

No. 305

Email from David Janott, Dated September 29, 2002

305-1

Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

 Subject: **Fish Passage Improvement Project at the RBDD**
 Date: 9/29/2002 11:47:06 AM Pacific Standard Time
 From: dkjsla@snowcrest.net
 To: tcwaterman@aol.com
 Sent from the Internet (Details)

This is a written comment submitted with regard to the subject item.

Thank you for providing printed and oral information concerning this far reaching project. Those responsible for answering individual requests for information were most helpful. In addition, the presentation of Sept 25th afforded all interested parties a clear and thorough picture of the current situation as well as the options.

While the short term economics speak in favor of maintaining Lake Red Bluff, in the long run, the only sustainable approach is the Gates-out Alternative. We cannot be assured that new fish ladders, built at huge expense, will be successful. When the current fish ladders were created we thought at that time they were the answer. Unfortunately we were wrong. Nothing in the presentation or the printed material indicates new fish ladders would necessarily be successful. The only fact guaranteed is that any attempt to maintain Lake Red Bluff for two months, four months or any period will result in further declines in the fish population. This will result in this entire issue being revisited again and again with the ultimate resolution being the elimination of gate operations. We can do it now, save the fish, and build a tourist economy based on a robust river. Or we will do it later when the fish are endangered or near extinction and have nothing but a near-dead river upon which to build an economic base. The residents of Red Bluff and Tehama County would be better off if we faced this situation now. Keep the gates out.

305-1

David Janott
14600 River Oaks Dr
Red Bluff, CA 96080
DKJSLA@SNOWCREST.NET

Tuesday, October 01, 2002 America Online: Tcwaterman

No. 306**Email from R.P. Scott, Dated September 29, 2002**

-----Original Message-----

From: rpscott2 <rpscott2@tco.net>
 To: tcwaterman.@aol.com <tcwaterman.@aol.com>
 Date: Sunday, September 29, 2002 11:30 AM
 Subject: Tehama County Diversion Dam

After attending the meeting on "Save Lake Red Bluff" last Wed. evening, I came away with the opinion that we're wasting our time arguing for the continuation of the summer dam closure. I agree with the philosophy of "The needs of the many outweighs the needs of the few". However, the bureaucrats seem to be under the impression that everyone is as self-centered and greedy as they are. Instead of stating the simple fact that the dam has to remain open all year-round to better accomodate the water needs throughout the valley, they give us a bunch of rhetoric about fish passage etc. If we know that the elimination of the lake is inevitable, instead of wasting time at these meetings, we could be coming up with alternative ways to bring revenues into our city. The dam will need to be raised and lowered each year until construction of the pump station is completed and its not clear how long that will take. It was my understanding that in any case, whether the lake stays or goes, a new pump station will be needed to get enough water into the irrigation canals during the summer months. We should certainly discourage dismantling the dam so that if, for any reason, the pumps should fail they could return to the old method of lowering the dam and backing the water up into the canals for irrigation.

I have heard from some long-time residents that the citizens of Red Bluff fought to keep the dam from being constructed, in the first place. It was their opinion that it would disrupt the fish migration, damage the scenic beauty of the free flowing river and take away the revenues gained from sports fisherman coming to the area. It is now apparent that they were right. However, once the dam was in place, the citizens of Red Bluff took advantage of the resulting lake and put in parks, launching ramps, marinas etc. to enhance the enjoyment of the surrounding area. They also managed to get the Drag Boat Races presented here to bring in additional revenues. If the lake must be discontinued, I have no doubt that we will come up with alternative plans to enjoy and profit from the river and abundant fish migration expected in future years. However, let us begin preparing for that future instead of stalling and giving false hope. At this point, the only ones profiting from this controversy seems to be the government representatives that are being paid to sit like Fence Posts and pretend to listen to our fruitless arguments for retaining the lake. I worry that financial contributions, to the

306-1

Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

306-1

Tuesday, October 01, 2002 America Online: Tewaterman

No. 306

Email from R.P. Scott, Continued

Page 2 of 2

project, will be wasted paying attorney fees and legal costs that will only postpone the inevitable.
As a river-front property owner, we intend to stay here weather the lake stays or goes.
Although we enjoy the summertime beauty of the lake and the boating, we will also appreciate the beauty of the river flowing freely past our property, watching the salmon swimming upstream and they can't take away those gorgeous sunsets. One way or the other, we will continue to enjoy living in Red Bluff. Our only concern is what's best for the majority of our county's citizens and we're having a hard time getting a clear understanding of that.

} 306-1,
cont'd

Tuesday, October 01, 2002 America Online: Tewaterman

No. 307

Email from Gwen Ontiveros, Dated September 30, 2002

307-1

Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

Subject: **Sacramento River**
Date: 9/30/2002 6:14:42 PM Pacific Standard Time
From: redwoodlady@orickarts.com
Reply-to: sitemanager@orickarts.com
To: tcwaterman@aol.com
Sent from the Internet (Details)

Please, allow the Sacramento River and it's natural inhabitants to resume its natural status.

By now humanity should have learned that the real gift of life includes learning to live with creation, as its caretakers and guardians, not focus on distorting creation to suit the self-interest of individuals who have accumulated the power to lead the sleepwalking public around by the pinkie finger.

It is in the best interest of mankind to co-exist with and nourish the natural world we live in. This planet is the Garden, we just have to learn how to be its benevolent gardeners.

Gwen Ontiveros
Orick Arts

307-1

Tuesday, October 01, 2002 America Online: Tcwaterman

TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY
Fish Passage Improvement Project
at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam

No. 308

Comment Sheet from Helen W. Morris, Dated September 28, 2002

308-1 See Response to Comment 26-1.

COMMENT SHEET
Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report
Public Hearing
September 25, 2002

Name HELEN W. MORRIS
Address 94 DALE AVE
REDBLUFF CA 96080

Please add my name to your mailing list. Yes No

R.B. Lake is quite an attraction for travelers as well as residents. It makes our city a destination for people who enjoy water sports. These visitors contribute greatly to our economy.

It would a great mistake, in my opinion, to limit our lake to less than the 4 months we are privileged to enjoy it.

9-28-02 Helen W. Morris

} 308-1

(Continued)

Submit comments at this meeting or send comments to: Art Bullock/Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, P.O. Box 1025, Willows, CA 95988, Fax 530.934.2355, E-mail tcwaterman@aol.com. The public comment period ends November 5, 2002.

No. 309

Flyer from Helen R. Gallacher, Dated September 25, 2002

309-1

Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

Save our lake, our recreation and our economy!

Yes Mr. Bullock, I have chosen to support alternative 1a endorsed by the Red Bluff City Council in its resolution adopted on May 7, 2002. I believe this alternative will serve in the best interest of all parties involved. You may accept and count this notice as my vote for alternative 1a.

Helen R. Gallacher
Name (Please Print)

Helen R. Gallacher
Signature

Sept 25, 2002
Date

1302 Lincoln St.
Address

Red Bluff, GA 30080
City, State, Zip Code

Paid Advertisement made possible by:
Gaumer's Jewelry
Raging Fork Bar & Grill
Red Bluff Round-Up Association
Walker Printing
A&J Events

No. 310

Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Dated September 24, 2002

310-1 This comment letter is duplicate to Comment Letter 299.

MICHAEL T. SHEPHERD
RICHARD L. CRABTREE
LINDSEY A. NAYDUCH
RON S. CHAPLIN

LAW OFFICES
SHEPHERD & CRABTREE
(530) 893-3700

1367 EAST LASSEN AVENUE
SUITE 1
CHICO, CA 95973
FAX (530) 893-1579

September 24, 2002

Via Facsimile & U.S. Mail

Arthur R. Bullock,
General Manager & Chief Engineer
Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority
P. O. Box 1025
Willows, California 95988
FAX: (530) 934-2355

Max Stodolski, Reclamation Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
Red Bluff Division
P.O. Box 159
Red Bluff, CA 96080
FAX: (530) 529-3895

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement/
Environmental Impact Report For the Fish Passage
Improvement Project At the Red Bluff Diversion Dam

Dear Mr. Bullock and Mr. Stodolski:

This office represents the City of Red Bluff in matters related to the proposed Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam ("Project"). The purpose of this letter is to request a thirty (30) day extension in the comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report ("DEIS/EIR") for the Project.

There are many reasons for this request. Most simply, the DEIS/EIR is very voluminous and contains a great deal of technical information which simply requires a substantial amount of time to review and analyze, in order to provide meaningful comments.

In addition, the DEIS/EIR relies on technical data and studies which are not included in the DEIS/EIR or its appendices. Our biological consultant, Mr. David Vogel, has had some difficulty in retrieving the technical information relied on in the DEIS/EIR. Of course, in order to accomplish a thorough review of the DEIS/EIR and its analysis, it is also necessary to review the technical data upon which the DEIS/EIR relies. The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") requires that technical data relied on "be readily available for public examination." (CEQA Guidelines §15147.)

} 310-1

No. 310

Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Continued

Arthur R. Bullock
 Max Stodolski
 September 24, 2002
 Re: City of Red Bluff –
 Fish Passage Improvement Project
 Page 2

In addition, it is clear that there were some substantial problems in printing and distributing the DEIS/EIR after it supposedly became available for public comment. Many persons, including the undersigned, did not receive their requested copies of the DEIS/EIR for several days. This is also true for the copy of the DEIS/EIR requested by Mr. Vogel. In addition, CD versions of the document were not available until the week of September 9. Contrary to public notices in the newspaper, the DEIS/EIR was not available on the Internet until approximately September 13, 2002. There are also apparently problems with the on-line ordering process for a CD version of the document.

Finally, the sheer importance and magnitude of the proposed Project, and its potential or probable impacts, require that the public be given ample opportunity to review and evaluate the DEIS/EIR, and comment thereon. "Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process." (CEQA Guidelines §15201.) Public agencies are required to provide processes "for wide public involvement, formal and informal, . . . in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities." (*Id.*) "Public review provides the dual purpose of bolstering the public's confidence in the agency's decision and providing the agency with information from a variety of experts and sources." (*Schoen v California Dept. of Forestry*, 58 Cal.App.4th 556, 574 (1997))

On behalf of the City of Red Bluff, and other interested parties and participants in this process, we request a thirty (30) day extension in the comment period in order to allow a full and fair opportunity for the public to submit detailed comments regarding this important project.

Thank you for your consideration in this regard. If you have any comments or questions, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

 SHEPHERD & CRABTREE
 RICHARD L. CRABTREE

RLC:tc
 cc: CH2M Hill FAX: (530) 339-3238
 2525 Airpark Drive
 Redding, CA 96001
 Attention: Mike Urkov
 Dale Cannon

310-1,
 cont'd

No. 310

Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Continued, Attachment A

Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

Officers:

Robert Williams
Chairman

Ken LaGrande
Vice Chairman

Shelly Massa
Secretary

Michael D. Hagman
Treasurer

Arthur R. Bullock
General Manager
& Chief Engineer

Member Agencies:

Directors:

Colusa County Water District
Douglas Griffin

Corning Water District
Barbara Patton-Sichel

Cortina Water District
Fritz Grimmer

Davis Water District
Tom Charter

Dunnigan Water District
Tom Munna

4-M Water District
Marion C. Mathis

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Sandy Denu

Glide Water District
Norala Michael

Kanawha Water District
Ronald W. Vickery

Kirkwood Water District
Larry Brockman

LaGrande Water District
Ken LaGrande

Orland-Artois Water District
John Enos

Proberta Water District
Don Lawley

Thomes Creek Water District
Robert Williams

Westside Water District
Robert Harper

5513 Highway 162
P.O. Box 1025
Willows, CA 95988
Phone: (530) 934-2125
Fax: (530) 934-2355
EMAIL: twaterman@aol.com

October 1, 2002

Mr. Richard L. Crabtree
Shepherd & Crabtree
1367 East Lassen Avenue
Chico, CA 95973

Re: Request for Review Time Extension, Draft EIS/EIR for the Fish
Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

Dear Mr. Crabtree:

This letter is in response to your request of September 24, 2002, for a thirty (30) day extension in the comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/EIR) for the fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam (Project).

Since the DEIS/EIR is indeed very voluminous and contains a great deal of technical information which takes time to analyze, the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority feels that an extension to the comment period closure date from the current October 30, 2002 to November 30, 2002 is appropriate. We have also requested that the US Bureau of Reclamation concur in this extension. Upon Reclamation's concurrence, which will be provided to you by separate letter, the new closure date will be official.

This modification will provide the City of Red Bluff and other interested parties and participants in the review process the additional time desired to submit detailed comments regarding this important project.

