. I have more family that
wants to come up and do the same things we did. And you
just can't beat it. You're up on Shasta Lake. You've got
your cabin. You're on the dock. It's unbelievable.

We're not going to have a lot of say in this
because basically Southern California needs water, and
it's generated in Northern California. What we expect
from the BLM would be if -- if our compound, our cabin, is
inundated with water, what we'd like is to have a cabin
moved up to an elevation that's appropriate so we can
enjoy it, or we expect to be bought out. And, you know,
we expect you guys to be generous. I don't think we need
to be run over on this thing. This is family history to
us, and we expect the best out of you people.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: My name is Steve Evans, S-T-E-V-E
E-V-A-N-S. I'm representing Friends of the River, which
is a statewide river conservation group based out of
Sacramento.

I have spent the last 30 years working to protect
the natural resources of the Sacramento River and its
tributaries. I want to put this project in a historical
context in that, as mentioned by Reclamation, the study of
this dam raise was first authorized in 1980. The study
itself was shelved by Reclamation when the voters of
California wisely rejected the Peripheral Canal in 1982.

It's been revived, and of course, I don't think
there's any coincidence that we're now looking at a Draft
Environmental Impact Statement and the project is moving
forward when the same governor, Governor Jerry Brown, is
proposing construction of massive twin tunnels under the
delta to send more water south. In fact, the bureau's own
numbers in the EIS show that every drop of water from the
dam raise, even the water that would benefit salmon, will
be sold water contractors. 77 percent of that water is
sold to water contractors south of the delta. So there's
a direct tie between this project and what we're doing and
what we're proposing to do down in the delta.

Of course, much of the benefit according to the
bureau for this project is to improve conditions for
salmon. But the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in its own
draft coordination report, which is an appendix on the
bureau's website to this project, says that the benefits
to salmon are negligible. 90 percent of the time, there
would be no benefit to salmon. So this project is really
about water and selling that water to water contractors.

This is a big issue because the dam raise will
harm two beautiful rivers that are eligible for federal protection as wild and scenic rivers: the McCloud and the Upper Sacramento River. It will violate state law that protects the McCloud in its free-flowing state, and it’s a wild trout fishery. It will flood Native American cultural sites used by the Winnemem Wintu today. It’s as if we were flooding churches in this town so we could store water for water contracts in LA. It will flood thousands of acres of national forest land that provides important habitat for dozens of sensitive, threatened, endangered species. It provides recreational opportunities for thousands of Californians. It will require the removal or relocation of dozens of roads, resorts, marinas, houses, power lines, you name it, with huge impacts to the local economy. It will also modify flows to the Sacramento River downstream, and these are flows needed to maintain the healthy riparian habitat of that river and many threatened, endanger species that depend on that habitat. And the bureau is promising that the impact of that flow modification will be mitigated through the adoption of adaptive management plan. That doesn’t exist today, so I really can’t tell if, you know, that mitigation will occur. I’ll close up. I think the bureau needs to look
at an alternative that truly benefits salmon by restoring spawning and rearing habitat, by improving fish passage and restoring fish passage upstream of Shasta Dam, by increasing minimum flows in the river, and by screening unscreened diversions. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

Next up is Craig Leigh, and on deck will be Robert Franklin and Jeanne France and David Martinez. If you wouldn't mind coming up and standing behind the speaker, that would be great. Thank you very much.

MR. LEIGH: May name is Craig Leigh, L-E-I-G-H, 62-year resident of Redding on the Sacramento.

That giant white truck you see out front see out, it's United States Weather Bureau. There's something none of you're are thinking about. We have gone from 45 inches annually in rain to 23. You build that dam higher, and you think drought years, well, the next year it will fill up. According to NASA, the Weather Bureau, National Geologic Society, California is going to go less and get fewer and fewer inches of rain.

You can see the difference if you live in Redding. We used to have seven or eight snowfalls. We used to have thunderstorms in the summer. You better think about. I don't know how you're going to fill this dam, but you better think about that.
Rainfall. That's what fills lakes and fills dams. We're going to look pretty stupid. And I tell everybody, what is Shasta Dam, what is it, the fourth largest dam in the world? And we don't get rain. Think about it. There's nothing you can do about it. And I am not for or against a dam, but I've seen what's happening and I've talked to experts. Every day we review snow-impact reports. Rainfall is a big deal. So anyway, thank you guys.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Leigh. Mr. Franklin.


I get out this way quite often, find myself in San Diego, Klamath Falls, all over the place. The reason why I'm here is for are fishing people. They have, thankfully, a federal recognition of their fishing right, fully vested property right to fish. Along with others in the Trinity-Klamath Basin, we enjoy a priority in-basin water call. And it's about that that I wish to speak.

The modelling that's used, the planning model for figuring out what to do here in your EIS, is intended to develop an accurate picture for various parties with very different ideas as to what's important so that we all
might possibly have a platform to argue about. And the hydrologic model CalSim-II, as it presently is run, fails to appropriately address, accurately address, the in-basin priority Trinity River needs.

Specifically, it’s insufficient in its treatment of carryover storage needs for the basin, and it fails to contemplate releases from Trinity Dam to the Lower Klamath River, such as is going on today to try and avoid fish kills in the Lower Klamath River, including kills of Trinity River fish. And also CalSim-II fails to dial in a 50,000 acre-foot annual priority entitlement to Humboldt County and other downstream users.

What you wind up with, I think, is an impression given to folks waiting for their water to come from the raise of the dam, and a goodly portion of that water is not available for viewing accurately. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Ms. France. Eric Cassano, can you please come up as well.


I'll be brief. I oppose the raising of Shasta Dam. The taxpayers cannot afford the monetary cost. The fish cannot tolerate the lack of free-flowing water.
Biologists cannot say that they know how to restore the salmon. Books cannot provide this knowledge. There’s no efficient way to get the salmon above the dam. Trucking them around the dam is foolish.

The Winnemem cannot and will not tolerate the continuing genocide of our people. We as a people must stop the engineers that work with water whose mantra is any drop that makes it to the ocean is a wasted drop. And the state water contracts will never, ever be fulfilled. They are written seven times over the available water.

The dam raise doesn’t even come close to providing that water. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. France.

Mr. Martinez. And Mr. Burgin, can you please step up.

MR. MARTINEZ: I am David Martinez, D-A-V-I-D, M-A-R-T-I-N-E-Z. I am Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member, Shasta County resident and voter.

I thoroughly oppose this dam raise seeing as how my family and my relatives have been directly affected from this dam since 1973. We were promised many things: like lands, infrastructure, like ways, and we have received nothing.

I am a descendent of the Silverthorn family. We ran Silverthorn Ferry on the Pit River Arm. That land
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMART2-1 CONT'D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>above the waterline was supposed to go to me and the rest of my descendants and family. Today, none of us own a square inch. And that was a promise from you guys, not you guys directly but your bureau. So I have no faith that you will do anybody right or there will be any justification or proper redress or compensation for any or the losses to any of the people that are out their businesses, landowners, resort operators, concessionaires, leaseholders, that will be affected by this dam raise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMART2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel they are going to get what we got. Here’s our promise. Oh, no, we got it. Who are you? That’s who we are today. Who are you? We’re the people that got almost totally destroyed by this dam raise. Are you going to treat the people that are there now the same way you treated us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMART2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And this is the lynch pin for those twin tunnels. Studies already show that the water that will come from this dam will go down south. It’s the only way you can do it. You can’t take water above the delta and say “Oh, we still have the same amount of flow going through the delta.” You have to have that extra water up above this dam for those twin tunnels to work. Right now you take the water below the delta, at the end of the delta, and ship it south. You’re going to take it above it and still have the same flow? I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There's a lot of inconsistencies in the reports. What is the cost to the Winnemem Wintu people and other native peoples that surround this lake when we lose our sacred sites, our churches, our homelands. They have already been taken from us, but we still use those areas. Sometimes we've got to do it without permission, but, you know, we were here a lot longer before the rest of you guys showed up. So we do use those sites.

What would you be paying us to lose that? What would you be saying if we were taking those kinds of things from you. If we said we're taking your church, we're taking your home, we're taking everything you have had in your family for 10,000 years, so that somebody down south can grow a damn water valley down there in the desert, or so the oil companies can frack and destroy the aquifers around here. That's where the water is going. Thank you very much.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you Mr. Martinez.

Eric Cassano, Greg Burgin, Catherine Joplin, please stand up.


I'm with a website called ShastaLake.com, and I am against the plan to raise Shasta Dam a hundred percent.
I believe that the 3M quarry project is directly linked at the hip with this particular project. Now, Bureau of Reclamation people claim it's too small of a project to merit a 3M quarry. Well, my understanding is any project over a 100,000 square yards, the bureau has a policy to have five times the amount of aggregate supply for that project. It's a policy: five times. Now, take five times the bridges, the camp grounds, the marinas. I think the 3M quarry and the timing, just like the Peripheral Canal, I believe it's all linked.

So that kind of leads into my next point. Let me just say it: The Shasta Lake Water Resource Investigation name, I think this whole process could be started over solely for the fact that it's very cryptic. It's an attempt to deceive the public with regards to what it actually meant. It should have been called Shasta Dam and Shasta Lake Enlargement Project, or Shasta Dam and Reservoir Enlargement Project. That would be more appropriate, and that would be more helpful to the public.

I have been trying to get a document that is referred to in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and it has to do with the aggregate. It's in the engineering summary appendix. It states more details regarding potential local salmon gravel aggregate sources.
are contained in the reclamation Shasta Dam enlargement sand and gravel -- excuse me, sand and aggregate sources

3 2007D. Now, I talked to Katrina Chow, it was in July sometime, and she said she'd have it to me in a reasonable amount of time. I haven't seen it yet. I've been contacting Louis Moore, tried to contact Katrina Chow again and left messages. They are not making these documents available. They are very pertinent to the environment impact. How can we review this if the supporting documents are not being made available? I think that needs to be -- at the very least, can you please get it to me before the comment period is over. That would be kind of nice.

