

12.6 Public Hearing

ORIGINAL

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
JOINT RECLAMATION BOARD AND SAFCA HEARING

RESOURCES BUILDING
FIRST FLOOR AUDITORIUM
1416 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2001
4:11 P.M.

TERI L. VERES, CSR, RMR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 7522

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Betsy Marchand, President
Mr. Steve Cohn, Chairman
Mr. Tony Cusenza, Member
Mr. Roger Dickinson, Member
Mr. Jeff Mount, Member
Ms. Sandy Sheedy, Member
Mr. Jon Chase, Member
Mr. Ray Tretheway, Member
Mr. Don Nottoli, Member
Mr. Butch Hodgkins, Member
Mr. Roger Niello, Member
Mr. Bill Edgar, Member
Mr. Brian Holloway, Member
Ms. Karolyn Simon, Member
Ms. Amy Dean, Member
Mr. Dan Silva, Member

STAFF

Mr. Peter D. Rabbon, General Manager
Mr. Steven Bradley, Chief Engineer
Ms. Lori Buford, Staff Assistant

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Roll Call	1
2. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda	3
3. Overview of the Draft Report, Flood Control Alternatives and Ecosystem Restoration Alternatives	3
Bob Childs	4
Mike Mirmazaheri	18
4. Receipt of Public Comments	
Michael Ault	26
Larry Sadler	27
George Basye	28
Ronald Stork	32
Tim James	34
Eric Rasmusson	35
Stan Spalding	37
Brian May	38
Bill Center	39
Bruce Houdesheldt	43
7. Adjourn	50
8. Reporter's Certificate	51

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome.
3 We'd like to call this meeting to order. This is a joint
4 meeting of the Board of Reclamation and the SAFCA Board,
5 and it is a hearing. No action will be taken today.

6 We have a few housekeeping matters to take care of
7 first. If you wish to give testimony at this hearing,
8 please fill out a card and give it to our clerk, who is
9 holding her hand up, and we will put the card right on
10 this stack.

11 Again, we are taking no action; but if you have
12 comments on the project before us, which is to solicit
13 public input on the American River Watershed, California
14 Long-Term Study Draft Supplemental Plan Formulation
15 Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental
16 Impact Report and it is dated September 2001.

17 And with that I would like to introduce to you the
18 members of the Reclamation Board who are present today
19 for this hearing.

20 We will start with the person well-known in the
21 Sacramento area, Mr. Bill Edgar, who is sitting right
22 here. And from the Modesto area, Tony Cusenza down here,
23 and from the Davis area but known statewide Jeff Mount.
24 And I am Betsy Marchand, President of the Board of
25 Reclamation.

26 Now I'll turn it over to Steve.

27 CHAIRMAN COHN: Well, thank you. I guess that
28 mike's working. Steve Cohn, Chair of Sacramento Area

1 Flood Control Agency, and it's a pleasure to be here
2 today.

3 This is, I believe, the first joint hearing we've
4 had in probably at least about two years. So with the
5 current Board members, this is probably our first time
6 together and it's a great pleasure to be here with the
7 State Reclamation Board and see some familiar faces.

8 We don't have our entire Board here. They may
9 start trickling in as we're listening to comment. We do
10 have, I guess, a County Board of Supervisors meeting
11 that's still going on.

12 MR. NIELLO: It did end.

13 CHAIRMAN COHN: So they should be here shortly.

14 MR. NIELLO: I'm sure they'll get here shortly.

15 CHAIRMAN COHN: While we're waiting, we'll go ahead
16 and introduce some of our members that are here.

17 My far left, Karolyn Simon, a member of the
18 American River Flood Control District and long-time East
19 Sacramento activist.

20 We also have from the same Board and same
21 neighborhood, I might add, Brian Holloway.

22 MS. SIMON: It's a small world.

23 CHAIRMAN COHN: A small world. Of course, my
24 colleague from the County Board of Supervisors, Roger
25 Neillo. It's a pleasure to have Roger here.

26 And my colleague over here on the far right,
27 Sandy --

28 MS. SIMON: That's a first.

1 CHAIRMAN COHN: A first here -- but this is my
2 fellow Council Member from North Sacramento, Sandy
3 Sheedy, and we'll introduce others as they get here.

4 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you. This is the room
5 that the Board of Reclamation regularly meets in so I
6 presume I should say welcome to our meeting room, but
7 most of us have not been on the Board too long. So I'm
8 not sure we're real used to it yet; but, anyway, it's
9 really nice to have you here with us today.

10 At this time on the agenda is a time for anyone in
11 the audience to comment on any item not on the agenda.
12 This is for any item not on the agenda, public comments.
13 If you have a comment, please proceed to the podium and
14 state your name and your comment.