Sincerely,



Arthur R. Bullock
General Manager & Chief Engineer

cc: Max Stodolski, Reclamation
Susan Price, City of Red Bluff
Dave Meurer, Congressman Herger's Red Bluff Office

No. 310

Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Continued, Attachment B



Gray Davis
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse



Tal Finney
INTERIM DIRECTOR

Arthur R. Bullock
Tehama Colusa Canal Authority
5513 Highway 162
Willows, CA 95988

Subject: Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam
SCH#: 2002042075

Dear Arthur R. Bullock:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on October 15, 2002, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0615 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
916-445-0613 FAX 916-323-3018 WWW.OPR.CA.GOV

No. 310**Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Continued, Attachment B****Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH#	2002042075		
Project Title	Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam		
Lead Agency	Tehama Colusa Canal Authority		
<hr/>			
Type	EIR Draft EIR		
Description	Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/EIR) analyzing methods to improve fish passage and create reliable agricultural water supply at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.		
<hr/>			
Lead Agency Contact			
Name	Arthur R. Bullock		
Agency	Tehama Colusa Canal Authority		
Phone	530 934-2125	Fax	
emall			
Address	5513 Highway 162		
City	Willows	State	CA Zip 95988
<hr/>			
Project Location			
County	Tehama		
City	Red Bluff, Tehama		
Region			
Cross Streets	Road 99W/Altube Avenue		
Parcel No.	035-047-006/007/009/016		
Township	27N	Range	3W Section 33 Base
<hr/>			
Proximity to:			
Highways	99 & 36		
Airports	Red Bluff Municipal		
Railways	Union Pacific		
Waterways	Sacramento River, Red Bank Creek		
Schools	Visa/Sac. River Discover Center		
Land Use	Government and General Industrial (Tehama County)		
<hr/>			
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Landuse; Cumulative Effects		
<hr/>			
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 1; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 2; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Redding); Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission		
<hr/>			
Date Received	08/29/2002	Start of Review	08/29/2002 End of Review 10/15/2002

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

No. 310

Letter from Richard L. Crabtree, Continued, Attachment C

OCT 15 2002 (TUE) 10:53 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (FAX) 530 275 2441 P. 001/001

NC-340
ENV-4.10

OCT - 1 2002

Mr. Richard L. Crabtree
Shepherd & Crabtree
1367 East Lassen Avenue
Chico, CA 95973Subject: Request for Review Time Extension - Draft Environmental Impact
Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/EIR) for the Fish Passage Improvement
Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam

Dear Mr. Crabtree:

This letter is in response to your request of September 24, 2002, and a subsequent request from Congressman Herger's office, for a 30-day extension of the comment period for the DEIS/EIR for the fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

Since the DEIS/EIR is voluminous and contains a great deal of technical information that takes time to analyze, the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority and the Bureau of Reclamation feel that an extension to the comment period is appropriate. Accordingly, we are extending the comment period closure date from October 30, 2002, to November 30, 2002.

This modification will provide the city of Red Bluff, other interested parties, and participants in the review process the additional time desired to submit detailed comments regarding this important project. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Buford Holt at 530-275-1554; TDD: 530-275-8991.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. RYAN

Michael J. Ryan
Area ManagerWBR:BFHolt:mecelli:10/01/02:530-275-1554
i:\data\holt\time\ext req ok.doc

Authored Copy

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Dated September 25, 2002

1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

TEHAMA-COLUSA CANAL AUTHORITY
FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
AT THE RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM

COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2002
6:45 P.M. - 8:45 P.M.
AT THE RED BLUFF COMMUNITY CENTER, RED BLUFF, CA

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY:
MARY J. CHRISTENSEN, CSR #11549
COURT REPORTER
P.O. BOX 711
RED BLUFF, CA 96080
(530) 527-5605

ORIGINAL

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

2

1 **SEPTEMBER 25, 2002**

2 --oOo--

3 **CHRIS PROUD:** My name is Chris Proud, I am an
4 associate planner at CH2M Hill. We'll get some brief
5 introductions from the folks sitting up here in the front.
6 We'll also provide some ground rules for the public hearing
7 so you all understand exactly how it is going to work
8 tonight. We'll also give some comment options and explain
9 exactly how your comments will be taken tonight. And, we'll
10 have a presentation from Mike Urkov, who is the project
11 manager for CH2M Hill, and an overview of the environmental
12 document, and then we'll get into your public comments, and
13 we'll try and get through this all quickly so we can get to
14 the comments, which is the purpose for all of you being here
15 this evening.

16 With that, I will do a couple brief introductions.
17 Tonight we have with us a couple hearing representatives from
18 the agencies.

19 From the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Max Stodolski.
20 He is filling in for the moment for John Davis, who is
21 running about five to ten minutes behind schedule, but these
22 folks will be sitting up here at the front table. We also
23 have Bob Williams, who is the chair of the TCCA board. So
24 they are both here tonight to hear your comments.

25 With that I want to talk a little bit about our
26 meeting tonight, the purpose is two fold. The first part of

No. 311 _

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

3

1 our meeting is the public open house, was your opportunity to
2 look at the information that is displayed about the project,
3 get your questions answered. An interactive part of
4 tonight's meeting.

5 Now, the second phase that we are moving into is our
6 public hearing. And the public hearing is for -- the
7 agencies will be up here, it is more a listening exercise.
8 They need to hear what you have to say. So on your side, you
9 will be speaking and providing your comments and the agencies
10 will be listening closely.

11 So the way that it will work is the comments that you
12 give here tonight, whether you get up and say your comments
13 verbally or leave them in the comment box or send them in at
14 a later date, they will be addressed in our final
15 environmental document. So they will all be addressed in a
16 similar way.

17 In addition to that there are different ways you can
18 provide comments. We have a comment box in the box or you
19 can get up and speak here tonight, as I mentioned previously,
20 as well. So there are a couple of different opportunities
21 for you to provide information tonight.

22 We do have some ground rules that I want to go
23 through. These are necessary, because we have a lot of
24 people here tonight, a lot of people who want to speak. So
25 we want to make sure the process is efficient and we need to
26 have some ground rules and hold to them pretty closely, they

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

4

1 include:

2 Respecting a time limit. We are going to have a time
3 limit on the public comments tonight, it will be three
4 minutes;

5 We need to respect others opinions and their right to
6 speak here tonight. You are probably going to hear things
7 tonight that maybe you don't agree with, but everybody has
8 the opportunity to stand up and say what they think tonight
9 as well;

10 We also need to be seated and approach the podium or
11 actually our microphone that we have up here when your name
12 is called, and I will explain how that process is going to
13 work in a moment as well;

14 And then also direct your comments to the front table.
15 Our lead agency representatives that I just introduced will
16 be sitting up here at the front table, and they are the
17 appropriate people that need to be hearing what you have to
18 say tonight;

19 And, finally, just respecting the speaker. And what I
20 mean by that is if you can remain quiet and if you have any
21 side conversations if you can take them out in the hall. If
22 you have a cell phone, if you could shut it off. And, sort
23 of limit applause and other things like that that aren't
24 appropriate for this type of meeting.

25 So, again, what we have is our comments -- or, I am
26 sorry, our ground rules, they are posted in a couple

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

5

1 different locations around the room and we will refer back to
2 them later on tonight.

3 One other housekeeping issue that I want to note is
4 restrooms out the main door here down the hallway and on your
5 right-hand side. So, obviously, if you need to get up and
6 leave the room during comments tonight, that is appropriate
7 as well. So that is the only housekeeping thing that I have.

8 With that, I would like to talk a little bit about the
9 comment process. And what we have tonight, we want to make
10 sure you all have the opportunity to be equally heard and we
11 will give you your three minutes to do that. To that end, we
12 have a speaker card system. We have given the information to
13 you at the front desk when you signed in. If you do want to
14 speak tonight, you need to fill out a card and tell us that.
15 We will call those cards in the order we received them and we
16 will be calling people up to the microphone in the front, we
17 will call the speaker and second person in line as well. We
18 would like the first person to approach the mic and then the
19 second person, there is a seat back there, you can remain
20 standing and simply approach the mic so we limit time of
21 people getting up from their seats and moving across the room
22 to make the comments tonight.

23 The other thing that we have tonight is the three
24 minute time limit, and I can give you some information on
25 that as well. In the interest of making sure you all have
26 sufficient time to speak, we have a timekeeper, it is

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

6

1 Mary Swain, who is here tonight, and she will be keeping
2 time. After about two minutes she is going to hold up a
3 yellow card to let you know that you have an additional
4 minute to sort of wrap up your comments. And then beyond
5 that, at three minutes she will hold up a red card, which
6 concludes your verbal comments for tonight. Now, that
7 doesn't -- we don't want to stop you from commenting,
8 obviously, but we do need to keep to a time limit. So if you
9 have additional comments that you want to make, you can fill
10 out a comment sheet in the back, drop it in the box, and mail
11 it in or e-mail it in. You have actually until
12 November 5th to provide your comments, so there is more
13 opportunity beyond just tonight to provide those comments to
14 us on the environmental document.

15 Now, as far as the speaker part, just one last sort of
16 note on the speaker cards. We will have speaker cards
17 available to all of you throughout the remainder of the
18 night. If you can identify Sharon Younkens in the yellow and
19 black in the back of the room holding up her hand, she has
20 speaker cards for everyone. So if you find that you need one
21 throughout the night, simply raise your hand and Sharon can
22 provide one to you.

23 So with that there is one other final comment I would
24 like to make at least in regard to our process to speed the
25 verbal comment process along, is if someone makes a comment
26 tonight that you agree with and you simply want to reiterate

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

7

1 that comment, what you can do is get up in the front, simply
2 state your name for the record, and state that you agree with
3 that person's comments and we will enter those exact same
4 comments for you under their name so we don't have an issue
5 of people repeating the same comments throughout the night
6 but yet we fully understand that that is your comment and we
7 understand simply the importance of that and how many times
8 that comment is made. That is one way to speed it along, but
9 it is your choice, you have three minutes to use.

10 One other thing I would like to comment about is, and
11 I have mentioned this a couple times, a few different ways to
12 provide comments is: We have your verbal comments, I want to
13 stress we have the comment sheets in the back of the room,
14 they provide contact information, you can mail that comment
15 sheet in, you can e-mail it, you can e-mail your comments --
16 and all the comments, regardless of how they are submitted
17 whether you say them here tonight or not, will be treated
18 similarly in the final environmental document, which is the
19 next phase of the project. And that is really where your
20 comments that you say tonight will be actually responded to.

21 The way the process works here in the public
22 commenting is, again, it is a listening exercise for the
23 agencies, they will be hearing what you are saying but they
24 will not be responding to the comments that you make tonight.
25 So I want to make sure that is clear and that people don't
26 have unreal expectations about that. So we are listening

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

8

1 closely, we are taking it down with a court reporter for the
2 public record, and all of your comments will be responded to
3 in the final environmental document, which is the next phase
4 of the project.

5 So our comment period, in closing, is actually on
6 November the 5th. This is a little different than some of
7 the materials we sent out previously, so it has been extended
8 to November the 5th at this point. So you can send in those
9 comments until November 5th.

10 And, with that, that kind of covers my introductions
11 as far as how the process will work and so on. As I
12 mentioned, we will be calling people up in a moment. I would
13 like to turn it over to Mike Urkov, who will provide a brief
14 overview of the presentation for tonight as well.

15 Again, folks in the back, there are seats available up
16 front here if you want to take a seat as well. We would be
17 glad to do that for you. So there are empty seats here,
18 please feel free to move on in.

19 **MIKE URKOV:** My name is Mike Urkov. I am here to talk
20 in a brief manner about the environmental document, which is
21 the primary reason why we are here tonight. I am going to
22 pass through a couple of concepts fairly quickly. I hope
23 that a large percentage of you took advantage of the
24 opportunity to go around and talk to some of the technical
25 experts who are here available to answer some questions, and
26 I hope that that is useful for you to gain an understanding

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

9

1 of the project and different aspects of the project.

2 What we are here talking about tonight is
3 fundamentally Lake Red Bluff, which is formed by Red Bluff
4 Diversion Dam. And at its most basic element, the dam is
5 putting the water and is used to elevate the level of the
6 water behind the dam so that water can be diverted by gravity
7 into the Tehama Colusa Canal authority. Tehama Colusa --

8 Can we get one more bank of lights off, please?

9 Thank you.

10 Now, over time, the amount or the length of the time
11 that the gates have been in have been decreasing fairly
12 steadily. In 1966, the dam's first year of operation, the
13 gates were in twelve months out of the year and since 1986
14 that has been a steadily decreasing trend to the current
15 four-month gate operation. The gates are in four months out
16 of the year, they go in about May 15th and stay open until
17 September 15th.

18 The primary reason the gate operation has been reduced
19 has been in response to the difficulty of fish to get by the
20 dam. What we have here is a simple picture of fish milling
21 around below the dam, which causes concerns about fish
22 ability to get passed the dam to the necessary spawning area.
23 Likewise, the reduction in gate operations has created a
24 squeeze on agriculture where the amount of time -- or the
25 demand for water for agriculture now exceeds the amount of
26 time that the gates are in and available to convert water for

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

10

1 agriculture along the Corning and Tehama Colusa Canal.

2 Given those two issues, the project came together
3 several years ago and developed a project purpose which has
4 two parts:

5 Part number one, to substantially improve the long
6 term ability to reliably pass fish by the Red Bluff Diversion
7 Dam; and also cost effectively move water to the district
8 served by the Tehama Colusa Canal.

9 In looking at those two project purposes, we have
10 developed the following sets of alternatives. And in
11 environmental document jargon, we talk about a No Action
12 Alternative, and that is a condition that would occur if we
13 were to do nothing, if we were to not take action, what would
14 happen? And likely what would happen is the gates would
15 remain in to the foreseeable future a four-month operation as
16 they currently are, the ladders would remain as they
17 currently are, and pumping capacity would be around 400 CFS.

18 The first two sets of alternatives we are talking
19 about are a four-month gate operation, Alternative 1A and 1B:

20 Under Alternative 1A, the gate operation would remain
21 the same, approximately May 15th to September 15th, and new
22 ladders would be put in to improve traction water systems,
23 would be put in place, and the pumping capacity, the ability
24 to put water into the canal, would be increased to 1,700 CFS.
25 So a large increase of what is available now;

26 Alternative 1B was added to the suite of alternatives

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

11

1 following a fairly extensive public input from the project.
2 And under that alternative, gates would remain in four months
3 out of the year, as they are now, and the primary means for
4 moving fish around the dam would be construction of a bypass
5 zone. Bypass channels have been engineered in such a way to
6 overcome past shortfalls that were identified in previous
7 bypass facilities and at the same time to build something
8 that our engineering staff does that is practical and
9 something that you can actually put into the ground. We will
10 talk about that a little more in a minute.