Also they have a map in there showing these potential quarry/borrow sites where they'll be getting this material. And they show little dots, little colored dots. Here's private and here's public. How about telling me what those companies are. The public ones, that's a little bit more ambiguous, but which is the name of this carry, what's the name of this quarry, and why wasn't 3M quarry at least listed as a potential project, or quarry, since according to Katrina, she said that they have been speaking to 3M officials regarding that quarry as an aggregate source. So that should be a potential aggregate supply as well.
RE: Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation Public Hearing

I think they are just basically trying to keep it too undulated because they are piecemealing the environmental review. And also, I think that they need to address -- I am just going to stop.

Thank you very much.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your time, sir.

Mr. Burgin.

MR. BURGIN: I'm Greg Burgin, G-R-E-G, B-U-R-G-I-N, Jr. I am direct descendant of the Wilkes family, which is the Wilkes expedition done to the Turtle Bay area.

For those that don't know the Wintu history, I encourage you to pick up a book and read it. If you understand any of our people around this area, you will know we have no lands. We have no say. Our words carry no weight with the government. We have no home. The water that was ours is being used against us to flood us out. None of our people own any land along the river or around the lake. We own it as a tribe.

There are many Wintu people up in this area. Shasta Lake has the highest amount of native children in the area enrolled in its schools there. What kind of message are we sending to our children that in 2014 the Indians still have no voice. He's still in the way of profit-making, in the way of corporation greed. When will
it stop. When will our lands stop being decimated. When
will our grave sites stop being decimated, our
grandmothers, our grandfathers. It's no different than
digging up a grave at some other cemetery and pulling the
shoes right off their feet. We've got to dig up pestles.
We have people in colleges labeled as specimens until this
day.

This is 2013, and us Indians are still specimens
and experimented on. This county goes all over the word
protecting other people all around, but we can't even take
care of the people that this land was stolen from. The
people are all against the dam, all the Indian people. I
know a lot of the leaders in these areas. I am related to
a lot of people around here, multiple tribes. Nobody here
is for raising this dam. But yet we feel that even though
we bring all the facts, the dates, the people that were
supposed to have broken promises, we still have no voice,
no stance, no land.

How much is enough? I mean really. One day I
pray that our elders will still be around to see some land
come into ownership of the rightful stewards of this
land. We don't want all of California. We want just
places where our families grew up, the villages, our
sacred spots where we hold ceremony. It's not like we're
asking for the whole world. We're asking for what's
fair. And one day when you go up to talk to the man above, you’ll be questioned on how you treated your brothers and sisters in this life. I can go there now, and I'm okay with what I've done and what I've tried to do.

I think there needs to be some kind of ratification for the people of this area. They want to say we’re not recognized, well why is all of our stuff in the Smithsonian, Shasta colleges, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, but we’re not a recognized tribe? It doesn't make any sense to me. You want to talk about genocide? The greatest genocide that's ever happened in the world has happened to the Indian people in this county. And still, 2013, the Indian person is still in the way. That's all I have to say.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Burgin.

Catherine Joplin, Tom Stokely, Curtis Brown, and Sue Horket, please step up.

MS. JOPLIN: Catherine Joplin, C-A-T-H-E-R-I-N-E,-J-O-P-L-I-N. I am a resident of Lakehead, and I serve on the Lakehead community development association. I had the opportunity to serve on the stakeholders committee which worked with BOR in the investigations in preparation for the report.

I object to the raising of the dam. I feel that
it severely impacts our community of Lakehead and Shasta County. I am also very upset about the impact it will have on the Wintu Indians. I won’t pursue explanations. I think their explanations have been very favorable.

I feel that we need to spread our water storage in more areas and not just more storage in Shasta. I feel that Sites Reservoir should have a higher priority because it will capture water from the tributaries below Shasta Dam, and most importantly, that it would have three times the water capacity of the water storage in the raising of the dam. If water capacity storage is truly the issue, then forget about raising Shasta Dam and look more closely at the Sites Reservoir in Colusa County. My detailed letter will follow. thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

MR. STOKELY: Thank you. My name is Tom Stokely, T-O-M, S-T-O-K-E-L-Y. I am here representing the California Water Impact Network and the California Environmental Water Caucus, which is a coalition of a number of groups.

The organizations I represent support salmon restoration, but we do not support this project. Why? Because this project is being justified with almost two-thirds of the cost being billed to the taxpayers on behalf of the salmon. And yet raising Shasta Dam appears...
...nowhere in over 1,100 recommendations from the National Marine Fishery Service in their Sacramento River Draft Salmon Recovery Plan. It does not appear in any plan by the Department of Fish and Wildlife or any other regulatory agency. It's simply an excuse for this project.

The obvious preferred alternative, CP4, is justified because it will produce 913,000 salmon smolt at a cost of $654.9 million to the taxpayers. At a return rate of .13 percent, which we will provide you with the background on that, that's approximately 1,057 returning adult salmon to the Sacramento River at a cost of $618,000 per fish. You thought the $600 toilet seats were expensive, we could do a lot more with $618,000 per fish than this project.

Besides that, it's certain that Reclamation will not operate the project to protect the fishery. There's nothing in the document that says that operation of the project, and that cold water pool reserve for salmon, will actually be managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the State Water Resources Control Board, the EPA, or any other regulatory agency. It's just clear that this is justification so that you can get the taxpayers to foot the bill for this project that's not cost effective.
Even if the contractors are going to be responsible for part of this project, there's a recent inspector general's report that indicates that under current repayment schemes by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Valley Project irrigators will never repay their share of the cost, and ultimately those costs will be passed onto the Central Valley Project electrical customers such as Redding Electric Utility. If this issue of repayment is not resolved soon, what we're going to see is a huge balloon payment by the power customers and a massive rise in rates, and that's going to apply to Redding as well.

There are also other alternatives that should have been looked such as water conservation, recycling, stormwater capture, retiring drainage problem lands in the western San Joaquin Valley. There are whole number of other opportunities that could actually produce real word water and would have both water supply reliability and fishery benefits. This project is not going to provide the fishery benefits.

In addition, this project will have significant water quality impacts. It's going to inundate old mine tailings, which will mobilize zinc, copper, and other toxic minerals which will actually harm the fisheries. We will submit detailed written comments. Thank you.
MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Stokely.

Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: My name is Curtis Brown, C-U-R-T-I-S, B-R-O-W-N.

I moved here in 1952 when I was 16 years old to be with my father. Redding had a population of about 10,000, between 8 and 10. They probably have 100,000 or more now. And irregardless of how people think, they have to look at it from a commonsense point of view. You have a population increase. It doesn't make any difference if it's here or Sacramento or San Francisco, Los Angeles.

You have to have water to support them. That's the only thing that you cannot substitute. You cannot substitute water. You can build roads. You can build bridges. You can build buildings. You can build homes. You can almost substitute anything else, but water you cannot substitute.

So it's just commonsense. Dams are going to have to be increased. That's are all there is to it. There's nothing you can do to stop it, unless you can stop population increase, and you cannot do that. It has to be taken care of from a reasonable point of view.

And the people that own the businesses up there around the lake and everything, I agree with them. They should be refinanced for what money it's going to cost them to move up higher on the lake and what have you. And
the federal government should give them property to
rebuild their homes. The people that live close to the
lake, like that one gentlemen who had a cabin here. He
was afraid he was going to get swamped. Move his cabin up
higher or even build him a new one up higher.

You know, it’s only fair because we’re going to
make plenty of money off of it because it has to be sold
down further in the Los Angeles Basin, and I’ll explain to
you why. They used to get their water out of Colorado
River. It came through the Boulder Dam. Well, Arizona,
Phoenix, all those cities over in there became so large
they had to have that excess water themselves. They
couldn’t let Los Angeles Basin take it anymore, so they
stopped them.

It has to come from somewhere, and it’s going to
come from Shasta Lake here. It’s going to come from the
other dams that are along the Sierra Nevadas. I worked on
the first offshore dam that was built in California down
out of Los Banos, and that’s what it was for, store water,
send it down the Delta-Mendota Canal. And they have pumps
down there, pumped it up over the Grapevine down there
into Los Angeles Basin. That’s been on the books for a
lot of years. I started working down there in 1963, and I
finished in 1967. They were trying to get the Peripheral
Canal at that time through there, and now they are calling
underground tunnels. But it's got to be done. How else are they going to get water, and I hope everybody understands that.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you Mr. Brown.

Ms. Horkey, Mr. Doyle on deck.

MS. HORKEY: My name is Sue Horkey, S-U-E, H-O-R-K-E-Y. I am a resident of Lakehead.

I will restate my exception in your presentation from your disks supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation that you are studying four alternatives for water use and creating the same stability for fish and for redundant water supply. For Sites, one of the locations, at the time you stated that Shasta Dam raising is the only presentation that's being made. If you're going to call those alternatives, you need to present all the facts for all the four sites at the same time or it's not truly an alternative. It sounds like there might already be an agenda onboard.

Once again, I think we're hiding behind the issue of fish. I've heard several statements here from people far more knowledgeable than I regarding the science behind this. The document states that 40 percent of the cold water pool will allocated towards fish stabilization, fish water temperature stabilization. The other 60 percent, where is that going? It's probably not in our best
兴趣。我确信它会向南转移以补贴农作物。

另一个人提供的信息显示，该研究是在Spyglass房地产公司完成的，该公司位于俄勒冈州。他们使用了2006年至2008年的数据库，该地区的历史最低点，之后的房地产市场在2007年崩溃。他们进一步贬低了他们打算通过标价来收购的房产，这些房产由于我们目前的经济衰退仅占2008年价值的80%，这已经被预见到一个低点。所以他们已经误导了国会，因为它们人为制造了过低的估价，我不认为这是一个好主意。

我们确实有McCloud河，那是要成为自然和风景保护区的。我们只是把窗户关掉？

我想Mr. Greg Watkins说的——我欣赏他的评论，他认为你不能用钱购买我们的生活方式。我们没有洛杉矶的经济。你不能用钱来买我们的离开。我们希望有国会的法案，如果这是必要的，让我们搬离新的湖的水平。

我的最后一个问题是如何让Los Banos居民了解...
MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments.