15 Is there anyone who wishes to make a public
16 comment? Hearing none, we'll close that part of the
17 agenda.

18 It would seem appropriate to have a pledge of
19 allegiance before we proceed.

20 Mr. Cohn, would you like to do that.

21 CHAIRMAN COHN: Yes, if everybody would stand.
22 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

23 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you. If there are no
24 objections, we will proceed to Item No. 3 on the agenda,
25 which is an overview of the Draft Report on flood
26 control -- on Flood Control Alternatives and Ecosystem
27 Restoration Alternatives. And for this part of the
28 agenda we'll ask Mr. Bob Childs with the Army Corps to

1 make the presentation.

2 MR. CHILDS: Thank you, President Marchand.
3 Pleasure to be here today. As you said, I'm Bob Childs.
4 I'm with the Sacramento District Army Corps of Engineers.
5 I happen to be the project manager for this particular
6 study, which really is a joint study between ourselves,
7 the Corps, the State of California, Sacramento Flood
8 Control Agency, and a number of other resource agencies,
9 including the Bureau of Reclamation, et cetera, et
10 cetera, and I've had the pleasure to work with the staffs
11 of all of those in preparing this draft report that is
12 now out for public review and comment with what this
13 Board meeting is about, to provide additional comment in
14 addition to the workshops we've held about a week and a
15 half ago.

16 And what I'd like to do today is just take a few
17 minutes and kind of set the stage a little bit about what
18 we've done, why we're doing this, what are the options
19 that are -- alternative options, et cetera, that are in
20 the report not in a lot of detail. The reports are
21 available. I think a lot of people have had a chance to
22 look at them, but set that stage so that everyone kind of
23 understands where we're at, what we're looking at, what
24 kinds of choices we have to make in the future.

25 So with that, I'd like to go ahead and proceed with
26 kind of a little bit of history for a couple minutes.
27 What prompted all of the action that we've been pursuing
28 over the last 12 or 14 years with the '86 flood event

1 really woke everybody up to understand that the current
2 flood control system on the American River was probably
3 not capable of handling the size of floods that we
4 originally thought it could back in 1955 when Folsom Dam
5 was completed into the rest of the system.

6 That got a coalition of the federal government,
7 state and local governments moving forward to improve the
8 flood protection and reduce the flood risk in Sacramento.
9 A lot has occurred since then on fixing the existing
10 system and a number of projects are authorized and
11 proceeding to construction right now to help improve that
12 level of flood protection and reduce the risk of flooding
13 to Sacramento.

14 A couple of those are probably worth noting because
15 it kind of sets the stage of what we did and what the
16 study's all about that we're looking at right now.

17 Two of those were in 1992 we came out with a
18 report -- a joint report recommending a flood protection
19 plan at that time which included primarily a flood
20 retention dam on the American River at the Auburn site
21 and some additional work in and around the Natomas area.

22 The result of that was Congress decided not to take
23 action on the detention dam portion of it, but they did
24 take action to authorize the levee work in and around
25 Natomas. Instead, they sent us back to re-look at all
26 the options again and come back and report to Congress.

27 That we did, and again in 1996 we completed a
28 report that again had a recommended plan, retention dam

1 at the Auburn site and some additional levee work on the
2 lower American River and the Sacramento River.

3 Determination again by Congress at that time was
4 not to authorize the retention dam but to go ahead and
5 authorize some features on the lower American River and
6 Sacramento River, which we now call the "common features"
7 that have been authorized and are under construction
8 right now.

9 A couple other items occurred between then:
10 Reoperation of Folsom agreement between Sacramento Flood
11 Control Agency, Bureau of Reclamation occurred in that
12 time frame which, again, helped provide additional flood
13 protection.

14 In 1999 Congress again took action on flood
15 protection for Sacramento. At that time Congress decided
16 they wanted to authorize a modification of Folsom Dam,
17 basically, enlargement of the outlets to make it more
18 efficient and directed us to do two other things: One,
19 to look at what we call advanced release or forecast base
20 release to, again, help make the efficiency of Folsom Dam
21 better than it is today.

22 The other thing Congress asked us to do in 1999 was
23 to go back again and look at two specific alternatives
24 for additional level of flood protection, and those two
25 specific alternatives were, one, a small raise of Folsom
26 Dam for flood control only and, again, re-look at a plan
27 that we had looked at both in '92 and '96 and that was
28 increase the height of the levees downstream, the channel

1 capacity of the American River and Sacramento and Yolo
2 Bypass; and that, basically, was the direction from
3 Congress to work with the state and local agencies that
4 led us to the draft report that we're looking at today.