11 In addition, we say, "Well, another thing that you can
12 do to improve fish passage would be to reduce the amount of
13 time the gates are in." Again, following the trend that we
14 have seen previously, and we have two alternatives to
15 consider to reduce month gate operation. Both of them are
16 two-month gate operations with gates going in in July and
17 coming out at the end of August:

18 Alternative 2A with new ladders and the 2000 CFS
19 pumping capacity; and Alternative 2B with gates in in July
20 and out in August but no changes to ladders. So the
21 improvement in fish passage comes solely from the reduction
22 in gate operations.

23 **CHIS PROUD:** Mike, just a second, I understand not
24 everyone can hear, so if you can pull the mic out and hold it
25 in front, that would be great.

26 **MIKE URKOV:** Is this better?

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

12

1 And Alternative 3 is an alternative where the gates
2 are not placed in the river anymore, zero month gate
3 operation, and this would require the maximum pumping
4 capacity of 2,500 CFS but, of course, ladders are no longer
5 needed because the gates aren't in the water impeding fish.

6 This is generally a footprint of a pumping facility
7 shown here just across Red Bank Creek. What we're showing
8 there is the maximum size pump station, that is as big as it
9 can be. And this shows the left ladder, which is looking
10 downstream. The ladder on the left side is your left ladder,
11 the ladder on the right side looking down stream is the right
12 side ladder. And that is the general layout of what the
13 facility can do.

14 We mentioned earlier that the bypass facility is
15 currently under consideration, is a reconfigured fish bypass
16 facility. It roughly encircles the Discovery Center and it
17 has been designed to physically reduce or eliminate concerns
18 related to previous bypass options.

19 So what are we talking about in terms of benefit to
20 the fish? We're talking about primarily salmon, winter run
21 Chinook salmon, spring run Chinook salmon, fall run Chinook
22 salmon, and late fall run Chinook salmon -- four different
23 runs of salmon -- and also green sturgeon. So the different
24 alternatives have different effects on those adult runs of
25 fish and have different levels of improvements in their
26 ability to pass the dam.

No. 311 _

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

13

1 For example, late fall run salmon don't occur at the
2 dam under the current gate operations. So any of the
3 alternatives would not effect them when the gates are up.
4 The primary species that we are talking about are species
5 that show up when the gates are in, and in this case we are
6 talking about spring run Chinook salmon and we're talking
7 about green sturgeon.

8 Simply put, agriculture benefits are measured by the
9 ability to put water into the canal. Currently, about
10 485 -- under the No Action Alternative, about 485 CFS are
11 available to put in under the gates out scenario; under the
12 four-month scenario, a 1,700 CFS pump station ability to put
13 water into the canal; and under a two-month alternative we
14 are talking about 2,000 CFS; and under the zero-month
15 alternative we are talking about 2,500 CFS.

16 The environmental document, in my mind, is fairly
17 clear and fairly straight forward in terms of impact. One of
18 the major impacts that would result in implementation of
19 alternatives is in terms of aesthetics. We are talking about
20 a reduction in the amount of time that the lake is in, which
21 is visible here in a photo taken from Antelope Boulevard with
22 the gates in and with the gates out.

23 In terms of recreation, the alternatives have the
24 potential for eliminating one of the major recreational
25 features or recreational events of the area, of course the
26 boat drags, and have differing effects on lake recreation

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

14

1 that we have in and around Red Bluff.

2 In terms of power resources, the increase pumping
3 foreseen under the alternatives would result in increased
4 electrical consumption, increasing under Alternative 3 the
5 entire -- the whole pumping alternative to be about twice of
6 what is currently used.

7 Alternative preferences has been stated by many of the
8 resource agencies that we have been working with throughout
9 this process and, notably, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
10 recently put out a draft coordination act report which stated
11 clearly that the best alternative in terms of fish passage by
12 the dam is gates out. However, it is notable that the report
13 also said the two-month alternative did yield substantial
14 benefits in terms of passage. That report was concurred by
15 the National Fishery Service, the California Department of
16 Fish and Game, and the California Department of Water
17 Resources.

18 Relatively early on in the process, the
19 U.S. Forest Service, which manages the land in and around the
20 Discovery Center, indicated their presence for anything but
21 the bypass channel, which would effectively irreputably
22 alter their land use plan for the Discovery Center and would
23 fracture the existing efforts going on.

24 The Tehama Colusa Canal Authority last year indicated
25 a preference for the gates-out alternative, which was then
26 clarified to say that they supported the maximum pumping

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

15

1 option because that met their needs for reliable water
2 supply, in a sense stated they did not have an opinion on the
3 actual gate operation of the dam.

4 City of Red Bluff indicated their preference for a
5 four-month alternative, specifically 1A.

6 Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce indicated their
7 preference for a four-month alternative as well.

8 The alternative preference from the US Bureau of
9 Reclamation is still pending.

10 So we are here tonight to hear what you have to say
11 about the project and what the impact or benefit from that
12 project will be. And, I will turn it back over to Chris.

13 **CHRIS PROUD:** Can we have the lights on in the back?
14 And, we are going to quickly shut down the projector here and
15 get the microphone set up for what you all are here for
16 tonight, to hear the public comments to be made. I have a
17 stack of speaker cards up here that I will be calling in
18 order. And, as I mentioned previously, we will call two
19 folks at a time, one to the podium and one who will be
20 waiting at the chair or standing behind. So we are going to
21 get our mic set up here in just a moment and we'll start
22 calling people in the order that they were received.

23 Again, if you would like to provide comments tonight
24 and you would like to speak publicly, please fill out a
25 comment card there at the table or if you don't want to wait
26 and provide a public comment, fill out a comment sheet as

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

16

1 well.
2 So I would like to ask that our representatives from
3 the TCCA and USBR, if they could join us up front here. They
4 are the folks you will be directing your comments to.
5 With that, if I could ask Susan Price to approach the
6 mic. And, Gregg Avilla is the next person in line.
7 **SUSAN PRICE:** Good evening. Can everyone hear me? I
8 will speak loudly.
9 Representatives and members of the public:
10 Preserve Lake Red Bluff. The potential economical,
11 recreational, and quality of life cost to the City of Red
12 Bluff from the loss of Lake Red Bluff will, over time, run
13 into millions of dollars.
14 The City of Red Bluff expresses its strong support of
15 Alternative 1A, an alternative that provides reliable
16 agricultural water supply, improvements to fish passage, and
17 continued economical, recreational, and quality of life
18 benefits to all stakeholders.
19 Alternative 1A would allow for the Diversion Dam to
20 operate four months. Alternative 1A would allow for improved
21 fish passage through the construction of new state of the art
22 fish ladders. Alternative 1A would allow for water to be
23 provided to agriculture users through a combination of
24 gravity flow when the gates are in and a pumping facility
25 large enough to meet peak water demands in the spring and
26 fall.

} 311-1

} 311-2

- 311-1 See Response to Comment 21-2.
- 311-2 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-3 See Response to Comment 11-1.

17

1 According to the draft environmental impact statement,
 2 environmental impact report, the negative effects on the loss
 3 of Lake Red Bluff on the City of Red Bluff include:

4 Reductions of income in jobs associated with loss of
 5 lake-dependent recreation and sporting activity, loss of the
 6 annual Nitro National Drag Boat races, reduction in property
 7 value, fiscal impacts to the City of Red Bluff, loss of the
 8 quality of life and community cohesion.

9 According to the draft report, between \$134,000 and
 10 \$402,000 in city transient occupancy tax will be foregone.
 11 This is an amount between two and eight percent of the city's
 12 general fund. At the time of declining state budget revenue
 13 and continued future economic uncertainty, this loss will
 14 negatively affect the city's ability to provide basic
 15 services to the public in their existing operations.

16 According to the draft EIR, between \$363,000 and one
 17 million dollars to the city sales tax will be loss. There
 18 are many other extensive losses. Is this what you would call
 19 insignificant? No, it is not. The City of Red Bluff
 20 supports the preferred alternative that not only continues
 21 the benefits of the quality of life benefits of the city, but
 22 also allows for the sense of opportunity for reliable water
 23 and improved fish passage, that alternative is 1A.

24 The City of Red Bluff summed it up when they adopted
 25 their resolution which supports the unequivocal leaving in of
 26 the gates at the Red Bluff Dam from May 15th to September

} 311-3

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

18

1 15th of every year, thus preserving Lake Red Bluff and its
2 benefits for the community.

3 Thank you.

4 **CHRIS PROUD:** I appreciate that, but if you could keep
5 the applause until the end of the hearing.

6 Our next speaker is Gregg Avilla and our next speaker
7 after Gregg would be Richard Crabtree.

8 **GREGG AVILLA:** Thank you.

9 My name is Gregg Avilla. I come before you tonight as
10 a citizen in the community of Red Bluff, my family has lived
11 here for over 100 years, and I wear these four different hats
12 tonight.

13 The first hat is I am a farmer on the west side. And
14 as a farmer on the west side, I would not be in favor of
15 taking one drop of water from my friends on the west side, my
16 farmer friends from Colusa to Red Bluff.

17 I wear another hat, the fellow that I jogged with for
18 over 20 years who is part of one of the agencies that were on
19 that list up there. He taught me many, many things about
20 environmental protection and, in fact, this gentleman was so
21 green that he probably was the on only one on Saint Patrick's
22 day that could wear all red and still not get pinched.

23 (Microphone interruption)

24 He taught me to value our natural resources. And, we talked
25 for over 20 years. He encouraged me to read Cadillac Desert
26 and encouraged me to go down to U.C. Berkeley and take the

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

19

1 BT Millers course. So I certainly do not favor anything that
2 would impact the environment.

3 The third hat that I wear is that of fishing in the
4 Sacramento River. My father was an avid fisherman, my
5 father-in-law is an avid fisherman, and so is my best friend.
6 My father sunk his boat about 40 years ago, 50 years ago out
7 in the river, went up in an airplane, found the boat, fished
8 it out of the river, and went back fishing for salmon.

9 But the hat that I wear that concerns me the most is
10 as a citizen of Red Bluff and the Mayor of the City of
11 Red Bluff.

12 About 17 years ago we had a disastrous occurrence in
13 Red Bluff, we had a disastrous fire at the corner of
14 Walnut and Main Street, the Cone and Kimball Building, and
15 many people feel that took the heart out of Red Bluff. Well,
16 I think we have revived a little bit due not in part to
17 Lake Red Bluff. But, I feel this is in jeopardy of being
18 compromised --

19 Can you hear me?

20 **CHRIS PROUD:** When you speak into the microphone, if
21 you could just --

22 We'll give you your full-time, but if you could hold
23 this close up to your mouth.

24 **GREGG AVILLA:** I am sorry if you can't hear me.

25 Anyway, that concerns me very much. I think that you
26 know it is kind of like an open heart surgery again.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

20

1 And the other three groups that I mentioned are the
2 sturgeons.

3 And I am very, very concerned that the heart of
4 Red Bluff will be taken out again, and I do not want that to
5 happen. I am in full support of measure 1A, because I think
6 that is the major thing and addresses all of the four areas
7 and I hope that will be considered and chosen.

8 Thank you.

9 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Richard Crabtree.

10 **RICHARD CRABTREE:** My name is Richard Crabtree, I am
11 an attorney who is working with the City of Red Bluff on the
12 issues related to this environmental document that we are
13 here talking about tonight.

14 First of all, I want to reiterate the City of
15 Red Bluff's request for an extra 30 days for the comment
16 period. We submitted that request in writing yesterday.
17 There were some glitches in the process in terms of making
18 the document available. In addition, it is a very large
19 document. According to the charts in the back of the room,
20 it took about two years to draft and essentially the public's
21 left now with a little less than two months to review and
22 comment on it. Given the size of the document and importance
23 of the issues that are addressed in the document, we believe
24 that the request for an additional 30 days is a reasonable
25 one.

26 Second, I would like to encourage everyone to keep an

311-4 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

311-5 Thank you for your comment. The time-extension request was
granted.

} 311-4

} 311-5

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

21

1 open mind as to the alternatives. By "everyone" I mean the
2 decision makers in this process.

3 I am a little concerned that just about everyone
4 staked out their favorite alternative without the benefit of
5 the EIR and, in fact, the purpose of any NEPA and SEQA is to
6 foster informed decision making. So the selection of
7 alternatives should not be actually done until the EIR has
8 been completed, finalized, and studied by the decision-making
9 agencies.

10 It is also important to remember that SEQA requires
11 the adoption of feasible alternatives which will achieve the
12 project objectives, and I am going to quote from an important
13 passage from SEQA:

14 "The legislature finds and declares it is the policy
15 of the State that public agencies should not approve projects
16 as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible
17 mitigation measures which would substantially lessen the
18 significance of the environmental impact of the project."

19 Now, I think one of the most important charts here is
20 the summary of impact chart that is in the back next to the
21 exit door. It expresses categories of impacts for all of the
22 alternatives and reveals that 1A has the fewest impacts. In
23 only one category are there significant unmitigated
24 environmental impacts associated with 1A; and, in fact, with
25 the gates out option there are four categories of significant
26 unmitigated environmental impacts. SEQA gives priority to

311-6

311-6 The selected project was determined after completion of the DEIS/EIR and in conjunction with the OCAP. As of November 2007, the selected project includes a pumping facility with a maximum capacity of 2,500 cfs. Reclamation anticipates a gates-in period between July 1 and the end of Labor Day weekend; TCCA has no position on changes to gate operations.