I have Anna Harkreader next. Anna Harkreader?

MR. TICHERA: I have a statement to read on her behalf.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

MR. TICHERA: If you don’t mind, I’ll just read what she has prepared for me.

MR. LUCERO: Would you mind stating your name, sir?

MR. TICHERA: Michael Tichera. I am the manager of Shasta Marina Resort.

MR. LUCERO: Sir, I’m sorry. Would you mind spelling your last name?

MR. TICHERA: T-I-C-H-E-R-A.

She is — her and her husband are the mother- and father-in-law of myself, and they are owners of the marina that I manage. The DEI states that all Shasta Marina's buildings, parking areas, access roads will be affected by the new pool elevation of CF3. And that was provided to us to us plate 39, recreation site states — and it gives the Shasta Marina site is to be abandoned. Very troubled to see the plan for our location is to be abandoned, and Shasta Marina has an “X” on top of the map. What exactly does that mean? And how was this alternative reached?
without consulting us. And why, when all of the facilities will be affected by raising the dam, we are to be abandoned and others to be relocated.

We are a profitable business on the lakes and provide employment opportunities that pull up the local economy. We have owned and operated Shasta Marina since June 1st of 1996 and invested in $18 million and millions of dollars in an effort to build this marina to ensure the future.

The numbers are summed as follows: We’ve managed to transform a small, run-down marina grossing less than $600,000 a year to a thriving, state-of-the-art facility with some of the most luxurious rental boats in the country. Today we gross five to six times what our predecessors have done in the past. We host over 600 trips a year, 135 moorage spaces. We bring over 12,000 a people a year to the lake, 12 full-time employees, 5 over 10 years. Our employees all are home owners, have families, and have always paid -- we have always paid a hundred percent of our full-time employees with health insurance.

During the summer, we employ an additional 8 to 10 employees. Each year, we invest millions in our local economy and services to supply us to support operations. We offer some of the best customer service you will find.
anywhere and provide a quality experience on Shasta for the public.

Our land items are definitely expendable, and our water-based assets are moveable. We move our marina most years as the water level changes. Consequently, we have put most of our improvements into floating assets and made the necessary functions that can be performed in high or low water conditions.

The shallow conditions of the O'Brien inlet have presented us with challenges during our time here, but we have dealt with them and the area has advantages that make it worth the efforts. We have changed every process within our company. There are three separate anchor systems that enable us to move in the shortest amount of time possible so as not to interrupt our guests time on the lake. It’s a quick disconnect and reconnect to move the docks with boats attached.

Before ruling that Shasta Marina be abandoned, we believe there are many options to investigate that would allow us to remain on the O'Brien Inlet. Abandoned campgrounds, private properties could be purchased, roads that could be created on the south side to take us into a deeper water location. All these solutions have been planned and thought about the entire time we’ve been here as we have already had the challenges of needing to move
two to three times a year.

We are a family owned and operated business and have the longevity of our employees. We also have family within our work group. Our people think like us.

MR. LUCERO: Sir, I have to ask you to wrap up or submit your comments into the record.

MR. TICHERA: Thank you. One last: Simply to be dismissed by those that have never even seen our operation is offensive. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Mr. Jones, Matthew Doyle, and Nick Gardner.

MR. JONES: Good evening. My name is Harold Jones, H-A-R-O-L-D, J-O-N-E-S.

My wife and I are the owners of Sugarloaf Cottages Resort up at Shasta Lake. We're one of the few businesses on the lake that is private. And we've got about two acres of land with about 400 foot of waterfront across. And one of my questions is why aren't we being considered to be relocated along with the rest of the businesses that are on permits on Shasta Lake?

Our resort is going to go under water. I will be out of business. My family's lifestyle will be gone. My house will be gone. We will have nothing left. How are we going to be compensated? Are we just going to walk away after spending 20 years on the lake and putting our
Another question is: The government comes in and takes my property that we don't want to sell to them. Then they turn around, they are forcing us to leave, and then they are going to tax me for capital gains. So they are taking my property, and then taxing me for taking my property. That doesn't really seem to be a real fair way of doing things.

The other question I had was the three quarters of the resorts, the land-based resorts, would be taken out with this project. How can you take three quarters of the resorts, the land-based ones, and then say that you're going to increase recreation on the lake. It doesn't make sense.

In the EIS, one of the things is that's awfully long document, and a lot of these questions are very difficult when you're looking at the document, you're trying to read the document, we have questions that aren't in the document, but yet we are we are asked to respond in a forum like this. How can we come up with a way of doing this with the document? You don't have the answers or the questions in front of us.

And it appears, honestly, that we need our Congressman. Doug LaMalfa and his team is going to have to be there to help us. If we don't get the help from
those guys, we're going to be left out to dry. And it's going to a long, tough road for all of us.

Lastly, you got to believe Lakehead as a town will die. When you take out 80 percent of the resorts up there, and Lakehead being a vacation town and they don't have the tourists up there during the summertime, the stores, the bars, the places that are not going to be inundated, are going to go out of businesses. That's going to drive values of properties down. That little town is going to die. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Matthew Doyle, Nick Gardner, Jerry Harral.

MR. DOYLE: Good afternoon. My name is Matthew Doyle, M-A-T-T, D-O-Y-L-E, president of the Shasta Lake Business Owners Association, also general manager of Lake Shasta Taverns and general manager of Lake Shasta Dinner Cruises.

As the president of the Business Owners Association, we oppose the dam raising. And there's one major issue behind it: Because there's no clarity behind it. As the hierarchy goes, the BOR is the lead agency, but the Forest Service actually manages recreation on the lake. Now, my only concern with that is for the first time -- I've been involved with this since 2004 as far as the original talks. My first Forest Service meeting was
two and a half weeks ago, and we were given less than a week's notice. On that meeting, we noticed that our marinas will drop from nine marinas to five. Now, this is not the exact of what's going to happen, but this the first time it's been submitted to us.

This is going to be devastating, and it's not going to be devastating to the businesses on the lake. This is going to be devastating to the entire economy within this area. And it's only because there's a lack of clarity. We have two government agencies, but we're not getting good representation. Even though recreation is listed several dozen times within the feasibility report, it doesn't really mean anything because it's also being forced down our throat by Forest Service. Which means we don't necessarily -- business owners, private business owners, Anna was one of them, Harold was one of them, Bill Schappell, he kind of made his notice. The issue is we don't have a place at the table.

Right now, we're being told what is going to happen. And the owners of Shasta Marina, the first time they noticed they were going to be going out of business is when they saw a black X on Shasta Marina with no relocation. How would that be after 20 years of hard work and sweat to just be pushed out. I'm pretty sure the Winnemem can understand how that is. We're just going to
I honestly feel this is going to happen whether we like it or not. What I am trying to do is take a proactive approach as far as securing the businesses up here on the lake. As it states in Chapter 18, and I'll read straight from the feasibility report. "Affected recreation facilities would be relocated as a part of the construction activities for all action alternatives. This could include relocation of affected portions of facilities within existing use areas, in adjacent undeveloped areas, or at new sites in general vicinity of the lake. This is the important sentence: "Because of the possible consolidation of facilities, the total number of facilities of specific type may be reduce." They are taking apart the businesses on the lake.

Now, it makes perfect sense on Excel as far as logic. Okay, you have more area, we can increase recreation, but you're going to decrease the number of marinas. Well, it doesn't work like that. The tourism recreation industry is extremely volatile. If you upset one customer by one statement, they might not come back.

We're talking about closing down -- and this goes back to the clarity -- we have no idea how long these marinas, the ones that actually do stay behind us, are going to be out of business. And it was stated during the...
last comment period, a gentleman I forget his name, stated specifically that current rules and regulation do not compensate for lost business. This is, of course, where we need Congressman Doug LaMalfa to come in to say, “Hey we need to protect businesses up on this lake.”

MR. LUCERO: Thank you.

Nick Gardner, Jerry Harval, Dave Mundt.


I wanted to talk to you about the salmon. Before they built Shasta Dam, the high water was in the winter and the low water was in the summer. When they built the dam, they knocked out 85 percent of the spawning grounds and reversed that. Now probably your average flow in spawning time in the winter is 3,200 cubic feet per second. I’ve been down fishing. I’ve fished this river since I was in 7th grade, and I am 62 now. I’ve been fishing and watched the water go down and see fry flocking.

If you could include in your environmental report a constant flow of at least 6,500 square feet per second from the first of October through January, that would enhance the salmon reproduction more than anything that’s been done to date. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your comments, sir.
Jerry Harral, Dave Mundt, and Geenie Seely.


I just want to say my heart goes out to the Wintu tribes and all the other neighboring tribes. I can't believe what's going on there. I do believe they need to be paid back by the water that goes down through the tubes to those people.

Also, Mr. Brown spelled it perfect that we have a lot more people now. We need to give these people water. Unfortunately, we have to have a dam. We have to have a bigger dam with more water.

That's really all I have to say. We need this dam. That's all there is to it. But my heart goes out, and I hope the people who get this water, who pay for this water, need to pay for the people who are losing their homes and also give the resorts a place to go. Thank you very much.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Harral.

David Mundt, Geenie Seely, and Walt McNeill.