311-7 See Response to Comment 29-1.

311-7

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-8 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

22

1 analysis of impacts to human beings, and here we are going to
2 have a physical change of the environment, the possible
3 elimination of Lake Red Bluff, which is going to have a very
4 significant impact on human beings. As Susan Price
5 mentioned, it is going to have severe economic impact on the
6 City of Red Bluff and it is also going to have quality of
7 life impact.

311-7,
cont'd

8 Thank you.

9 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Chuck Hayden and the
10 speaker after that would be Rob Gibbs.

11 **CHUCK HAYDEN:** Good evening. I am Chuck Hayden, I am
12 a community law director for the City of Red Bluff. I am
13 here to request you implement a win, win approach, option 1A.

14 Option 1A will enhance fish passage, provide water for
15 agriculture, and minimize adverse effects on Red Bluff's
16 residences and businesses. Option 1A will minimize adverse
17 effects on local recreational opportunities, the character of
18 our community which attracts tourists, tourist spending,
19 transient occupancy tax, and the overall quality of life in
20 our fine community.

311-8

21 I concur with comments made previously by others in
22 support of option 1A. In short, please mitigate all
23 significant negative impact that would be caused by the
24 implementation of the plan.

25 Thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight.

26 **CHRIS PROUD:** We have Rob Gibbs to speak and then

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

23

1 Nikki Stoddard.

2 **ROB GIBBS:** Good evening. I am the City of Red Bluff
3 parks and recreation director. I have come to Red Bluff
4 early in the 1960s and have worked for the City of Red Bluff
5 in the Parks and Recreation Department for over 27 years.
6 In that time, I have come to know what lake Red Bluff has
7 meant to this community.

8 Members of the park then and now are reminded on a
9 daily basis by travelers on the I5 corridor what a beautiful
10 area Lake Red Bluff has created in our River Park. These
11 people who are traveling through are looking for a quiet,
12 peaceful place to stop where people can relax, stretch their
13 legs, and maybe even have something to eat. Lake Red Bluff
14 provides this environment and in so doing benefits the
15 economic well-being of our community.

16 In 1976 the City of Red Bluff celebrated its
17 centennial. River Park and Lake Red Bluff was chosen
18 representative for the celebration, because it reflects what
19 the residents of this community feel have attracted us to
20 this area, which include the natural resources that are
21 available to provide the public recreational resources and
22 activities available for each and every member of their
23 family. A variety of programs and activities were offered
24 that day, many involve the water of Lake Red Bluff.

25 The common waters of Lake Red Bluff provide memories
26 for many generations of our community, so much so that

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-9

Thank you for your comment. Responses are only given for comments that directly relate to content in the DEIS/EIR. See DEIS/EIR Section 2.0, Description of Alternatives, for further information pertaining to this comment.

24

1 families have purchased and placed memorial benches along the
2 shoreline of Lake Red Bluff, this, in an effort to provide
3 not only the memory of their family members, but an area to
4 enjoy and hopefully provide pleasure and memories for the
5 future generations to come. I am sure they did not intend to
6 be sitting overlooking a gravel bar.

7 The Parks and Recreation Department receives hundreds
8 of requests each year for events that take place at River
9 Park, they include: Barbecues, birthday parties, car shows,
10 craft events, company picnic, social gatherings, promotions,
11 annual 4th of July celebration, service club events, and band
12 concerts. Each year various entities from Santa Clara,
13 Santa Cruz come to the Sacramento River and make a point to
14 stop at the River Park; an elderly couple each year apply for
15 the proper permit so they can walk along the river park and
16 enjoy a glass of wine, all due to the fact this park provides
17 an attractive setting adjacent to Lake Red Bluff.

18 Each year in the four-month period when the dam gates
19 are down and Lake Red Bluff is provided, we have
20 approximately 50,000 daily visitation to this area, therefore
21 providing recreational pursuits for many in an economic
22 stimulus for our community.

23 Lake Red Bluff has become an integral part of the
24 lives of thousands of our local residents to which a price
25 tag cannot be fixed. Because of this, I believe you should
26 implement and develop a plan to meet the needs of all of

} 311-9

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

25

1 those involved without sacrificing the four-month period that
2 establishes Lake Red Bluff.

3 What makes this country great is the fact that each
4 individual has a right to be heard and I hope the voice of
5 the community is heard and I hope 1A is chosen and
6 Lake Red Bluff preserved.

7 Thank you.

8 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Nikki Stoddard and
9 then Gordon Todd.

10 **NIKKI STODDARD:** Hi. My name is Nikki Stoddard and
11 I am the manager of Rio Vista Mobile Estates, a senior home
12 front park and we have a marina.

13 We could all agree that the recreational opportunities
14 and economic benefits derived from having the lake in the
15 summer months is priceless. We have a marina that is used by
16 our residents during the four months out of the year that
17 Lake Red bluff is full. Most of them look so forward to the
18 water coming up on May 15th, getting their fishing poles,
19 their boots, and taking a look at the view that we have to
20 offer. Many of these tenants have relocated to Rio Vista to
21 enjoy Lake Red Bluff and our marina. The river is an
22 economic asset we desperately need in our community. The
23 closure of the Diversion Dam would be a tremendous loss to
24 our community and the town of Red Bluff. I can't imagine our
25 beautiful park-like setting with a dry river bed running
26 through it. Also, the property values of our retired tenants

} 311-9,
cont'd

} 311-10

} 311-11

311-10 See Response to Comment 29-1.

311-11 See Response to Comment 10-1.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

26

1 would be greatly affected.

2 And, I did a little research, we had quite a few
3 mobiles for sale this year and we have some of them that sold
4 on the marina and the average price was about \$29,900 and
5 then we also have sites that were not on the arena and the
6 average price there was \$18,300. Now we have 13 homes on the
7 marina and this equates out to \$388,700 in value on the
8 marina versus \$237,900 not on the Marina. So this equates
9 out to \$150,000 loss in value and as well \$1,500 loss in
10 property taxes. Not to mention, we charge more for rent for
11 the homes on the marina. And, so our homeowners would lose
12 \$4,212 a year.

13 Thank you.

14 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Gordon Todd and then
15 Teri Downey.

16 **J. GORDON TODD:** I have been a resident to this area
17 for over 50 years. I worked at the irrigation district and
18 so I know about the water end. If we have to implement a new
19 design, I'll settle for the 1A deal. When the dam is
20 drained, there is nothing but a gravel bar along the park,
21 the park will have a big gravel bar with the sun beating on
22 it.

23 I am concerned for all of the property holders along
24 the lake. The value of their property will decrease
25 tremendously if the lake is gone. Now, I think they should
26 be compensated. Have you made any studies of that? If you

} 311-11,
cont'd

} 311-12

} 311-13

} 311-14

311-12 Thank you for your comment. Page 3-315 of the DEIS/EIR supports your comment. The EIS/EIR clearly states that the Gates-out Alternative would likely have a negative impact on property values within the City of Red Bluff adjacent to the lake. Furthermore, DEIS/EIR summary Table ES-4 lists this impact as significant.

311-13 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. Aesthetic and visual resources were also evaluated in the EIS/EIR. The Sacramento River and Lake Red Bluff were both identified during the scoping and document development phases of the EIS/EIR as key visual and aesthetic resources of concern. As described in DEIS/EIR Section 3.12.2, potential temporary and operational impacts for each alternative were identified. Although some of the temporary impacts are projected to be less than significant, the majority of anticipated impacts, particularly with respect to operations, are projected to be significant and unavoidable.

311-14 See Response to Comment 10-1.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

27

1 take the lake away from us without compensating the property
2 holders, I can almost talk grand theft.

3 Thank you.

4 **TERI DOWNEY:** Good evening. My name is Teri Downey
5 and I have been a resident of Red Bluff for 11 years. I am
6 here tonight to express my concern about proposed closing of
7 Lake Red Bluff, as we now know it.

8 My husband and I are Los Angeles transplants moved up
9 here in 1991 in large part because of the beauty of the town
10 and the fact Sacramento River runs right through it. Back
11 when I was dating my husband, we began to talk about moving
12 up to Red Bluff and he drove me up here to show me all of the
13 wonderful aspects of small town living, especially the river,
14 and I was sold.

15 A few years later, we moved to Red Bluff and started
16 our family. Our kids have all been strapped into their vests
17 for boat rides and activities on the lake, and having the
18 river in town has been so convenient. Going to Whiskey Town
19 or Shasta Lake to go skiing means a full day commitment.
20 Having the river in town means a quick two-hour ski run after
21 work or mid morning tubing run with the kids before nap time.
22 The convenience of the lake being in town means the expense
23 of water craft we actually own gets used. Whenever we have
24 out-of-town visitors our favorite activity is to wait just
25 until sunset and launch the boat, drive it up to the top of
26 Surrey Village, kill the motor, and float all the way back

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-15 See Response to Comment 21-2.

28

1 down. We have found no better way to explain to some of our
2 big city friends why we live here and to give them the tour
3 of the river.

4 The river, as we know it, means a lot of different
5 things to a lot of different people. Some enjoy it for its
6 beauty, some for its recreation, some for its fishing, others
7 enjoy it for the tourism dollars it brings to Red Bluff every
8 year. The boat drags, for example, is a highly attended
9 event that brings in lots of visitors that spend money in
10 town at hotels, restaurants, and shops.

11 The closing of the dam year round would forever alter
12 this town. There will be no way to gain back what we have
13 already, the beautiful peaceful river, the boating, the
14 skiing recreation, fishing. The loss of revenue would
15 decrease in tourism.

16 Certainly all of us concerned citizens here tonight
17 deserve to have our rights protected. We pay our taxes and
18 we should not be discounted by governmental agencies that do
19 not seem interested in trying to work out a solution for the
20 benefit of all parties involved.

21 The river is the heart of this town. Please do not
22 take our heart, save Lake Red Bluff. Thank you.

23 **CHRIS PROUD:** If you could please hold your applause,
24 it is not appropriate at a public hearing, so I would
25 appreciate it if you would not applaud after each individual
26 comment. Plus, it will move the process along as fast as

} 311-15

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-16 See Response to Comment 26-1.

29

1 possible.

2 Our next speaker is Laurie McCarthy and then we have
3 Joseph Mandolfo.

4 **LAURIE MCCARTHY:** My name is Laurie McCarthy. I am a
5 resident of Red Bluff. I have been here for 21 years. I
6 came here longer before that, and I saw this town full of
7 pride and I saw this town full of dignity. And in that time
8 that I first came here, I have seen government and special
9 interest groups strip this town of much of its pride. I have
10 seen our timber industry go by, I have seen our cattle
11 industry decrease, I have seen our farmers begging for water.

12 We now have a recreational avenue in this town that
13 helps bring income into this town. We have some pride left;
14 I don't want to see that taken away. I don't want to see
15 this town left at the river bank gasping for air.

16 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

17 Our next speaker is Joseph Mandolfo and then
18 Peggy Bishop.

19 **JOSEPH MANDOLFO:** My name is Joe Mandolfo. I own
20 Snack Box Restaurant in Red Bluff. My reasons for supporting
21 Alternate 1A are many as a member of the community and a
22 business owner.

23 For the past 10 years, my family and I have lived in
24 Red Bluff. I have watched my children grow. Now I have
25 grandchildren, which make it possible for me to talk about
26 the many wonderful activities on the river in the park, we

} 311-16

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

30

1 just had a family reunion recently. This is the reason I
 2 moved here, started a business here in town, and my children
 3 now work for me and in the town as well.

4 I am concerned about the economic impact as well as
 5 the aesthetics of our beautiful town. The loss of tourism
 6 will certainly have an effect on my business and the many
 7 young people that rely on my restaurant for their livelihood.

8 I concur with Susan Price. Her comments were
 9 thorough, precise and very appreciated. Thank you, very
 10 much.

11 **CHRIS PROUD:** The next speaker we have is Peggy Bishop
 12 and then Ken Kramer.

13 **PEGGY BISHOP:** I am Peggy Bishop. I saw Red Bluff in
 14 1948 for the first time, there wasn't a dam. I want to thank
 15 the people that are saving the fish, because they are saving
 16 our house too. Economics, all of this, is really important,
 17 but we live along Reeds Creek and if the dam has the gates
 18 down in the winter, we flood and so do all of the people
 19 along Aloha. And, I think that Susan Price should put that
 20 in her comments also, because it is important to us.

21 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Ken Kramer and then
 22 David Gunter.

23 **KEN KRAMER:** Hello. My name is Ken Kramer. I am a
 24 business owner, we own property along the river and I am also
 25 on the board of -- advisory board for Mercy High School that
 26 overlooks the river.

311-17

311-18

311-17 See Response to Comment 29-1.

311-18 Thank you for your comment. A 12-month Gates-in Alternative was not considered as part of this project; thus, the EIS/EIR did not include a discussion about flooding caused in winter months if the gates were lowered. The primary function of the RBDD gates is to deliver water to agricultural customers, and water demand is historically low in the winter months. Therefore, the 12-month Gates-in Alternative was not included.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

31

1 I want to stress on all fronts 1A is the obvious
 2 alternative, and it just seems to be so obvious that with
 3 everything you are hearing here today and all of the public
 4 outcry, that trying to save a few fish for this whole
 5 community is just a travesty.