MR. MUNDT: Good evening. My name is Dave Mundt, M-U-N-D-T. My affiliation is with Citizens Who Are Taxpayers. I am a former resident of Lakehead, and that town I will always love the best of any place I have ever lived.
I'm opposed to the raising of the dam. I see this as a single-threaded approach to a very complex problem. I am very disappointed that the Bureau of Reclamation has had a laser-like focus on the dam when a holistic approach using multiple resources would be a better use of our money and your money too. A billion dollars, and we all know a billion-dollar budget is going to inflate to, what, a billion and a half, two billion. I have managed almost a million dollar software budget. I know how easy it's for these things to go array, and I'm sure you do too. But we don't need to talk about that.

I don't see water storage as the primary issue driving this. I see water shortage as what we need to focus our efforts on. I think multiple channels is what we need to investigate rather than a single thread of raising the dam.

A few comments on statistics: Last meeting we had, we talked about the statistics about the drought of 1977 when the water level went down 238 feet. And then we also noted that in 1978, it filled up again in one year.

I would like to say about statistics this: We know that statistics, as any student of statistics from college knows, those were probability factors and not facts. So in 1977 when we had that drought, the bureau knew that the drought was coming. My parents owned the...
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Antlers Resort in Lakehead, and so the bureau -- I don't know if any of you were employed with the bureau at that time, but the bureau drove to Lakehead down Antlers Road, and because the statistics also predicted that the lake would fill up in 1978, they gave my parents a check to hold us over so that we would be safe and protected, because we knew the lake would fill up.

And of course that was a story. It did not happen. We lost everything we owned. My family was blown apart. And I say that not to engender sympathy. We're all doing fine now. We're happy, doing great, living back in Redding. But my point is this. There is so much weight on this project based on statistics -- I am a little bit nervous -- but I don't see contingency also based on those statistics. Thank you so much.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you for your time. Just a time check here, we have about 15 or 16 more speakers. So if you do the math that's about 45 plus more minutes just so you know where we stand.

Geenie Seely is next, Walt McNeill, Colleen Leavitt will be after that.

MS. SEELEY: My name is Geenie Seely. I'm a Native American. I am Wiyot from Humboldt County, born on a rancheria.

What I'm hearing here is some naive people trying
to have some discourse with federal agencies. My people have had them for 200 years. I am fighting the same battles my mother and father fought. I've dealt with all kinds of government agencies, so I'm naturally very skeptical.

My first question would be, you're getting all of these comments coming in. How do we know what they say? Are you just tabulating them: pro, con. We don't. I don't trust the government. I'll be quite frank about it.

I am hearing several comments here. A lot of people are talking money, like, okay, the bureau has some money. The government doesn't own much. The money comes from us. We're the ones that provide the money to the government. The government owns nothing except a few forts and some post offices, and people are talking about federal land. The people own that land.

So I just want to clear up a few things. I've taught Native American studies for many years. I have taught public education for 35 years. I am 83 years old, and I am still working to protect the land, and I'll be working until the day I die. I want these things cleared up because people need to know. A few people are questioning, and you have a right to question. But you can't let it stop there. You need to keep the fire under their feet to make sure they are accountable.
My people come from the reservation. We were terminated. This is the just how the federal government can control you. My people were terminated. Then they were unterminated. Then they were recognized. By whom?

The Secretary of the Interior. I don't know who he is. He doesn't know who I am. This is how the government works. Now I am again terminated by my own people, so I know all the politics.

And the thing is, I just want to make sure that everybody here follows up on these things. I came to the last meeting. I said it was worst meeting I have ever been in. It was supposed to be a workshop, couldn't hear anything. It reminded me of a 7th and 8th grade cafeteria. I taught 7th and 8th grade for 35 years, so I know what it's like. So I would just like to, like I said, encourage people to follow up here. Do not accept what the government says as cast in stone.

I'm on the Shasta County Coordination Committee. You say you're operating under NEPA. My understanding under NEPA is that people or agencies that operate under the federal government cannot come into an area and change their culture, their economy, or anything else, or any of these drastic changes, without meeting with the governments in that area.

Now, we're having these hearings. These are just
Mr. Lucero: Excuse me, Ms. Seely. I'm sorry, your time is up.

Ms. Seely: All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lucero: Please submit your comments in writing.

Walt McNeill, Colleen Leavitt, and Matthew Davison.

Mr. McNeill: Good evening. My name is Walt McNeil. I'm an attorney here in Shasta County. I am also a resident here in Redding. I'm here as an individual water user. But as an attorney, I have represented probably all of water agencies in this county in the Shasta-Trinity division in respect to negotiations of long-term water contracts under CP EIA. Seven years ago, and I also continued to, represent Bear Creek Community Services which has about 10,000 water users, and I represent private parties. We have a very direct interest in water.

I am not making these comments on behalf of any particular client, but I wanted to let you know that I have been deeply involved in water issues for the last 10 to 20 years. I want to point out just one glaring deficiency in the draft BIS. There are many issues here,
but one I want to point out, and I'll leave the other
issues to for other people to cover, and that is the
failure of the draft EIS to address the California area of
origin water statutes as well as the failure to address
the impact of that in regards to acquisition of water
rights.

I think a little history is helpful. When the
dam was built, about that time the State of California
passed Water Code Section 10505. It states, "No priority
under this part shall be released nor assignment made for
any application that will, in the judgment of the board,
deprive the county in which the water covered by the
application originates of any such water necessary for the
development of the county."

At the same time, Water Code Section 11460, prior
right to watershed water. Without reading the whole
thing, basically it provides the same area of origin right
to landowners and to the counties, property owners, water
users within the watershed of origin. When I looked at
Chapter 6 of the draft EIS, there's no mention of those
statutes. It's completely ignored. When I look at the
section related to acquisition of water rights, you're
still working on that, and you're saying that it's being
pursued.

What I want to emphasize is that for maybe 50
years, federal government promised water users in Northern
California that they would have the first right to water
that originates here, and that that right would not be
disturbed. What we have come to learn is that the United
States and Bureau of Reclamation do not honor that
promise. And in fact, when they operate the CVP, they do
not honor area of origin rights. Enlarging the dam will
only increase the amount of water that’s taken from area
landowners and taken to another place without giving it to
the people here who need it in the first place. Thank
you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

Colleen Leavitt, Matthew Davison, Buford Holt.


So I’m really impressed with the comments from
all the people here tonight, and I hope that you’re going
to take them seriously. Often, I think we’ve been through
the environmental review processes here in Shasta County
that seem like our comments really aren’t taken that
seriously.

I was especially interested in people that made
comments on alternatives to the project. I know the
Bureau of Reclamation has a long history of building dams,
but maybe that’s not the best way anymore. People talked
about holistic approaches and water conservation. And I actually would like considered in the environmental impact report the possibility that instead of building the dam — if you look at a picture of Shasta Lake, and as anybody who lives here knows, there are multiple jutting-out areas, and as soon as the water gets low, it's nothing but rock. Why couldn't those be removed. It would change the shoreline somewhat, but it would add capacity for storage of water, and it would not raise the level of the water.

I mentioned to one of the guys here with the name tag, and he said, "Oh, what are you going do with all rock we're removing." Well, okay, that's a problem, but I don't think it's nearly the problem that moving people's businesses, flooding people's homes, flooding Indians' sacred places. There must be a way to deal with that.

I'd like to see an actual serious consideration. If that won't work, why not.

Maybe storage requires raising the dam, but what about a combination of alternatives. Maybe some removal, you know, excavation of the lake to make it bigger. What about water conservation. I mean, like I say, I know you have a long history of building dams, but maybe that era is over and we should start thinking about other things.

The other comment -- and I realize that this is a time for us to make comments that should be considered in
the environmental impact report, or if we're not happy we
need to put out the things possibly for litigation later.
So I just have a couple other things. In the cases where
the California Environmental Quality Act is stricter, and
I know there are areas, is your EIS going to comply with
the stricter regulations under the California
Environmental Quality Act?

And is there any discussion, or could there be,
of some legislative changes that would allow the bureau to
operate the dam higher, the existing dam higher? I think
it's 20 feet that you keep it from the top. Could you
raise it a couple of feet and still manage it? And I
understand that it's regulated by legislation, but maybe
we could get it changed. Maybe we could get a couple feet
there, maybe we could scoop some stuff out. You know, I
just would like to see other alternatives besides raising
the dam.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Leavitt.

Matthew Davison, Buford Holt, and Ed Marek.

MR. DAVISON: My name is Matt Davison, M-A-T-T
D-A-V-I-S-O-N. I want to keep my eye on the little
charming timer over there multi-colored graphics.

I appreciate the chance to speak in public about
this issue that you have provided. Because many people
have presented all these different angles, I am going to
focus on just four issues for why I reject the validity of raising Shasta Dam.

So point number one I have is the budget process.

I do like that you have a timeline in the back, and you had one at the previous presentation here, that showed all steps you're going through very methodically to do this. I know there are bigger forces pushing this forward than anyone in this room, but I wish I could see on a timeline like that in the future the budgeting of the process at each step. Because I know as you get into a process like this, the more you invest in, the more it becomes urgent you go ahead and do it. It develops its own momentum. So I would just like transparency in terms of knowing that the more money that goes into this, the more you're going to just do it. It's like gambling fever. You've got to because you are already in the pot.

So the second point -- that's one level at which I reject that part of the process, that it should have transparency in terms of how much money is being invested at each step.

The second point I want to make is the fish habitat argument, that it improves the fish habitat. We have a gentleman from the fisheries that was here, a very nice gentleman. And I looked at his charts and everything, and I said, "All this seems to only point to
fish going downstream." And he was very kind and said
"Yes, you are correct. This has nothing to do with
improving fish habit for fish coming upstream because they
can't get upstream." And so that's the reason I reject
the argument that this improves the fish habitat for
raising the dam.

The third one is the theory of recreation
increase, like some sort of mysterious atomic theory that
more water acreage -- ah, the green dot has appeared. The
more acreage there is, that there will be this sort of
magnetic attraction that there will be more recreation on
the lake. Actually, a lot of people aren't slamming into
each other on the lake now. So that's more affected by
the economy. The economy is the main reason you don't see
more people recreating. It has nothing to do with
acreage. So I reject that argument for raising the dam.