6 I think if you look at the situation, you look at the
 7 alternatives, the mitigation, the lawsuits that are sure to
 8 come, I just would like to express my concern and let
 9 everybody here know that there is alternatives and for
 10 everyone here -- and I am not even sure why I am facing you
 11 guys, I should be facing you guys.

12 This is an opportunity for everyone here to voice
 13 their opinion, to get involved, and step forward. There is
 14 only one chance to do this. Thank you.

15 **CHRIS PROUD:** We need to keep our comments focused
 16 forward. I understand that many people want to speak to the
 17 crowd, but, again, the idea here tonight is that the agencies
 18 want to hear the comments that are being made, it is one of
 19 our ground rules that are posted around the room as well. I
 20 would appreciate it if you could keep your comments to the
 21 front.

22 Our next speaker is David Gunter and then
 23 Ken Robison.

24 **DAVID GUNTER:** My name is Dave Gunter. I have several
 25 things to say, three of them have been addressed many times:
 26 The taxes revenue that we are going to loose, the income we

} 311-19

} 311-20

- 311-19 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.
- 311-20 See Response to Comment 11-1.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

32

1 are going to lose from people that work in our restaurants
2 and parks.

3 I am full in favor of building a bypass so that the
4 dam can stay up more than just four months a year, because
5 four months a year is fine, I am in favor of four months a
6 year if that is all we can get. We need to have our
7 recreation, we need to have fishing. Also, I am a fisherman.
8 We can't fish if we can't get out to them and if you take the
9 river away from us we are going to dry up.

10 Thank you.

11 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Ken Robison and then
12 Steve Evans.

13 **KEN ROBISON:** Hi. I am Ken Robison, I have been here
14 a long time like everybody else.

15 I am told that CH2M Hill, the author of the report,
16 has built thousands of pumping plants throughout the world
17 and that is a major part of their business. I find it
18 suspicious that their preferred alternative is something they
19 are likely to bid on in the future and I have been told --
20 I have been told just a few minutes ago by Dale Canon of
21 CH2M Hill they would like to bid on that project and it is
22 likely to be a two or three million dollar design contract.
23 I would certainly like to know if that is true. I would like
24 to know if CH2M Hill will be bidding on that and, again, I do
25 find it suspicious that that is their preferred alternative,
26 something that directs business back to them.

} 311-20,
cont'd

} 311-21

} 311-22

311-21 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

311-22 TCCA and Reclamation will determine how best to implement the
selected project, including the need to use federal, state, and private-
sector assistance in the implementation process.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-23 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

33

1 Thank you.

2 **CHRIS PROUD:** Next we have Steve Evans and then

3 Jeff Berglund.

4 **STEVE EVANS:** Good evening. My name is Steve Evans.

5 I am the conservation director of Friends for the River, a

6 statewide river conservation group dedicated to the

7 protection, preservation, and restoration of California's

8 free flowing rivers, streams, and watershed. We have about

9 five thousand members, many of whom come up into this area to

10 recreate on the wonderful Sacramento River.

11 Friends of the River strongly support Alternative 3,

12 the gates out alternative, primarily because it provides 100

13 percent fish passage for several threatened and endangered

14 fish species.

15 For those of you who are reading the Environmental

16 Impact Report, I think there is information in the report

17 that is very important to take a look at. For example, the

18 gates out alternative improves fish passage for the

19 threatened spring run Chinook salmon by 91 percent. We're

20 talking about a run that used a number of young-in fish in

21 the entire central valley that some years are down to a

22 couple of hundred and in terms of the run upstream of the

23 Red Bluff Diversion Dam it is often less than a couple of

24 hundred fish. Ensuring 100 percent effective passage for

25 this species is critical to prevent them from becoming

26 extinct. It also improves passage for winter run Chinook

} 311-23

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

34

1 salmon and endangered species by 12 percent, fall run Chinook
2 by 20 percent, steelhead by 12 percent, and it addresses the
3 species that little is known about, the green sturgeon.

4 Green sturgeon formerly were found at virtually every major
5 river system in northern California, now they are only found
6 in two, the Sacramento River and Klamath River. Estimates
7 say that green sturgeon amount to just perhaps a couple of
8 hundred fish in the Sacramento River and they're often found
9 congregating just below Red Bluff Diversion Dam because
10 sturgeon cannot, cannot use a fish ladder.

11 The gates-out alternative, Alternative 3, provide for
12 a 54 percent increase in fish passage for green sturgeon and
13 that is critical to keep this fish off the endangered species
14 list.

15 Briefly, I want to say I think that EIS/EIR overstates
16 the impact on aesthetic resources and some economic resources
17 in Red Bluff. I think people in Redding and Sacramento would
18 be surprised to hear that the free flowing rivers do not
19 provide economic benefits to their communities. I think
20 residents of this community disagree. I think over time a
21 free flowing Sacramento River in Red Bluff would restore
22 itself and be a beautiful asset that would attract, still
23 attract recreationists to Red Bluff. There is definite
24 economic impact associated with the drag boat races. Perhaps
25 an alternative could be considered to provide for those drag
26 boat races only.

311-24 Thank you for your comment. Responses are only given for comments that directly relate to content in the DEIS/EIR. See DEIS/EIR Sections 3.10, Socioeconomics, and Section 3.12, Aesthetic and Visual Resources, for further information pertaining to this comment.

311-25 Thank you for your comment. Throughout the public process and comment periods, discussions have been ongoing to determine if an alternative could be considered that would allow for the Nitro Nationals event to be held. Several issues would need to be addressed to lower the RBDD gates for this specific event, including sturgeon-run timing considerations, cost of maintaining RBDD solely for this event, and the inability to reschedule the event because of the nature of the racing circuit. Although the selected project does not include a gates-in period during Memorial Day weekend, a request for this operation will be submitted to NMFS if gate operations were to change.

} 311-24

} 311-25

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-26 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

35

1 And, with that, I will submit additional comments in
2 writing. Thank you.

3 **CHRIS PROUD:** Please hold your comments. We need to
4 have respect for the speakers. Different people in the
5 audience have different opinions and we need to respect those
6 tonight. So I want to keep to that as well just as a matter
7 courtesy to everyone that is here and to speed us through
8 this process for everyone who would like to provide comments.

9 Our next speaker is Jeff Berglund and then
10 Doug LaMalfa.

11 **JEFF BERGLUND:** I am here on behalf of the Red Bluff
12 Kiwana's Club. They have an installation dinner tonight of
13 about 100 members of the community and they have asked me to
14 come forward and give their two cents on supporting the
15 Alternative 1A on that choice. So if there are 100 members
16 of Kiwana's, I think I should have 30 minutes to talk.
17 Anyway, they come from a variety of walks of the
18 Red Bluff Community and they are in full support of 1A. So,
19 that is all I have to say.

20 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you. Our next speaker is Doug
21 LaMalfa and then Scott Ferris.

22 **DOUG LAMALFA:** Good evening. I am Doug LaMalfa,
23 assembly candidate for this district here. My day job is as
24 a rice farmer down in Butte County and I am also a boating
25 enthusiast, I have a flat bottom I have at home. The issues
26 up here are interesting to me as a farmer, as a boater, and

} 311-26

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

36

1 as a citizen of northern California.

2 I don't come in here pretending to know everything
3 about this issue, I am new to it, but you can bet if I am
4 re-elected in November we will be monitoring this issue and
5 ready to work with you folks to have a good alternative to
6 help the folks of Red Bluff and also maintain the needs of
7 TCCA with delivery of water to the farms up and down the
8 valley.

9 The one alternative I didn't see over there was the
10 one that would provide the largest possible pumping plant as
11 well as improve fish ladders. Personally, I would like to
12 see that alternative there that the TCCA has covered so that
13 the fish ladders will be made available to make the need to
14 remove the dam as necessary.

15 So, folks, I will be around to monitor the issue and I
16 would be happy and looking forward to working with all folks
17 involved on this issue. So, thank you, very much.

18 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Scott Ferris and
19 Marshal Pike.

20 **SCOTT FERRIS:** My name is Scott Ferris. I represent
21 the Northern California Salmon Fishing and Sportsman
22 Association and so I feel like maybe I am going into the
23 lion's den here, because I have to say we strongly support
24 the position taken by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and
25 Steve Evans with the Friends of the River on the third
26 alternative.

311-27

311-27 Improving the fish ladders and building the largest pumping plant on the Sacramento River as one alternative was not considered feasible and, thus, was not considered.

311-28 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

311-28

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-29 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

37

1 With that being said, I have been a fishing guide on
2 the river for more than 40 years and it seems as though
3 people have forgotten what Red Bluff is like before the
4 Red Bluff Diversion Dam went in. I think the facts indicate
5 that it is probably one of the largest factors in the decline
6 of our salmon and steelhead population in the last 100 years.
7 The current regime gives us a chance to raise these gates and
8 give these fish a chance to come back without any
9 obstruction.

10 Back in the '60s, the Red Bluff area had a river park.
11 People used the upper river with their boats. It sounds to
12 me like people think if we take the dam out there isn't going
13 to be a river there. The big gravel bar out in front of the
14 bridge crossing is primarily the effects of 30 years of
15 having that Diversion Dam in and an accumulation of gravel.
16 In time, if the river were allowed to return to its original
17 state, I am sure you would see that gravel disappear and the
18 water would spread out and the bathtub ring that you see when
19 the gates are open would disappear as riparian habitat is
20 reconstructed along the edges of the river.

21 You know, as a society we want our cake and want to
22 eat it too. And, I guess in this case we have to make a
23 decision. Do we want a surplus of fish and if so how much
24 sacrifice are we willing to make to have those fish? These
25 fish are part of the public trust and belong to all of the
26 people in California and not just the people of Red Bluff.

311-29

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-30

Thank you for your comment. The public review period for this project has been extensive and well documented. See DEIS/EIR Section 1.5.1, page 1-8, for further details.

38

1 Thank you.

2 **CHRIS PROUD:** The next speaker is Marshal Pike and
3 then Ron Panich.

4 **MARSHAL PIKE:** Thanks very much. My name is
5 Marshal Pike, I am authorized here to represent the views of
6 the Red Bluff, Tehama County Chamber of Commerce and Visitors
7 Bureau. I come here intending to address the issue of
8 historic support for the need for agriculture, the fish of
9 the Sacramento River, and the people of our community. Of
10 the six alternatives, we support 1A because it amply
11 describes.

12 I want to provide some perspective as to the community
13 depth of concern over the possible loss of Lake Red Bluff.
14 The last 20 years the town of Red Bluff plans to provide year
15 round water for agriculture has been subject to controversy
16 and compromise. In that time, our population has grown by 40
17 percent while our state population has more than doubled.
18 Many persons in this room have personal family connections
19 and a history of participation and to no small degree of
20 frustration at the ability of the State and Federal agencies
21 to arrive at this decision that allows the community some
22 peace and certainty about access to the water resources that
23 flow in our mist.

24 At every turn in these last 20 years, no public
25 opportunity to have direct input on the decisions made has
26 ever been offered before. No public input was allowed when

} 311-30

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

39

1 the gates-in operation was first reduced from 12 months to 10
 2 and subsequently from 8 and then down to 6 in the 1980s. We
 3 accepted this as a compromise, because the primary purpose
 4 and need still supported our community's purpose and need for
 5 recreation and amenities.

6 In 1993, another agency decision known as the bylaws
 7 opinion reduced the gates-in operation below the minimum
 8 necessary to sustain our agriculture economy. The very
 9 existence of the Diversion Dam is targeted by the agencies
 10 that seem to be hell bent, excuse me, on the removal of dams
 11 across the west. And, of course, there is a big club, the
 12 Endangered Species Act, that is available for these decisions
 13 to be undertaken.

14 Red Bluff and the people and businesses of Tehama
 15 County have compromised and yielded ground to this onslot and
 16 we finally have a chance to affect a decision. We stand here
 17 tonight together with TCCA on the fundamental need for
 18 reliable water resources for agriculture purposes and the
 19 future growth of the north state economy. No wedge will be
 20 driven between farmers and the community they live in.

21 We also stand here for the perpetuation of all species
 22 of fish which make the Sacramento River home. We feel
 23 strongly that the survival of these species need the best
 24 engineering possible, that the facility should allow passage
 25 and account for measurements of the health of the run far
 26 beyond the outdated method that is currently in use. We need

311-30,
cont'd

311-31

311-32

311-31 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

311-32 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-33 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

40

1 new science to study the effects of temperature, floral
2 attraction, riparian health, and protective off-shore
3 habitat, improvements of hatchery management, and the
4 understanding of all of these factors on the fish. What we
5 need is a new compact from this process --

6 (3 minute time warning)

7 -- to allow for these competing interests to put down the
8 my-way-only, my-need-only point of view and move towards
9 co-existence and common purpose.

10 To that end, the alternative that does not preclude
11 any of the competing interest, the only alternative that
12 addresses all of the needs of agriculture, fishery, the only
13 alternative for the future is 1A.

14 I have and will be submitting formal written comments
15 for the 7,000 persons from all over the northern California
16 in support of the resolution passed by the city council.

17 Thank you.

18 **CHRIS PROUD:** Our next speaker is Ron Panich and then
19 Dave Vogel.

20 **RON PANICH:** My name is Ron Panich. As a public
21 citizen, I want to ask questions about the use of water
22 generated by this project.

23 Of the six alternatives proposed, I am supporting
24 Alternative 1A that retains the gates in four months,
25 improves the fish ladders, and also provides for a pumping
26 facility to meet the water needs of the TCCA in the future.