And the fourth argument is water release. I
heard an argument that they need to release -- the amount
of water that they are releasing changes. In drought
condition, they would be able to retain more water. I
didn't see that they contended how much is released to
generate electrical power. So I'd like more clarity in
terms of how much of that water release we get anyway
because of electrical power.

Finally, I just want to say before I run out of
time here on the yellow dot. As an American who's not a
tribal member, I think it's far past the time where we
recognize the Winnemem Wintu as Americans. They lived
here before us, and I think they should be recognized.

Thank you very much.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Davison.
Buford Holt, Ed Marek, and R. Wade.

MR. HOLT: My name is Buford Holt, B-U-F-O-R-D
H-O-L-T.

I just wanted to comment on one of the things
that's missing from this document, not all the document
per se. It's difficult. It's a good document put
together by competent people. I don't have a problem with
what's there so much as the ending has problems. And
we've had some excellent comments from my predecessors up
here at the mic.

What my concern is is that it's been 10 years,
probably, since the context was given for which all this
stuff is happening. Several of the comments addressed
that. "Gee, you haven't looked at the alternatives."

Well, they did, ten years ago. The CalFED EIS and the CVP
IA implementation EIS, but who remember that 10 years
later? And you have to remember, those documents were
themselves a couple of feet thick. There's a lot of
material there, and then there are lots and lots of
environmental reports from the CalPED stuff. There were whole bookshelves full of CalPED documents.

And so what's happened is we've lost sight of that context or it's been forgotten. And what I think would be helpful in a document like this is to have an appendix that summarizes some of the broader picture.

Like right now California faces at least three major budget-busting problems: Water supply, which people are mentioning because we are already tapping -- virtually everything that can be economically captured is being captured with small exceptions. We've got the problem of water delivery, the trans-delta sort of thing. And we've got flood control issues, which no one has even mentioned here. That's a whole separate sort of thing. But we're talking about things where the budgets are tens of billions of dollars. And in today's environment, those things are kind of difficult to do. But we don't have, for the public, that kind of perspective, putting them in tradeoffs that we'd have to take. And I think it would be very useful to have a brief summary of that.

Nor is there a mention of the fact that global oil production has peaked. In 1970 we went from being domestically self-reliant to importing oil with borrowed money. In about 2006, the global oil production peaked. And what that means is the era of relatively cheap oil is
gone. You can look at the numbers, but it's clear that
this is no longer the world in which Colonel Drake drilled
70 feet through unconsolidated sediments, buried under
bedrock he found oil 250 years ago. Now, we have floating
platforms dynamically positioned in the ocean dropping
miles of pipe. It's far more expensive to get oil now.
The finances to pull this stuff off are going to be
questionable. So thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Holt.

Ed Marek, R. Wade, Joy Wade.

MR. MAREK: Yes, my name is Ed Marek. I live
here Oak Run.

MR. LUCERO: Sir, can you spell your last name,
please?

MR. MAREK: M-A-R-E-K. I'd just like to address
both the audience and ladies and gentlemen here. I think
that what hasn't been discussed, from my perspective, what
we're really discussing is planning for disaster. And
maybe this occurred to you that sometimes when you plan
for disaster, you can plan a disaster. I'd like everyone
to take a look at the environmental impact report. And it
is in there rather buried, but find the climate change
modelling appendix part one, page 17, some of the more
moderate facts for North California. "Snowpack decreases
is projected to be more substantial over the portions of
the basin where baseline cool weather temperatures are
1 generally closer to freezing thresholds and more sensitive
to projected warming. Such areas include much of the
4 northern Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountains of the
Sacramento River Basin." That's us, Northern California.
Then page 25-2, mean April 1st snow water
7 equivalent, that's the snowpack existing in this
8 watershed. Declined by the 2020s, 53.4 percent; by the
9 2050s, 75.9 percent; and by the 2070s 88.6 percent decline
10 in our snowpack.

Now, the dam does nothing whatsoever to
11 ameliorate the damage done by climate change, the slow
12 disaster we're facing. What it does do, and what it is an
13 attempt to do, is to reduce the effects for Central and
14 Southern California. What would be disaster for us would
15 be survivable for Central and Southern California because
16 it will allow you to collect the water, the precipitation
17 that does not fall as snow but falls as rain, and continue
18 to ship it south by increasing storage capacity in
19 Northern California.

And the point I want to make about this is that
21 for us, this is not going to be a disaster that is
22 survivable. Northern California is dependent on the
23 forest resources not only for the timber economy but for
24 tourism and the greater forest ecology. If those forests
cannot survive, as they cannot do as to soil moisture declines with declining snowpack, then we will not have the same Northern California we have now, however high the lake is.

So anyway I just said, concluded, you're asking the wrong question in your study. And I understand you're constrained. You can only discuss the water storage options specifically in Lake Shasta. But nothing you are going to do here is going to benefit us to live in this future. And it's only going to extend the ability of Central and Southern California by several decades. And maybe even the salmon, it's entirely possible you can keep the water colder by using the dam. But it's really not solving the problem.

So just to conclude by saying: Instead of planning for this disaster, maybe we should start planning to avoid this disaster. I hope you at all take that comment to heart.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much, sir.
R. Wade, Joy Wade, and Gill Goss.

This is project doesn't make any sense to me. You're essentially just doing a railroad job on people’s houses and our tourist business. The other thing is do we
have the rainfall to support the project. Recent history says no. One year out of six we get enough water. That's 17 percent of the time; 83 percent of the time we don't have enough water. Would any — I am a small business guy. Would I ever put up any money to come out ahead 17 percent of the time? This is project makes no sense at all because the water is not available. And you are — just like to Wintu got the railroad job, all those people that spent years and years developing their recreation businesses, believe me, it will all go in the toilet.

And it's to ship water south. The Lower San Joaquin, they've pumped out aquifers. Water is the new gold, and the smartest thing that we could do would be quit flushing all our water into rivers. We've got graywater systems that we should be using to replenish aquifers. Fresno is constantly drilling wells just to take care of their half a million people. If they collected the graywater and injected it, they could replenish aquifers. So it's a plumbing design problem, as far as I am concerned. And we should look to graywater instead of spending billions of dollars and railroading the people in Northern California. Thank you for your time.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Wade.
MR. WADE: Joy Wade will not be speaking.
MR. LUCERO: Thank you, sir.

Gil Goss, Kenwa Kravitz, and Linda Malone.

MR. GOSS: My comments were already entered. Gil Goss.

MR. LUCERO: Mr. Goss, thank you very much.

Kenwa Kravitz, Linda Malone, and Michael Preston.


MR. LUCERO: Excuse me. Ms. Kravitz, can I have you speak closer to the mic?

MS. KRAVITZ: Yes. I apologize. This is very sensitive to me.

In 1941 the Congress passed an act called the Acquisition of Indian Land for the Central Valley Project. That has never been answered for in regards to my people. I truly oppose the raising of the dam.

I currently have in my possession a document called a CDIB, Certified Degree of Indian Blood, that states I am a descendent and have Wintu blood in me, meaning Indian blood of the land that was taken. This government agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs gave it to me. It’s an official document. I would like to see some
accountability before anything more is done in any way
shape or form. Who holds the government of the United
states of America accountable for what they have done to
my people? Where is the accountability?
I don't -- I will just honestly say that I do not
trust the United States government because of these
things. All the way back to 1851, the Ash Creek Treaty
was never ratified. It promised my people 35 square miles
of the river basin right here. All this side of the
Sacramento River all the way, basically, out to Mount
Lassen up to the Pit River all the way to the Sacramento
River down to Cottonwood.
Lots of us people here live in that area. Does
anybody know about that? No, because it was held in
secrecy for a really long time. There's a continued
breaking of trust, breaking of treaties, in regard to my
people. And not only my people, but all the people across
this land. That was given to us. It might not seem like
much to you, but to me this is where my people come from.
Lots of people don't understand that, but to say this is
where I come from. That's huge. And if you cover that
dam, you're going to cover that land.
Right at McCloud River, my ancestors lived
there. There are burial sites there. I have deeds of
trust that were given to ancestors. Kitty McKenzie up in
Lamoine which will affected. The McKenzies down the McCloud River. Over in Trinity Center, the lake over there covering that area. This is personal. It's not -- when is enough enough? Who will hold the United States Government accountable for what they have done to me, my people, and my children. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much.

Linda Malone, Michael Preston, and our last speaker is Peggy Williams.

MS. MALONE: Hello and thank you for hearing my words.

I take off where she left off. We have a sad history, and whenever we're asked to talk about it, it hurts. It hurts really bad. We had this removal once before. In 1938, my parents were moved. And if you know McCloud River, it's one of the most pristine rivers in the world. It's the coldest river in the United States. And when you raise the dam, you're going to go up two miles, into that, and that river is lost.

Also what is sad is that you have recreation here, and you make a lot of taxes off the water and the lake and the recreation and the boats, the houseboats. And my brother drowned in the lake in 1995. You had a 17-year-old who just drowned last week. You still haven't found him. I know, personally know, two other people that
are in the lake. Jack Potter, Senior, and Mr. Hale, I believe. He was like 35 years old. He's still not found. My brother was not found after 15 months, then he came up. So your feasibility and your investigation, to me the edges of your lake is too steep.

It is a very deep lake. It's so deep you can't find people with those little bitty cameras that go ten feet because I saw that when we hunted for my brother. So it's -- every year, people drown in that lake. So we need the water, but then we need the people to live, and then you need it for your recreation also. But when they built Shasta Dam, it's so steep, that whole hillside. Where they put Shasta Dam, that's one of the hardest spots in Northern California that they chose.

But we try to get along. We've got a long time, but we still have to deal with issues. Every year, two or three times a year, and every time we come and tell you, like years from now, it's a whole different group. And the law changes on us. And then the BIA steps in and says you have to do this now, and it takes us a long time.