311-32,
cont'd

311-33

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-34 DEIS/EIR Section 1.7, page 1-18, lists the preparers of the document. It does not seem probable that such a conspiracy exists.

41

1 Is it possible that the draft EIS/EIR contains data,
2 analysis, and recommendation intended to provide a paper
3 trail to cover decisions many have said was made long ago.
4 Those persons or agencies in the loop have targeted the
5 Red Bluff Diversion Dam nearly since its inception.

} 311-34

6 I believe it was President John Kennedy who prayed the
7 foresight and engineering marvels of this time built under
8 legislation called the Central Valley Project. Perhaps the
9 era of dams built in the 1960s, that includes Whiskey Town
10 Lake, the San Louis Reservoir, as well as the Red Bluff
11 Diversion Dam will ever be seen again, I don't know.

12 Since 1960, our state population has more than
13 tripled. Americans and others from around the world continue
14 to seek the golden state for exactly the same reason that
15 started the decline in salmon and other inhabited fish in the
16 first place. That reason was and is the hope for the future,
17 a population hoping to make life just a little better for
18 their children and grandchildren that they had experienced
19 that drove the first great wave of California immigrants to
20 seek gold from the stream beds and rivers of California and
21 the salmon have never been the same since.

22 We cannot go back and make it different; but, if we
23 could, would we deny hope to a wave of man when we say, "You
24 are one too many. Go back to where you came from and don't
25 bother our paradise anymore?" If the answer to that question
26 is "no", then providing hope to the future generations of

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-35

If fish passage were not an issue, the gates at RBDD could be lowered 12 months per year and water delivered to downstream users or an offstream storage facility with the present infrastructure. It is true that a pumping plant could provide year-round water reliability for TCCA, but if fish passage were not an issue, the pumping plant would not be needed.

42

1 Californians is also what this decision is about.

2 We all know the old phrase "whiskey is for drinking

3 but water is for fighting over." It is clear that the next

4 great crisis for California is not energy, but water. Our

5 population is supposed to grow again by the tens of millions

6 over the next 20 years at a time when water resources to the

7 desolate part of our state will be limited by the demand of

8 the neighbor states with more senior rights to the water than

9 the Colorado River.

10 The entire Calfed process is intended to be forward

11 looking to meet that inevitability where our burdensly

12 population stops the traffic of drinking water resources,

13 while fish passage projects drive the water interests to meet

14 programmatic requirements for water quality and habitat

15 restoration of the Calfed process primarily for the

16 biological health of the Sacramento River Delta as it flows

17 into the San Francisco Bay.

18 The additional purpose, one we are fighting for, is

19 control of the additional water made available by the new

20 pumping plant, either with or without the Red Bluff Diversion

21 Dam. Make no mistake, the metropolitan water district of

22 southern california is very interested in the outcome of this

23 project. New water to replace lost water make for an

24 interesting political environmental dilemma. It is

25 imperative the we plan for this future as well.

26 Stated categorically, there is the perception and

311-35

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

43

1 traight of eliminating the empowerment of the Red Bluff

2 Diversion Dam --

3 (3 minute time limit)

4 The quick question I have is: What role does the TCCA
5 have now or expect in the future to have for the development
6 of project plans for off-stream water storage and consider of
7 the value of new water made available by the pumping plant,
8 who will have rights over the pumping, the timing,
9 withdrawals, and what entities would have riparian water
10 rights over any new water drawn by such a pumping plan in
11 excess of currently contracted water delivery to member
12 districts.

} 311-36

} 311-37

13 Thank you.

14 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

15 Our next speaker is Dave Vogel and the Pat Johnston.

16 **DAVE VOGEL:** Thank you.

17 I am a consulting fishery scientist who has worked in
18 this discipline for the past 27 years, including 14 years
19 with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine
20 Fishing Service.

21 Now, it doesn't take a fishery scientist to recognize
22 fish passage would be improved when the dam is out; but using
23 the same logic, optimal fish passage would also occur without
24 a huge pumping station. However, that is not the question
25 being asked here. The real question is: How much measurable
26 benefit could be achieved when comparing the various

311-36 See Response to Comment 311-35.

311-37 See Response to Comment 311-35.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

44

1 alternatives and maintain a cost-effective balance among all
 2 beneficiary uses?

3 Unfortunately, the EIR is deficient in this topic.
 4 There are numerous flaws that must be corrected before the
 5 EIR is finalized. To know how much improvement can be
 6 achieved over baseline conditions, we must first have
 7 reasonable information on existing conditions. The EIR
 8 admits those datas are lacking.

9 For example, and there are many, the documents used
 10 the result of research in the 1980s when the dam gates were
 11 in 12 months of the year to represent so-called baseline
 12 conditions. By doing so, the EIR does not account for the
 13 benefit resulting from many fish passage improvements
 14 subsequently implemented, such as the 15 million dollar fish
 15 screens completed in 1990.

16 One of the most disturbing aspects of the EIR is lack
 17 of meaningful information on the very large scale pumping
 18 station on the river. For fish screens of this magnitude to
 19 operate properly on the river, very good control over river
 20 channel hydraulics must be maintained.

21 I have personally witnessed significant river channel
 22 changes of this type over the past 20 years. The downstream
 23 end of this proposed site has now become shallow from the
 24 river channels changing force from the right bank to the left
 25 bank. This circumstance is highly problematic and I cannot
 26 envision how such fish screens can function without major

- 311-38 See DEIS/EIR Section 1.2.1, page 1-2, for the Purpose and Need Statement. Also see Responses to Comments 457-2 and 457-3.
- 311-39 See Response to Comment 457-2.
- 311-40 The EIS/EIR assumed, as the baseline condition, the No Action Alternative (NEPA) and existing conditions (CEQA). Those conditions were described in detail in the DEIS/EIR Fishery Resources' Affected Environment section under Impacts of Current Operations (pages 3-13 through 3-16 for native anadromous salmonids; page 3-23 for other native anadromous fish; page 3-26 for non-native anadromous fish; and page 3-28 for resident native and non-native fish). Also see Response to Comment 457-2.
- 311-41 The commentor states that the pump station is not adequately detailed and analysis is insufficient to appropriately evaluate the impacts. However, to the extent possible, given the stage of design, the impacts of constructing a pump station are detailed in the DEIS/EIR, and measures to avoid adverse construction impacts and proposed mitigation measures are provided. Descriptions of the effects to fisheries resources from construction of the pump station were provided on DEIS/EIR page 3-63 (under the Gates-out Alternative), and proposed mitigation measures were provided on DEIS/EIR page 3-66. Effects to water quality, which could also impact fisheries resources from construction of the pump station, were provided on DEIS/EIR page 3-102, and proposed mitigation measures were provided on DEIS/EIR pages 3-102 and 3-103. It was stated in the DEIS/EIR project facilities description that this facility would be designed in accordance with field-collected information that would include river geometry, hydraulics, and environmental conditions during project design. It is recognized that river channel hydraulics must be understood and accommodated in the design of the fish screen and pump station. Until the exact size of the fish screen/pump station is determined and the river channel hydraulic information is gathered, analyzed, and understood, specific details cannot be evaluated and disclosed. In the DEIS/EIR under the Proposed Facilities description beginning on page 2-12, it is stated that the positive-barrier fish screening facilities would be designed to operate to meet CDFG and NMFS criteria for the protection of fish at this facility. At this stage, it is premature to discuss details of a pump station facility and will remain so until the specific information necessary to conduct that evaluation is obtained and analyzed. During permitting, the near-final and final designs and exact project

No. 311**Public Hearing Transcript, Continued**

- 311-41, details will be scrutinized and evaluated by the permitting agencies. Finally, to the extent possible, construction and operational impacts of the proposed pump station and fish screens are further described in the Draft Biological Assessment (BA) for salmon, steelhead, and sturgeon prepared and attached as Appendix L to the DEIS/EIR.
- cont'd
- 311-42 The commentor states that the river [Sacramento River] has changed geomorphically near the downstream end of the proposed fish screen and that for the fish screen to continue operating properly, the channel might have to be dredged or reconfigured. The commentor suggests that the river is now more shallow than it was, and the river has shifted towards the left (east) bank.
- The comment has merit, in that fish screens need to be located and designed with a certain depth and length to assure the proper hydraulic function and satisfaction of fish screening criteria. During the feasibility study work, field surveys were made of the river bathymetry from downstream of RBDD to about 1 mile upstream. The measured water depths during the gates-up operation appeared to be in the range of 10 to 12 feet deep on the right side facing downstream. These depths will need to be confirmed again during the design phases of the project to locate the fish screen and intake facilities.
- The Sacramento River in the location of the fish screens seems stable because of the type of bed scour and bank topography. The fish screens are located on the outside of a bend that generally has a deeper section. Although no onsite drilling has been done, the underwater bed formation and the banks appear hardened. Because of the apparent type of bed scouring, and the near-vertical banks, the geomorphic stability of the river in vicinity of the screens was assumed solid. Several years of aerial photographs on the Sacramento River can be used during the next phase of the project to examine the stability and movement of the west bank within 1 mile upstream of RBDD.
- An anecdotal comment about geomorphic stability is that the side channel along the 1,000-foot-long fish screen at GCID has been very stable along the full length of the screen and, if anything, might have scoured in a few places against the sheet-pile cutoff wall used to construct the fish screen. The GCID facility is also on an outside bend in the bypass channel.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

45

1 dredging in the river and reconfiguration of the existing
 2 channel. None of this is described in the draft EIR except
 3 that "Details will be worked out in the final engineering
 4 design."

5 Small fish screens are relatively easy to design; the
 6 very large screens are an entirely different matter.
 7 Improperly designed fish screens designed at this site could
 8 conceivably result in catastrophic effects on fish. I have
 9 seen many disastrous fish screens that were originally
 10 designed with good intentions but ultimately failed after
 11 construction.

12 In summary, I believe the draft EIR is very deficient.
 13 There are numerous technical errors in logic, incorrect
 14 assumptions, lack of essential supporting data, and highly
 15 relevant information that was excluded. The EIR has painted
 16 a picture of worse case scenarios that we know is not
 17 accurate. The draft has grossly understated the biological
 18 benefits of new fish ladders and has overstated the benefits
 19 of massive new fish screens.

20 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

21 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

22 Our next speaker is Pat Johnston and then Robert
 23 Ramsey.

24 **PAT JOHNSTON:** Hi. I have been involved in trying to
 25 save Lake Red Bluff since 1986, I did a documentary on it for
 26 KIXE when we first realized there was such a substantial

311-42,
 cont'd

Additional fieldwork at the TCCA site will be used to confirm water depths, length, and location of the fish screens for optimal performance. Because the RBDD gates are up during the winter runoff period, the movement of the river (or lack of) during high flows can be investigated using the historical aerial photos over the past 65 years since the completion of Shasta Dam.

} 311-42,
 cont'd

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

46

1 problem.

2 One of the main things I wanted to do here tonight is

3 find out whatever happened to the Paynes Creek bypass study.

4 And, Max told me there is none, there never has been one.

5 We have heard in the newspaper all week long how the bypass

6 is not an option, "the bypass is not an option." Well, how

7 do we know that if there has never been a study? I look

8 around at all of these studies we have done improving that

9 gates out work, but they are all askew. I would like to

10 point out over here on the impact where it talks about

11 impacts with the recreation, that that is not based on

12 loosing -- on the beginning of the study is where your

13 baseline starts, not today, not at the four-month period, but

14 at the twelve-month period of gates-in in 1989. That is the

15 baseline. So there is substantial impact, even in the four

16 month.

17 Now, I would like to talk about the four-month,

18 because I think what the plan is is for the National Marine

19 Fisheries and all of those agencies that don't live here

20 making the decision about our lake is that they want to take

21 the water away, and they have been trying to for 16 years.

22 They don't want to hear about the bypass, they don't want to

23 do a study on it, they want the gates out, and I don't think

24 it is about the fish, because southern California has been

25 after our water forever.

26 We are talking right now with the gates as is, you

} 311-43

} 311-44

311-43

Table A-1 on page A-6 in the DEIS/EIR lists the Paynes Creek Bypass as an alternative identified in previous studies. Alternative screening is described on page A-1 of the DEIS/EIR. An alternative must meet the purpose and need of the project to be considered.

311-44

If fish passage were not an issue, the gates at RBDD could be lowered 12 months per year, and water delivered to downstream users or an offstream storage facility with the present infrastructure. It is true that a pumping plant could provide year-round water reliability for TCCA; but if fish passage were not an issue, then the pumping plant would not be needed. The NMFS does not have jurisdiction over water transfers to Southern California.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

47

1 guys say we are pumping 400 CSFs per second. And how many
 2 pumps are going in at some point, can somebody tell me? If
 3 we have no -- if we eliminate the dam, how many pumps are
 4 going in?

5 Don't do that to me.

6 **CHRIS PROUD:** Actually, the way the process works, you
 7 are providing comments this evening, but we won't be
 8 responding.

9 **PAT JOHNSTON:** I think that part of my problem tonight
 10 is I thought we were going to compare and finally after 15
 11 years have some answers to our questions.

12 I think another thing I would like to point out is
 13 that a lot of people involved in this study are from
 14 Colorado. Now, Colorado is running out of water too, so I
 15 think that is kind of suspicious. Along with what
 16 Ken Robison said, most the people sitting here telling us
 17 that the lake being gone is the best option does not live
 18 here. Do we have one person working on this study from
 19 Tehama County? And where are the other agencies tonight? I
 20 would love to talk to National Marine Fisheries. I would
 21 love to talk to people from the state, not representatives
 22 from here. You know, I would like to talk to the U.S. Forest
 23 Service and ask them why they have been investing so much
 24 money into the Diversion Dam area when it is not going to be
 25 anything without a lake.