But when you raise the lake again, we're going to lose more land. I can't believe Lakeshore might disappear. I shopped there. But it just seems to go on and on, and we have lost enough land. For the second time, it really hurts. Thank you for hearing me.
MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Malone.
Michael Preston, Peggy Williams. And if you
still want to speak, please give your name to Mary,
otherwise we have two more speakers left.

MR. PRESTON: Michael Preston, M-I-C-H-A-E-L,
P-R-E-S-T-O-N. (Speaking in Native language). My name is
Michael Preston, up on McCloud River representing the
Winnemem Wintu Tribe and also a member of Shasta County
public and youth. And I want to speak to you actually on
that ground right there.

And basically, I wanted to address the
environmental justice issue that the dam has created in
the first place from 1941 in accordance to the Winnemem
Wintu Tribe and the loss of sacred sites. This is
documented in the Central Valley Indian Land Acquisition
project. Before we move forward with the Central Valley
Project, I feel like we should be addressing these issues
with that Central Valley Indian Acquisition Project
stating it would provide, you know, just -- I'm sorry,
looking for correct word -- provide like land to live on,
which was 4,000 -- over 4,000 acres of Indian allotment
lands, which were allotted not only to the Winnemem Wintu
Tribe but also surrounding Wintu tribes and different
Wintus that reside along the rivers.
law, I feel like that should be once again revisited. And also infrastructural support was also promised through that. So in that not being ratified or being swept under the rug and not being addressed, is an environmental justice issue.

This issue with dams happens all over the world. We've displaced a billion people around the world. This just so happens to be in Shasta County. And the main reason why these dams are being put in place is economically it forces control of the water and, I think, at the expense of the local people. So we are representing the local people, tribes first and foremost, and then the public which is also going to be -- the general public overall, which is going to be at an economic loss as well as stated by many of the people here.

And so I wanted to addresses that as well just from the economic means -- that just based on -- like Brazil, for instances, and different countries. Go into these different countries and basically subdue the economics there and the infrastructural promises, and then basically getting these governments into debt and subduing them to World Bank, for instance.

I see this as the same issues, just in the local area with the Bureau of Land Management and federal
government coming in and coming into the local economy.
And the promise of jobs, the promise of salmon returns,
the promise of these different things will benefit the
area. However, in the long run it's not what is
actually going to benefit the economy or the people in the
long run.

So based off of the water allocation going down
to the south, that's what it's all about. It's all about
the agricultural interests that are in the Central Valley
paying a pretty price and paying for this water that will
be up there, as well as Southern California. It's not
really for the people, per se. It is, only about for --
the vast majority, though, for which the water is used, 70
percent of the water is used for agricultural means.

Also fracking is a big deal which is coming up on
the chopping blocks in Southern California, which has used
millions and millions of gallons water to extract oil and
natural resources. And so that's what I feel is the main
reason for the dam raise, and the main reason for the
water allocation down to Southern California. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you very much for your
comments.

Ms. Peggy Williams, you have the honor of being
the last speaker tonight.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Peggy
I am a member of the board of directors for the Lakehead Community Development Association, which does a tremendous job for the community.

I want to just touch on a few points, and one of them, a couple people remember, is terrorism. When the dam was built in the '30s, '40s, we had no terrorism, but we had no jobs. This is not going to help with the job situation. It will employ people. But you're going to put all the water for California in one big basket up here, and then are we going to wait for some crazy terrorist to come and fly into the dam when it's high and flood all the way to Sacramento. That's what will happen.

I've often wondered that about the I-5 bridge, what it would do for travel, the way people would have to go around. It would cause a major problem. And I find that with the dam. I was told six feet they can do with the existing structure, six feet up.

And I also -- as a few of you know, I have lived in my home on the lake for 30 years. I recognize at least a half a dozen owners or managers of resorts that I deal with and have for years: 20 years, 18 years. And this is not a 24 hours and you're off or 8 hours and you're off the rest of the week. This is 24/7, 365 days a year.

These people work. They work hard. And it's not only for
them, their employees, it's for all the tourists, tens of thousands of tourists that come. And we're not seeing them now because of the economy: no jobs, gasoline, this kind of thing.

I think the water storage problem would be best served by carrying the water down the state and not putting it all in one place and having little spots.

And also, the American Indians: As far as I am concerned, I am an American Indian now. You're taking my home of 30 years. Three daughters I raised in that house. You know, they can't believe it that I am going to have to leave there. I said they are going to carry every toothpick out of my house then.

So not only the businesses, the employees go, no tourists. I just think everybody loses with the extreme amount that they want to raise the lake. I just think everybody will lose.

And I met two farmers. And these two farmers, I said, "Bob, what are you not rice ranching this year?" He says, "Nops, neither is Larry." I said, "Why not?" He goes, "We can get more money for the water than we can get for the rice." So if we supply 90 percent of the produce to the United States and our farmers are selling water, who's going to grow the produce? Who is going to feed the people? What will happen?
But you guys are going to relocate me like you relocated the Indians? Never going to happen. We're going to get the same shaft they got, and I truly believe that, but I appreciate you being here and listening. And I appreciate all the people that I have seen here tonight that I have known for decades. I know they worked 24/7, 365 days a year for their employees, for our community, taxes, and for tens of thousands of tourists.

MR. LUCERO: Thank you, Ms. Williams, appreciate your comments.

We have called the last speaker. Does anybody else want to make a comment?

Then in that case, on behalf of Reclamation, I'd like to thank everyone for taking the time to attend and participate in this hearing. Please remember, if you still plan to provide written comments, you have until September 30th midnight.

This concludes our hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement For the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. Thank you and good night.

(Meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.)
### Responses to Comments from Curtis Brown, Provided on Behalf of Self

**BROW-1:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
BROW-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”

BROW-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-3, “Relocation of Privately Owned Cabins on USFS Lands.”

BROW-4: Neither Reclamation nor DWR in operating the CVP and SWP realize any profit as they are public agencies.

Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-1, “Water Supply Demands, Supplies, and Project Benefits.”

BROW-5: Water released from Shasta Reservoir does flow into the Sacramento River where it is delivered to CVP contractors in the Sacramento Valley and also pumped from the South Delta for CVP contractors south of the Delta. It is reasonable to assume that if the BDCP were to be implemented, some water released from Shasta Dam would be conveyed through the Delta conveyance facilities to contractors south of the Delta. As described in Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” the BDCP is considered for the purposes of evaluating potential cumulative impacts of the SLWRI. Further speculation on implementation of the BDCP or similar programs is not required by NEPA.

Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

Responses to Comments from Greg Burgin on Behalf of Self


BURG-2: A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

BURG-3: 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.

_Responses to Comments from Eric Cassano on Behalf of Self_

CASS2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

CASS2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ENG-2, “Borrow Materials.”

CASS2-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

CASS2-4: The requested document has been mailed to Mr. Cassano. Text regarding sand and borrow sources within the Final EIS have been revised to provide clarification on the identified borrow sources for the construction of the dikes required for the various action alternatives. In the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that have been identified as potential sources for borrow material.

CASS2-5: As described in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix, Chapter 3, “Design Considerations for Dam and Appurtenances of Dam Enlargements,” multiple borrow sources are available to meet project needs. Material availability would vary with market demand and production restrictions, but it is expected that sufficient materials will be available when needed for construction. The sites that have been identified are included in the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites.” Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that have been identified as potential sources for borrow material. The construction contractor will make the final decision on where the aggregate sources for construction will be supplied from. Any commercial source would need to meet all applicable local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements.

CASS2-6: In the Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 25, “Potential Borrow Sites,” has been updated to include the commercial facilities information that has been identified as potential sources for borrow material. For further clarification refer to Master Comment Response ENG-2, “Borrow Materials.”

CASS2-7: NEPA regulations, 40 CFR 1502.4, states "proposals or parts of proposal which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement." The DEIS evaluates the entire SLWRI in a single impact statement and therefore meets NEPA regulations.
Responses to Comments from Tom Stokely on Behalf of California Water Impact Network and California Environmental Water Caucus

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

CWIN-2: This comment appears to be related to allocation of costs to project beneficiaries, which is outside the scope of the DEIS. 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(b)). As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-5, “Potential Project Financing,” an updated cost allocation was included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report. This comment was included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

CWIN-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”

CWIN-4: This comment appears to be related to allocation of costs to project beneficiaries, which is outside the scope of the DEIS. 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(b)). As described in Master Comment Response COST/BEN-5, “Potential Project Financing,” an updated cost allocation was included in the SLWRI Final Feasibility Report. This comment was included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

CWIN-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”

CWIN-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

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


CWIN-9: The EIS, Chapter 7, “Water Quality,” includes a discussion of heavy metals and the associated impacts. Mitigation measures have been developed to ensure that the one known site (Bully Hill area) will be
addressed. In addition Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” of the EIS includes a comprehensive list of environmental commitments, including preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to ensure compliance with relevant water quality requirements.

**Responses to Comments from Matt Davison on Behalf of Self**

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

**DAVI-2:** Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of EIS.”

**DAVI-3:** Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

**DAVI-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-9, “Relationship Between Recreation and Shasta Lake Water Levels.”

**DAVI-5:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

**DAVI-6:** Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

**Responses to Comments from David Martinez on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member**

**DMART2-1:** Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

**DMART2-2:** Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for SLWRI and provided to decision makers. 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.

**DMART2-3:** Water released from Shasta Reservoir does flow into the Sacramento River where it is delivered to CVP contractors in the Sacramento Valley and also pumped from the South Delta for CVP contractors south of the Delta. It is reasonable to assume that if the BDCP were to be implemented, some water released from Shasta Dam would be conveyed through the Delta conveyance facilities to contractors south of the Delta. As described in Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan,” the BDCP is considered for the purposes of evaluating potential cumulative impacts of the SLWRI. Further speculation on implementation of the BDCP or similar programs is not
required by NEPA. Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”

DMART2-4: It is unclear which reports the commenter is referencing. If the commenter is referencing reports related to the BDCP in comparison to reports related to the SLWRI, please see Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.” If the commenter is referencing reports related only to the SLWRI, please see Master Comment Response GEN-2, “Unsubstantiated Information.”

DMART2-5: Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6, “Areas of Controversy,” of the DEIS acknowledges that Native American concerns and cultural resources remain an area of controversy. The U.S. Congress will use this Final EIS, the related Final Feasibility Report, and supporting information, as well as any additional information they believe appropriate, to determine the public interest in the project, and the form scope of project authorization (if any). As this Final EIS chapter includes public and agency comments received on the DEIS, and responses to each of these comments, these decision makers will have a full characterization of the public interests.

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.”

DMART2-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

DMART2-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”

Responses to Comments from Larry Farr on Behalf of Mayor of the City of Shasta Lake
FARR-1: Comment noted.

FARR-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”
FARR-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response EJ-1, “Potential Effects to Disadvantaged Communities.”


FARR-5: As stated in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Chapter 4, “Design Consideration for Reservoir Area Infrastructure Modifications and/or Relocations,” Sections, “Recreation Facilities,” and “Public Boat Ramps,” that the public boat ramps that are affected by the action alternatives will be modified in place to allow for access. If for any reason the boat ramps cannot be modified in place the capacity will be relocated as to maintain recreation distribution around the lake.

The associated costs for modifications to the public boat ramps are accounted for in the overall cost estimates and can be found in detail in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix, Attachments 2 through 4, for the different action alternatives.

FARR-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

FARR-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response EJ-1, “Potential Effects to Disadvantaged Communities.”

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

FOTR3-1: Comment noted.

FOTR3-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response BDCP-1, “Relationship of the SLWRI to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.”


to the Eligibility of Rivers for Inclusion in the Federal Wild and Scenic River System.”

**FOTR3-6:** Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6, “Areas of Controversy,” of the DEIS acknowledges that Native American concerns and cultural resources remain an area of controversy. The U.S. Congress will use this Final EIS, the related Final Feasibility Report, and supporting information, as well as any additional information they believe appropriate, to determine the public interest in the project, and the form scope of project authorization (if any). As this Final EIS chapter includes public and agency comments received on the DEIS, and responses to each of these comments, these decision makers will have a full characterization of the public interests.

As stated in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.1.2, “Purpose and Need/Project Objectives,” of the DEIS, the Project purpose is to improve operational flexibility of the Delta watershed system of the existing Shasta Dam and Reservoir to meet specified primary and secondary project objectives including increasing survival of anadromous fish populations in the Sacramento River and increasing water supply and water supply reliability for agricultural, M&I, and environmental purposes, to help meet current and future water demands (primary objectives); and to conserve, restore and enhance ecosystem resources in the Shasta Lake area and the upper Sacramento River, reduce flood damage downstream, develop additional hydropower generation capabilities at Shasta Dam, maintain and increase recreation opportunities at Shasta Lake and maintain or improve water quality conditions downstream (secondary objectives). The DEIS examines the full range of impacts on the human environment of five action alternatives and a no action alternative.

Chapter 14, “Cultural Resources,” identifies impacts from inundation of Traditional Cultural Properties and Sacred Land Filings, which include Winnemem Wintu places of traditional, ceremonial, and sacred uses. See “Impact Culture-2” in 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.”

**FOTR3-7:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**FOTR3-8:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

FOTR3-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-3, “Botanical Resources Effects Related to Flow Regimes.”

FOTR3-11: NEPA requires full disclosure of the potential effects of Federal actions and accompanying alternatives and possible mitigation. The mitigation measure Bot-7 in Chapter 12, “Botanical Resources and Wetlands,” Section 12.3.5, “Mitigation Measures,” describes a range of performance measures to mitigate identified impacts on riparian and wetland communities.

Mitigation Measure Bot-7 identifies specific actions (modification of dam operations and funding restoration actions) that will be included in the final plan to avoid and compensate for impacts on riparian and wetland communities such that a no-net-loss performance standard is met. Mitigation Measure Bot-7 also identifies the minimum measures that will be implemented to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts. Details about off-site mitigation opportunities in the primary study area are not yet available. Potential mitigation lands containing comparable wetland and special-status species habitat comparable to those that would be affected by the action alternatives have been identified and specific details about how these lands may be used for mitigation will be discussed in detail in future documents and be subject to review by regulatory agencies and the public. The DEIS follows standard NEPA procedures in disclosing impacts on biological resources and providing mitigation measures that Reclamation will be required to implement following future Congressional authorization, that commits Reclamation to the measures. The intent of this document is to identify measures that are flexible and adaptable so they can be implemented effectively by Reclamation to respond to direct and indirect impacts on riparian and wetland habitats resulting from the project. The mitigation measure clearly states that a mitigation and adaptive management plan will be implemented and will include implementation funding mechanisms and criteria. On pages ES-32 and ES-33 of the Executive Summary, the DEIS identifies implementation of a comprehensive revegetation plan and a comprehensive mitigation strategy to minimize potential effects on biological resources as environmental commitments. Therefore, the document properly identifies the probability of implementation of mitigation as required under NEPA and commits Reclamation to implementing this mitigation.
As stated under Mitigation Measure Bot-7, Chapter 12, “Botanical Resources and Wetlands,” Section 12.3.5, “Mitigation Measures,” feasible measures in this context are those that are not in conflict with applicable laws, agreements, and regulations, or with the purpose of the project. Also as stated in Section 12.3.5, appropriate restoration actions are those that do any of the following: 1) enhance connectivity of river side channels (e.g., by modifying the elevation of secondary channels, remnant oxbows, or meander scars); 2) expand the river meander zone at selected locations (e.g., by assisting in funding projects that meet this objective); 3) increase floodplain connectivity (e.g., by assisting in funding projects that meet this objective); 4) control and remove nonnative, invasive plant species from riparian areas to shift dominance to native species; 5) create riparian and wetland communities (e.g., through plantings); and 6) increase shaded riverine aquatic habitat (e.g., through plantings). Because the plan would be developed in coordination with USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, and the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, each of these entities would have the opportunity to provide input on the appropriateness and feasibility of restoration actions.

FOTR3-12: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-2, “Alternative Development – Anadromous Fish Survival,” and Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

Responses to Comments from Jeanne France on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Tribal Member
FRAN-1: Please refer to response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

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

FRAN-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

FRAN-4: Thank you for providing your position relative to the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for the SLWRI and provided to decision makers. 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.

FRAN-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
FRAN-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response WSR-8, “Action Alternatives Don’t Meet All Water Demands.”

Responses to Comments from Nick Gardener on Behalf of Self
GARD-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”


Responses to Comments from Jerry Harral on Behalf of Self
HARR-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”

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

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

Responses to Comments from Buford Holt on Behalf of Self
HOLT4-1: Comment noted.

HOLT4-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General.”

HOLT4-3: The Final Feasibility Report was published with the Final EIS as an attachment. The Final Feasibility Report includes additional contextual information.

HOLT4-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-7: Comment noted.

HOLT4-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HOLT4-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
Responses to Comments from Robert Franklin on Behalf of Hoopa Valley Tribe (senior hydrologist)

HOOP-1: Comment noted.

HOOP-2: CalSim-II is the best available tool to represent CVP/SWP operations. Operations modeling was performed using the CalSim-II simulation model, the best available tool for predicting CVP/SWP system-wide water operations. Details on the CalSim-II model and the assumptions included in all simulations can be found in the Modeling Appendix, Chapter 2, “CalSim-II.” Also see Master Comment Response GEN-7, “Rules and Regulations for Water Operations under SLWRI Action Alternatives.”

Responses to Comments from Sue Horkey on Behalf of Self

HORK-1: The SLWRI is intended to evaluate alternatives that meet various legislative and planning directives as stated in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” and Chapter 2, “Alternatives.” Sites Reservoir is being evaluated under a separate study and is not considered an alternative to SLWRI as it would not provide the benefits to meet the SLWRI purpose and need and primary objectives. Please refer to Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives,” Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response ALTS-1 “Alternative Selection.”

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

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

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

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

HORK-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

HORK-7: Comment noted.

Responses to Comments from Catherine Joplin on Behalf of Self

JOPL1-1: Comment noted.

JOPL1-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
JOPL1-3: Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. Your comment will be included in the record for SLWRI and provide to the decision-makers. 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.


Responses to Comments from Kenwa Kravitz on Behalf of Winnemem Wintu Cultural Museum
KRAV-1: Comment noted.
KRAV-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”
KRAV-6: Comment noted.
KRAV-7: Thank you for sharing your history. 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.
KRAV-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from Colleen Leavitt on Behalf of Self
LEAV-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

LEAV-4: Comment noted.

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

LEAV-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-1, “Potential Effects to Cultural Resources.”


LEAV-9: Please refer to Master Comment Response CEQA-1, “CEQA Compliance.”

LEAV-10: The current reservoir is operated at levels sufficient to provide flood surcharge storage space to avoid overtopping during large flood events.


Responses to Comments from Craig Leigh on Behalf of Self

LEIG-1: As described in the Climate Change Modeling appendix, a wide range of drier climates than the historic climate were used to evaluate the sensitivity of enlarged Shasta to potential climate changes. Please refer to Master Comment Response CC-1, “Climate Change Uncertainty and Related Evaluations,” and Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

Responses to Comments from Linda Malone on Behalf of Self

MALO-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

MALO-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”
MALO-3: 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.

MALO-4: Comment noted.


MALO-6: Thank you for sharing your opinion on the SLWRI. 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.