26 So, anyway, I think you guys presented --

- 311-45 The maximum pumping capacity is 2,500 cfs. The initial installed pumping facility would be capable of pumping 2,180 cfs. The pumping facility could be expanded to include another 320 cfs.
- 311-46 The existing RBDD facility has several offices that employ representatives from both Reclamation and USFWS, requiring staff to be located within a reasonable distance to the project site. Additionally, several of the irrigation districts that comprise TCCA are located in Tehama County. The remainder of the agencies are staffed by personnel primarily located in the northern portion of California, including Sacramento and Redding.
- 311-47 The purpose of a public meeting is to solicit public input concerning environmental impacts of a project pursuant to CEQA and NEPA.
- 311-48 DEIR/EIR Table 1.5-1, page 1-13, lists the agency concerns, including those of USFS. The USFS has participated throughout the RBDD EIS/EIR process, and formal comments from the agency have been incorporated into the document.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

48

(3 minute time
limit warning)

1
2
3 There is no time limit on a public hearing. According
4 to the Brown Act, there is not a time limit at a public
5 hearing, so I want to finish up real quick.

6 How much money has already been spent on this project } 311-49
7 so far? Couldn't we have put in a bypass by now? I have }
8 watched these agencies piddle away money for 15 years and } 311-50
9 accomplish absolutely, positively nothing. I think you guys }
10 are giving us the 1A option and the 2A option only to placate } 311-51
11 us, because they are not an option, it is ruining our river.
12 We need to -- everybody talks about we need water storage off
13 of the lake -- off of the river. Our general plan calls for
14 Lake Tehama off of the Cottonwood Creek. We have --

15 **CHRIS PROUD:** You have to stop now, I apologize.

16 **PAT JOHNSTON:** I am sorry, you are breaking the law.
17 You are violating -- do you want me to file a Complaint? You
18 are violating the law, according to the Brown Act. Well, we
19 have until mid night, right, that is what you said? Then why
20 did you waste three hours of our time with these stupid signs
21 up here? Why? Why not give us three hours and not give -- I
22 have a page to go here, I would like to finish it.

23 **CHRIS PROUD:** We need to give everybody a chance to
24 make a comment tonight --

25 **PAT JOHNSTON:** I will follow the law.

26 Okay. See you threw me, now I have to find where I am

- 311-49 Calculating the total cost of the project to date is not part of an environmental review under CEQA or NEPA.
- 311-50 See Response to Comment 311-43.
- 311-51 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

49

1 at.

2 The gates are out. We have children hanging out down

3 by that river right now. What are these agencies going to

4 do? It is going to become a very, very dangerous channel.

5 It already is. Kids are going to be getting -- really

6 drowning in there, so that is another aspect. And there is

7 also a five to seven degree difference between like Antelope

8 Boulevard and down by the park. You know, it cools our hot

9 community down significantly.

10 And, my last question would be: If it is really about

11 the fish -- which it is not, it is about the farmers, the

12 recreationists, and the fishermen to fight each other so they

13 can take our money -- because if it was really about the

14 fish, they would take Shasta Dam out because the spawning --

15 Would you stop?

16 -- because the spawning grounds are above Shasta Dam.

17 So we might want to ask National Marine Fishery exactly why

18 they don't take Shasta Dam out. Because, they have more

19 money and are more powerful and it is easier to pick on us.

20 Better go read the Brown Act.

21 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

22 Our next speaker is Robert Ramsey and then

23 Jim Connors.

24 **ROBERT R. RAMSEY:** This is a tough act to follow. The

25 last two speakers, my compliments to both of them.

26 My name is Robert Ramsey and I am a resident of

} 311-52

} 311-53

- 311-52 Rivers and lakes present a drowning hazard to all.
- 311-53 The question is answered by the commentor.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-54

As of November 2007, the selected project includes a pumping facility with a maximum capacity of 2,500 cfs. Reclamation anticipates a gates-in period between July 1 and the end of Labor Day weekend; TCCA has no position on changes to gate operations.

50

1 Red Bluff and Tehama County. My family has been here for 150
2 years.

3 We have had a lot -- I think I want to ask a question,
4 and I am wondering which of you people up there as presenters
5 might be able to answer that question, and that question is:
6 I talk to a lot of people around here, and the feedback I get
7 is principally "It is a done deal. We're wasting our time."
8 I don't like hearing that kind of fiddle. So I am asking
9 you: Is it a done deal? Have you guys got your minds made
10 up? I mean, is it a done deal? Are we wasting our time
11 here? Do we get an answer?

311-54

12 **CHRIS PROUD:** One of the things that we mentioned in
13 the beginning of the evening as kind of the process of how
14 this works tonight, it is not that -- the first portion of
15 the meeting was intended to provide sort of one-on-one
16 contact with folks, talk to them, answer your questions, and
17 give opinions at that point. The way the public hearing
18 works is we need to hear and take in for the record with the
19 court reporter what your comments are this evening. So that
20 is how the process is going to work. The agencies need to
21 listen to that and your specific comments. The questions you
22 all make here tonight will be specifically addressed and
23 responded to in the next phase of the environmental document,
24 which is the final environmental.

25 So as far as interaction and questions and answers at
26 this point, that is not how the public hearing will be

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

51

1 working tonight. If you could direct specific comments and
2 relate them to the environmental document, those will be
3 responded to in the next phase.

4 So, I know that doesn't get at your answer, but it is
5 how the public hearing will work this evening.

6 **ROBERT RAMSEY:** I will be real brief. I apologize for
7 my breach of protocol here.

8 I am glad to see that there is a recorder over here
9 jotting all of this down, and I am sure the rest the audience
10 will be assured of that too. So with that, I don't have any
11 words to say.

12 Thank you.

13 **CHRIS PROUD:** The next speaker is Jim Connors and the
14 Lauren Davis.

15 **JIM CONNORS:** Good evening. My name is Jim Connors
16 and I am here speaking for my dad, Ed Connors, who is out of
17 the state, and I have a short statement he had wanted me to
18 read.

19 Red Bluff Diversion dam had a built-in fish trap from
20 its inception. When the gates are in and the lake is up, the
21 young fish migrating downstream face a problem in Red Bluff,
22 they by their nature, move with the flow, stay near the
23 surface and near the water's edge. Down at the dam, the
24 excess water is moving under the partially opened position of
25 several of the dam gates. This produces an underflow in the
26 lake, which is far greater than the relatively unique surface

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

52

1 caused by the flow of the fish ladders. The young migrant
 2 fish loose their young to water treads as they approach the
 3 dam, they are lost in the body of water about 800 feet wide,
 4 14 foot deep and to some unknown land. They must mill around
 5 in the vast area trying to get out, maybe for days, until
 6 perhaps by accident they slip out one by one into the current
 7 that carries them under the dam gates, all the while they are
 8 lost in the fish trap and we have no clue as to percentage of
 9 mortality that occurs. It is almost certain that fishery
 10 people, both State and Federal, must have known of this fish
 11 trap soon after the diversion started, but not before, while
 12 you pretend not to notice it today. The solution is fish
 13 ladders that function properly to save the adult fish. The
 14 spill gates from the top of Red Bluff Diversion Dam break the
 15 fish trap and deliver the fish safely to the river below the
 16 dam. This arrangement will cause all of the current through
 17 Lake Red Bluff to be surface current. This will be helpful
 18 to out-migrating fish, both juvenile and adult, and should
 19 stem perhaps year round Lake Red Bluff. The spill gate
 20 system has been repeatedly offered to the Bureau and Canal
 21 authorities, it has never been accepted as an alternative in
 22 this EIA. Why is that?

311-55

23 That is the end of my father's prepared statement.
 24 And, I, myself, would like to ask one simple question: All
 25 the farmers and everybody is in favor of decreased pumping.
 26 About a year and a half ago, I think we all remember the

311-56

311-55

If the commentator is referring to the fish trap in the left bank (north) fish ladder, that trap was designed to capture upstream migrating adult fish and went into operation 1971. The trapping facility was designed to obtain adult salmon for introduction into the TC Fish Facility (TCFF) on the opposite side of the river. The trapping facility also allows for the examination of adult salmon and steelhead, and allows collection of fish for tagging or other scientific purposes. Only a small number of adult fish passing through the ladder were/are trapped each year because the trap is operated only intermittently. The vast majority of adult fish using the fish ladder do so unimpeded by the fish trap. If the commentator is referring to the idea that fish are "trapped" in Lake Red Bluff, that might not be accurate. It is likely that there is a delay in passage, and it might be less desirable for migrating juveniles to pass through a lake rather than a river environment; nonetheless, Lake Red Bluff does not act as a "trap." Additionally, a large majority of juvenile salmon and smolts (dominated by the large numbers of fall Chinook) pass through RBDD when the gates are out of the water (>September through <May). Those juveniles that pass through Lake Red Bluff when the gates are in are thought to pass the facilities in proportion to the flows through those facilities, with the majority passing under the gates. For additional information see Response to Comment 311-56.

311-56

The concept of a top-spilling gate at RBDD has been previously discussed as a possible solution for reducing mortality of juvenile fish as they transit RBDD. Downstream movement of juvenile salmon through Lake Red Bluff and past the RBDD facilities are believed to occur in direct proportion to the flow in the river. Because the largest proportion of Sacramento River flow passes through RBDD under the gates when they are in the down position, it is believed that the largest proportion of juvenile salmon are swept under the gates. Previously, it had been demonstrated that very large numbers of juvenile salmon that were swept under the gates at RBDD became disoriented and vulnerable to predation by pikeminnows (formerly referred to as squawfish) and other piscivorous fish that congregated downstream of the dam in large numbers when the gates were in. However, since implementation of the 1993 BO for Winter-run Chinook Salmon, the dam gates are no longer placed into the river until May of each year, thereby enabling the majority of the juvenile salmonids to pass downstream of RBDD prior to the gates going in, or allowing a majority of predatory

No. 311**Public Hearing Transcript, Continued**

311-56,
cont'd

pikeminnows to migrate upstream of the dam without congregating. This circumstance has resulted in a significant reduction in the annual loss of juvenile salmon passing RBDD. The juvenile fish that currently pass under the dam gates are likely to continue to become disoriented during their passage through the dam, but this is also likely for juvenile fish that would be swept over the dam if a spill-gate facility were installed as an alternative to the existing undershot gates. Now that the RBDD gates are only in for 4 months each year, the benefit (if any) of installing an alternative such as a spill gate would not likely justify the expense of their installation.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

53

1 energy crisis we went through and what happened to our
 2 electricity bill. Who is going to be paying for all of this
 3 electricity and excess pumping, the extra pumping that is
 4 going to be required as well as the maintenance of the pumps?

5 Thank you.

6 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

7 Next we have Lauren Davis and the Larry Frash.

8 **LAUREN DAVIS:** I am Lauren Davis. I am a fly
 9 fishermen, I have been on the river for 20, 25 years from
 10 May to January. I was going to --

11 **CHRIS PROUD:** Can you speak to the mic a little
 12 closer?

13 **LAUREN DAVIS:** On what this river was prior to
 14 Shasta Dam, but I am going to do the Williams Act. What is a
 15 natural bypass? Is that natural to fish? Is the dam
 16 natural? Also, one other thing was a statement made that the
 17 people of Chico came down to Red Bluff Park and took an essay
 18 of the tourists an who used the park and recreation of
 19 Red Bluff. 95 percent of the people at the park and the
 20 river are local people.

21 Thank you.

22 **CHRIS PROUD:** Next is Larry Frash and then
 23 Ken Lindauer.

24 **LARRY FRASH:** I looked at the alternatives tonight and
 25 I like 1A and 1B, but only because they are the best options
 26 given to us. If we can build a better ladder and a better

} 311-57

} 311-58

} 311-59

} 311-60

} 311-61

311-57 See Response to Comment 1-1.

311-58 The term "natural bypass" did not come from the EIS/EIR. An
 engineered bypass for fish passage would not be natural.

311-59 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

311-60 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

311-61 See Response to Comment 37-1.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

54

1 bypass system, why is leaving Lake Red Bluff full year round
2 not one of the options on our alternatives list?

} 311-61,
cont'd

3 Thank you.

4 **CHRIS PROUD:** Next is Ken Lindauer and then
5 Joan Wyman.

6 **KEN LINDAUER:** I am a farmer and I farm prunes --
7 plums -- dried plums on the Diversion Dam on the west side of
8 the river. I am in favor of leaving the gates down for the
9 four-month period, 1A as we have been referring to it.

} 311-62

10 During the past 30 years or so, the Red Bluff Dam has
11 been excellent. The Red Bluff community has built up
12 enterprises, homes, and recreational activity based on the
13 annual presence of the lake. I feel that there is not enough
14 environmental justification now to take this lake away from
15 the community that is now making such good use of
16 Lake Red Bluff. I present several comments to justify my
17 position.

18 First, the Tehama Colusa Canal Authority Board seems
19 to favor leaving the gates up because they say they do not
20 want to battle the fish and wildlife and environmental
21 advocates ad infinitum over this gate issue. It is a good
22 point, but I feel as farmers and ranchers we will have to
23 continue to justify our existence, gates up or down. We will
24 need to continue to build on our solid spaces as good
25 stewards of the land.

} 311-63

26 The Tehama Colusa Canal Authority Board is of the

} 311-64

311-62 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
No response is required.