Responses to Comments from Ed Marek on Behalf of Self
MARE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MARE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

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

MARE-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

MARE-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

MARE-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record,” and Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

Responses to Comments from Walt McNeil on Behalf of Self
MCNEI-1: Comment noted.
MCNEI-2: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-4: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

MCNEI-5: Reclamation operates the CVP in compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes and regulations, including Water Code Sections 10505 and 11460. Refer to, for example, Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, v. United States Department of The Interior, 721 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013); cert denied, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 2014 (U.S., Mar. 24, 2014).

Please refer to Master Comment Response WR-1, “Water Rights.”

Responses to Comments from David Mundt on Behalf of Self

MUND-1: Comment noted.


MUND-3: 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.


Responses to Comments from Michael Preston on Behalf of Self
PRES-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”


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

PRES-4: Please refer to Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.”


PRES-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response FRACK-1, “Water Supply Used for Fracking.”
Responses to Comments from Rex Rider on Behalf of Self

RIDE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-8, “Inundation Zone/Reservoir Buffer.”

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

RIDE-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response FSCABINS-3, “Relocation of Privately Owned Cabins on USFS Lands.”

Responses to Comments from Bill Schappell on Behalf of District 4

SCHAP-1: Comment noted.

SCHAP-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SCHAP-3: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-9, “Relationship Between Recreation and Shasta Lake Water Levels.”

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

SCHAP-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SCHAP-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response RBR-2, “Reduced Public Access Around Shasta Lake.”

SCHAP-7: The estimated costs and non-monetized benefits presented in the DEIS were determined by comparison of the with-project condition to the No-Action Alternative (future conditions, 2030 baseline), consistent with the Federal planning process identified in the U.S. Water Resources Council’s 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies (P&G).

For a summary of costs, please see the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Attachment 1, “Cost Estimates for Comprehensive Plans,” which estimates costs for the Comprehensive Plans. For a summary of the overall potential benefits, including increased water supply reliability, of all comprehensive plans, please see the Table 2-24, in Section 2.5, “Summary of Potential Benefits of Action Alternatives,” of Chapter 2, “Alternatives.” The quantified benefits were based on modeling efforts that are described in several parts of the DEIS: Chapter 6, “Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Water Management,” Chapter 11, “Fisheries and Aquatic Resources,” Chapter 23, “Power and Energy,” and the Modeling Appendix.
Please refer to Master Comment Response COST/BEN-1, “Intent of EIS and Process to Determine Federal Interest.”

**SCHAP-8:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

**SCHAP-9:** Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1 Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

**SCHAP-10:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability.”

**SCHAP-11:** Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

**Responses to Comments from Harold Jones on Behalf of Sugarloaf Cottages Resort**

**SCR2-1:** Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-5, “Relocation of Private Recreation Facilities onto Federal Lands.”

**SCR2-2:** Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-5, “Relocation of Private Recreation Facilities onto Federal Lands.”

**SCR2-3:** Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. A response to this type of comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

**SCR2-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response PLAR-1, “Effects to Private Residences and Businesses.”


**SCR2-6:** Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

**SCR2-7:** Comment noted.

**SCR2-8:** Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”
Responses to Comments from Geenie Seely on Behalf of Self
SEEL-2-1: Comment noted.

SEEL-2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response NEPA-1, “Sufficiency of the EIS.”

SEEL-2-3: Comment noted.


SEEL-2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

SEEL-2-6: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-8, “Public Outreach and Involvement,” and Master Comment Response EI-1, “Intent of NEPA Process to Provide Fair and Full Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.”

SEEL-2-7: Comment noted.

Responses to Comments from Chief Caleen Sisk on Behalf of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe
SISK-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”


SISK-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-3, “Current Effects to Cultural Resources.”


SISK-7: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”

SISK-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response FISHPASS-1, “Fish Passage Above Shasta Dam.”
SISK-9: As stated in the DEIS Engineering Summary Appendix Chapter 3, “Design Consideration for Dam and Appurtenances of Dam Enlargements” Sections, “Reservoir Area Dikes,” dikes will be required in the Lakeshore and Bridge Bay area to protect California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) highways and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) from inundation.

SISK-10: Please refer to Master Comment Response CR-2, “Federal Recognition.”

Responses to Comments from Matt Doyle on Behalf of Shasta Lake Business Owners Association
SLBOA2-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

SLBOA2-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1. “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

SLBOA2-3: 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.

SLBOA2-4: 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.

SLBOA2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities.”

SLBOA2-6: Thank you for your comment on the DEIS for the SLWRI, we appreciate your time in responding to the document. A response to this comment is not required under NEPA because the comment does not raise a significant environmental issue (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1503.4). Many comment authors expressed personal opinions, histories or experiences which are not appropriately addressed as part of the NEPA process. This comment will be included as part of the record and
made available to decision makers before a final decision on the proposed project.

**SLBOA2-7:** Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake.”

**SLBOA2-8:** 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.

**SLBOA2-9:** Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

**Responses to Comments from Anna Harkradr on Behalf of Read by Michael Tichera from Shasta Marina Resort**

**SMR2-1:** As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” relocation plans were developed to verify that for each action alternative, the existing recreational capacity could be maintained. Reclamation and USFS will continue to work together to develop and finalize plans for relocation of recreational facilities that is suitable for the National Recreation Area, should an alternative be authorized by Congress. At a minimum the current available capacities would be maintained, inundated and affected facilities would be relocated to the extent practicable. Chapter 2, Alternatives, Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” text has been revised to clarify that the affected marinas would be maintained in the immediate vicinity, but due to unforeseen circumstances preventing this, relocating or consolidating with other marinas would be reconsidered. In the Final EIS Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 39, “Recreation Site Status,” has also been updated to reflect that affected marinas would be relocated in place.

**SMR2-2:** While we thank you for information regarding the operations of your marina 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.

**SMR2-3:** While we thank you for information regarding the operations of your marina 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.

SMR2-4: As stated in the DEIS Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” relocation plans were developed to verify that for each action alternative, the existing recreational capacity could be maintained. Reclamation and USFS will continue to work together to develop and finalize plans for relocation of recreational facilities that is suitable for the National Recreation Area, should an alternative be authorized by Congress. At a minimum the current available capacities would be maintained, inundated and affected facilities would be relocated to the extent practicable. Chapter 2, Alternatives, Section 2.3.8, “Comprehensive Plan Construction Activities,” text has been revised to clarify that the affected marinas would be maintained in the immediate vicinity, but due to unforeseen circumstances preventing this, relocating or consolidating with other marinas would be reconsidered. In the Final EIS Engineering Summary Appendix Plate 39, “Recreation Site Status,” has also been updated to reflect that affected marinas would be relocated in place.

SMR2-5: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities.”

SMR2-6: 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.

Responses to Comments from Russ Wade on Behalf of Self
WADE-1: Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

WADE-2: Please refer to Master Comment Response RAH-1, “Available Water to Fill an Enlarged Reservoir.”

WADE-3: 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.

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


**Responses to Comments from Greg Watkins on Behalf of Councilman of the City of Shasta**

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

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

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

**WATK-4:** Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-3, “Effects to Tourism at Shasta Lake.”

**WATK-5:** A detailed discussion on management of the cold-water pool for anadromous fish is presented in Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” Section 2.3.6, “Operations and Maintenance,” for CP4 and CP4A. It is explained that Reclamation would work cooperatively with the SRTTG (Sacramento River Temperature Task Group) to determine the best use of the cold-water pool each year under an adaptive cold water management plan. Reclamation would manage the cold-water pool and operate Shasta Dam each year based on recommendations from the SRTTG. Because adaptive management is predicated on using best available science and new information to make decisions, a monitoring program would be implemented as part of the adaptive management plan. SRTTG members would conduct monitoring, develop monitoring protocols, and set performance standards to determine the success of adaptive management actions.

**WATK-6:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTR-1, “Range of Alternatives – General,” and Master Comment Response ALTS-1, “Alternative Selection.”

**WATK-7:** Please refer to Master Comment Response DSFISH-8, “National Marine Fisheries Service Recovery Plan, Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Doubling Goals and Biological Opinions.”
WATK-8: Please refer to Master Comment Response REC-4, “Relocation of Recreation Facilities,” and Master Comment Response REC-1, “Effects to Recreation at Shasta Lake.”

WATK-9: As discussed in Chapter 2, “Alternatives,” potential borrow sources were examined at a preliminary level and would need further sampling and testing to determine suitability and refine quantity estimates. A maximum haul route distance of 20 miles was assumed to evaluate a worst-case scenario of traffic, noise and air quality impacts related to haul of borrow materials. Borrow sites will be refined during the final design and permitting phases of the project.


Responses to Comments from Peggy Williams on Behalf of Self

WILL2-1: Comment noted.

WILL2-2: Increased law enforcement needs of an enlarged Shasta Dam are presented in Chapter 22, “Public Services,” Section 22.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”


WILL2-4: Increased law enforcement needs of an enlarged Shasta Dam are presented in Chapter 22, “Public Services,” Section 22.3.4, “Direct and Indirect Effects.”

WILL2-5: As described in the DEIS Appendices Engineering Summary Appendix, bridge relocations and modifications are described. The Pit River Bridge will require modifications but will remain in place, and no major traffic disruptions are expected.

WILL2-6: As stated in the DEIS Appendices Plan Formulation Appendix Chapter 3, “Shasta Dam and Reservoir Enlargement Scenarios,” raises of up to 30 feet can be accomplished by raising the existing dam crest. A raise greater than 30 feet would require additional mass be added to the structure.

WILL2-7: 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.

**WILL2-8:** Please refer to Master Comment Response ALTD-1, “Alternative Development – Water Supply Reliability,” and Master Comment Response P&N-1, “Purpose and Need and Objectives.”

**WILL2-9:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-5, “Some People Support Dam Raise and Others Oppose Dam Raise.”

**WILL2-10:** Please refer to Master Comment Response SOCIOECON-1, “Socioeconomic Effects to Shasta Lake Vicinity.”

**WILL2-11:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**WILL2-12:** Please refer to Master Comment Response GEN-1, “Comment Included as Part of the Record.”

**WILL2-13:** Comment noted.