311-63 TCCA cannot meet their agricultural water customer needs with the
present 4-month operation of RBDD. Before the gates are lowered in
May, TCCA must use their Constant Head Orifice (CHO) to divert
water via Stony Creek. This temporary method of delivery will not
be allowed by agencies into the future. TCCA is supporting a pump
station to improve water supply reliability.

311-64 Table A-13 of the DEIS/EIR demonstrates the capital costs as well as
the O&M costs for each alternative.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

55

1 opinion that there will be less expensive to pump than to
 2 maintain the dam because of the lower electric costs to run
 3 the pump and the high cost of the dam maintenance using the
 4 gates. This may be true now, but over the next 50 years I
 5 think the gravity flow of water has to be the least expensive
 6 delivery system.

311-64,
cont'd

7 Also, the dam has to be maintained and someone will
 8 foot that bill, it will probably be the Bureau of Reclamation
 9 if they can't justify charging the Tehama Colusa Canal
 10 Authority. Maintenance of a large pumping unit is a real
 11 cost also.

311-65

12 Lastly, we recently spent millions of dollars, I think
 13 it was 23 million, to put in the current rotary fish screens
 14 in that system for the Tehama Colusa Canal. I think we
 15 should continue to use this until absolutely every system is
 16 developed. I think it would be wrong to just turn around now
 17 and spend millions more again and putting in pumps with new
 18 screens and an intake system.

311-66

19 In relation to the dam, I would like to offer another
 20 prospective, and that is to point out the great improvements
 21 in the volume of cold clear water that Shasta Dam is providing
 22 to the river year round. Compared to years before 1945 when
 23 we had no Shasta dam, this supply of cold clear water has
 24 greatly enhanced the fish habitat of the Sacramento river.
 25 The river now has several runs of salmon and good trout
 26 fishing year round, much better than before in the '40s, the

311-65 See Response to Comment 311-64.

311-66 The RPP would only supply approximately 12 percent of the necessary pumping capacity needed to meet TCCA agricultural demands (2,500 cfs).

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

311-67 See Response to Comment 31-6.

56

1 1940s, despite of what some families might expound. Surely
 2 the Diversion Dam may impede on recreation a little, but its
 3 significantly incidental compared to the huge improvement to
 4 the water qualities and quantity created by Shasta Dam.
 5 Without Shasta Dam, what do you propose the Sacramento River
 6 would be like now environmentally
 7 with the --

8 **CHRIS PROUD:** Your time is up, if you could please --

9 **KEN LINDAUER:** My question is whether the fish
 10 presentation advocates have any case at all that the
 11 Diversion Dam is significantly affecting fish population when
 12 one looks at the larger river watershed environment.

} 311-67

13 Thank you.

14 **CHRIS PROUD:** The next speaker is Joan Wyman and then
 15 Robert Peery.

16 **JOAN WYMAN:** Good evening. My name is Joan Wyman and
 17 I am the Postmaster of this fair city of Red Bluff. I have
 18 been the Postmaster here for 10 years.

19 Part of the reason I chose to come here is because of
 20 this river, because of Lake Red Bluff. I live over at 180
 21 South Main Street, it is right over here where the dam backs
 22 the water up. There are 60 mobile homes where senior
 23 citizens, such as myself, live. And there seems to me,
 24 being a quasi-government employee myself, I know that
 25 sometimes situations like this come up where you have to come
 26 out and face people like ourselves and sometimes the

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

57

1 decisions are already made in your minds and in your hearts.
 2 Well, I am here to beg you to listen to us, because we are
 3 the City of Red Bluff and we are begging you to please don't
 4 make the decision on this yet. Please listen to 1A with your
 5 minds and your hearts and give us an opportunity for all of
 6 us to survive. And, if it doesn't work, I hope someday that
 7 I come back as a salmon.

8 Thank you.

9 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

10 The next speaker is Robert Peery and then Eric Wright.

11 (Pause)

12 The next speaker is Eric Wright.

13 **ERIC WRIGHT:** Hi. I am a canal water user and not a
 14 public speaker.

15 Two issues here that haven't been brought up that
 16 concern me is one Ken Lindauer brought up, the cost of water.
 17 I don't think that in the long run that you are going to be
 18 able to pump that water cheaper than it is going to gravity
 19 in there.

20 The other issue: I understand your study was funded
 21 by Calfed and I think there is a motive behind Calfed, if you
 22 were studying the spotted owl on behalf of the
 23 Sierra Club or a logging contract association or report. I
 24 think that you need to get a study that is not funded with a
 25 motive in front of it.

26 Thank you.

311-68

311-69

311-70

311-68 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

311-69 Table A-13 of the DEIS/EIR demonstrates the capital costs as well as
 the O&M costs for each alternative.

311-70 The EIS/EIR relied on numerous studies funded from many sources.
 See DEIS/EIR page B-45 for a complete list of all references used in
 the DEIS/EIR.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

58

1 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

2 Next we have Ken Hill and then John Gumm.

3 **KEN HILL:** My name is Ken Hill. I am a resident of
4 Tehama County, Red Bluff. I have lived here for over 40
5 years and presently live over the river and enjoy very much
6 up or down, the value of it, and I think there are several
7 questions that haven't been addressed, at least in
8 respect -- the U.S. Fish and Wildlife study hasn't said a
9 thing about when the fish ditch or spawning canal was built
10 40 years ago, which was part of the reason for the
11 Diversion Dam going in, to divert water down the canal.
12 This was a band that approved that didn't work. It was easy
13 to walk away from it, although it costs very many millions of
14 dollars. And the question is: What if this dam project
15 doesn't work? Say the four months in dwindles to two months
16 dwindles down to nothing and it just doesn't prove to be
17 effective, what do we do? Is there an opportunity to put
18 this dam back in? I very seriously doubt that, but that is
19 something that maybe is in your studies.

20 The power bill has already been brought up. Running
21 12 to 14 to 15 intake irrigation pumping is very, very
22 expensive.

23 Back, again, to the diversion canal with the gravity
24 feed. You open the gates and you let it go. No cost, very
25 little cost, and very efficient. Out of the options they
26 have given us, we all seem to be in favor of 1A, because that

} 311-71

} 311-72

} 311-73

} 311-74

311-71

A discussion of the legislative and administrative record on the issue of authorized purposes of RBDD and the TC Canal are found on DEIS/EIR pages 1-4 through 1-7. In DEIS/EIR Section 1.2.3, the subject of recreational use and authorized purposes of RBDD and the TC Canal are discussed. As stated in that discussion, recreation is not specifically identified in the 1951 Report of the Regional Director of the Sacramento Canals Unit, Sacramento River Division-CVP, California, and the report was approved and signed by President Truman in 1953. The TCFE was not part of the original authorization for RBDD and the TC Canal, but was added as a fishery mitigation and enhancement feature based on the findings of the 1963 Interim Evaluation Report of the impacts and mitigation and enhancement recommendations by USFWS and CDFG. These findings recommended that a dual-purpose spawning channel and a salmon-access channel (single-purpose channel) be constructed, which, when constructed, were estimated to provide for a capacity for 26,000 spawning fall-run Chinook salmon. Of these, 3,000 adults were considered as compensation for those fish that would have spawned in the impoundment formed by RBDD, and 23,000 additional fish were seen as enhancement fish. At that time, Reclamation did not support the idea of fish-spawning channels because of uncertainties in designs criteria, construction issues, and maintenance related to those facilities. A subsequent Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report (CAR), completed in 1967, provided an even larger estimate of 37,000 salmon that would be supported by the planned TCFE, and estimated that releases of project water at RBDD to Thomes and Stony Creeks from the TC Canal would result in annual Chinook salmon runs of 5,000 and 15,000 salmon, respectively, in those streams. These estimated enhancement and compensation fish totaled an estimated 54,000 fall-run Chinook salmon per year (USFWS, 1998). As stated in the 1998 Supplemental Fish and Wildlife CAR, major impacts from implementation of the RBDD-TC Canal project, including entrainment, fish blockage, and delay identified in the planning process, were greatly underestimated. In addition, during the life of the TCFE and operation of the Thomes and Stony Creek Chinook salmon enhancement facilities, it was estimated that of approximately 1.3 million adult fall-run Chinook salmon that were estimated to be

No. 311**Public Hearing Transcript, Continued**

- 311-71, cont'd produced from these facilities, only approximately 209,000 salmon were realized, a deficit of nearly 1.01 million adult salmon. This estimated deficit was further calculated to be approximately \$21 million dollars lost to the sport and commercial fishery as a result of the failure of the TCF program to produce the estimated mitigation compensatory and enhancement adult Chinook salmon. In addition, approximately \$3.7 million was not realized from enhancements to trout sportfisheries planned to occur in the TC Canal and Stony and Thomes Creeks.
- 311-72 RBDD would remain in place as described on DEIS/EIR pages 2-9 through 2-12. Reclamation anticipates a gates-in period between July 1 and the end of Labor Day weekend; TCCA has no position on changes to gate operations. In response to the commentor's question of "what happens if a selected alternative doesn't work?" the AMP process would continue to monitor, evaluate the effectiveness, and make recommendations for optimizing RBDD operations. Depending on the outcome and the results of AMP findings and actions, it might or might not be necessary to continue to modify RBDD operations to effectively meet the goals and objectives of the selected project.
- 311-73 Table A-13 of the DEIS/EIR demonstrates the capital costs as well as the O&M costs for each alternative.
- 311-74 See Response to Comment 311-73.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

59

1 is basically the only one that addresses our problem, four
 2 months in. I understand the five months in isn't even
 3 considered. Six months has not been addressed. In fact, we
 4 would be very lucky to get four months in. This is
 5 disturbing, I think there is more to be studied on this.

6 There is another point that hasn't been brought up, is
 7 improving the fish ladders. This should be done and
 8 addressed to put a fish ladder in the center of the dam.
 9 There is 13 gates out there, possibly a set of two or three
 10 could be converted into a more efficient unit to put the fish
 11 out, which brings up the point that maybe we have dumber fish
 12 than the Columbia River, because those come up hundreds of
 13 feet in the dam and they don't seem to have any problems like
 14 what we are discussing here. So there are ways to take care
 15 of this problem.

16 The last point I have is the EIS or EIR draft that
 17 addresses the returning the river bank to the original
 18 habitat. Once this dam is gone, which appears to be what
 19 people are thinking, you are go to have an awful lot of
 20 snarly looking river and river bank and rock banks and what
 21 have you, so I assume you will return it to the natural state
 22 left of restoration so hopefully that can be done.

23 Thank you.

24 **CHRIS PROUD:** Thank you.

25 Our next speaker is John Gumm and Bill Heins.

26 **JOHN GUMM:** Thank you for letting me speak. I am

311-75

311-76

311-77

311-75 See Response to Comment 37-1.

311-76 See Response to Comment 457-13. Larger ladders and/or a bypass were considered in the fish passage benefit analysis of alternatives considered and summarized in Appendix A to the EIS/EIR. The results of ladder evaluations were that the new proposed fish ladder's AWS would need to be nearly tripled in size as a measure to attract fish into the improved new ladders. Furthermore, the new ladders would need improved weirs, as well as ladder-entrance bay improvements. In spite of these major improvements for the new fish ladders, it was uncertain if a major problem of fish passage at RBDD, namely, delay due to gates-in operation, would be sufficiently reduced to significantly improve passage of salmonids through newly designed ladders. Furthermore, none of these ladder improvements have been proven to improve passage for adult sturgeon, a species of concern identified and addressed in the EIS/EIR. The existing RBDD center ladder must be installed seasonally after large spring flows and the risk to RBDD flood operations have diminished. The modification/expansion of the existing center fish ladder or a fish lock, or lift, in the center of RBDD were evaluated during previous feasibility investigation and was again reviewed in the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) discussions. However, after significant review of options and methods, center passage facilities, beyond that currently provided, were not carried forward into the alternatives evaluated in the EIS/EIR because of concerns regarding their effectiveness, constructibility, and practicality for considerations at RBDD.

311-77 Thank you for your comment. Responses are only given for comments that directly relate to content in the DEIS/EIR. See DEIS/EIR Section 3.12, Aesthetic and Visual Resources, for further information pertaining to this comment.

No. 311

Public Hearing Transcript, Continued

60

1 John Gumm, past president of the Chamber of Commerce and been
 2 involved with the Board of Directors since 1977 and past
 3 promotor with the fellows that have been putting on the boat
 4 drags bringing in millions of dollars into this community.
 5 We have lost so much, we lost our lumber industry. We have
 6 the river, and I think it is very important that we stay with
 7 the Alternative 1A. We have talked about this and I have
 8 been to many meetings over the years about this issue and the
 9 four-month issue has come up and I think it is a compromise.
 10 This country is a compromise. And, I am hoping that you
 11 folks will realize what our concerns are and that we have
 12 come to a compromise and leave it the way it is.

13 The other thing I wanted to tell you is that when I
 14 was growing up I spent my summers on the coast, on the Oregon
 15 coast, my grandfather was a dentist and he was a dentist for
 16 the fishing industry (phonetic), and in the fishing industry
 17 the fisherman were complaining to my grandfather and my
 18 grandfather actually showed me, "See all of those boats out
 19 there on the water? They are from Japan, Russian, from all
 20 of these other countries and have taken up our fish. That is
 21 going to be a problem in your lifetime and I want you to know
 22 about it." I am not a biologist, I just know what my
 23 grandfather told me and what they were complaining about many
 24 years ago.

25 So I think that we really need to look at this and I
 26 think that the bypass would be one of my alternatives; but,

} 311-78

} 311-79

311-78 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.

311-79 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted.
 No response is required.