5 Basically, the findings you'll see in that
6 report -- a number of things. One I wanted to mention
7 again, I talked about, but what we call the without
8 project condition or what the condition is we expect to
9 be there if we did nothing so we can compare our plans to
10 determine what they can and can't do for increasing flood
11 protection.

12 As I mentioned before, what they really include are
13 all that past work that we did, the work on Natomas,
14 raising the levees there. The common features work that
15 we're under construction with, the reauthorization of
16 Folsom, that's an agreement between the Bureau and the
17 Sacramento Flood Control Agency. The Folsom Modification
18 Plan, that's been authorized and is in advance design and
19 nearing initiation of construction.

20 And one other item that's in there, and I'll
21 mention this a little bit when we get into the plan, is
22 this advanced release.

23 We look at that as a without project condition,
24 although we don't know exactly what that will be because
25 it will probably take a couple years to get that through
26 the process to figure out exactly how much we can do with
27 advanced release. Basically, what that means is looking
28 at the ability to release water ahead of a storm,

1 forecast it and create more space in Folsom to provide
2 additional flood protection.

3 We are in the process of doing that, and it's going
4 to take some time to make this happen because this is
5 something that has not been done before, at least out
6 here in the West; and I don't think anywhere in the
7 country right now something like that's occurring, but
8 it's something that has promise.

9 So that is kind of the base setting of where we
10 started looking at adding these other two alternatives to
11 the purpose -- or to the project.

12 So for flood control and that's -- one other item I
13 went to mention before I get there is we really had two
14 purposes. Congress asked us to go back and look at it
15 from a flood protection standpoint. We are now also
16 looking at what's called ecosystem restoration, which we
17 have authority to pursue, along with a non-federal
18 sponsor. And we do have some of these features in this
19 project, too, and I'll talk about those in just a minute.

20 First the flood control alternative. Where did we
21 look at? As I mentioned, we looked at three levee
22 raising plans. Essentially, that means increasing the
23 depth off release out of Folsom to higher flows than they
24 are right now. Right now that objective release is
25 115 -- 115,000 cfs. We looked at raising that to 160,000
26 and 180,000 cfs in combination with some new outlets.
27 Those are three alternatives we looked at there.

28 Basically, the work that's required there is to

1 modify some of the levees in the Lower American River,
2 one of them raise the levees, modify the Sacramento
3 Bypass and Sacramento Weir to move some additional water
4 out to the Yolo Bypass because we've increased the
5 objective release. Because we're doing that and putting
6 more water out in the bypass, in order to not increase
7 the risk to those people adjoining the bypass, we would
8 modify the Yolo Bypass to carry that additional water out
9 there.

10 The other three we looked at were raising Folsom
11 Dam and raising the height of Folsom Dam three and a half
12 feet, seven feet and twelve feet to provide additional
13 storage capacity in Folsom. And, basically, what this
14 requires and looks at is you raise the dam itself, a
15 concrete section, the earth and dikes around the dam, the
16 roads, replace the -- what they call the radial gates or
17 the big gates on top of the dam to allow storage of
18 additional waters for those three-and-a-half, seven- and
19 twelve-foot raises.

20 So that's briefly what those particular
21 alternatives were. I'll talk a little bit here about
22 what their performance are, what their costs are, what
23 some of the benefits of those are; but before that, one
24 other item I want to mention is that prior to reports in
25 '92 and '96 we did recommend a detention dam upstream.
26 At that time it was what we call a National Economic
27 Development plan or NED plan.

28 It was basically the plan that provides the most

1 benefits for the dollar spent on the project. Right now
2 we did look at that, again just to provide information
3 purposes, not as an alternative, but it does still appear
4 to be what we call the NED plan for the area. That's
5 there for information. It's not one of the alternatives
6 we were asked to look at, but we wanted to make it
7 information available for everybody to understand that.

8 Before I get into the details on the flood control,
9 the alternatives for ecosystem restoration is essentially
10 to restore areas that have been impacted by previous
11 federal projects. We had five particular ones we looked
12 at. Four of those are sites on the American River,
13 modification to those, and I'll get into those in a
14 little bit more detail in a minute.

15 The other one was automation of the shutters, which
16 means the intake devices to the penstock at Folsom, and
17 the idea there is to provide -- and I'll explain that a
18 little bit in a minute -- to provide better control of
19 the cold water pool in Folsom, therefore, increasing the
20 ability to control temperatures on the Lower American and
21 make it more habitable for the fish in the Lower American
22 River during the summer and the fall.

23 So what do these plans do? Real quickly, for flood
24 control the plans downstream will increase -- all of the
25 plans will increase flood protection and reduce the risk
26 of flooding. Primarily, you've got about a 1 chance in
27 165 of a flood occurring in any one year when all the --
28 without project conditions that are completed.

1 In other words, the downstream levee is completed,
2 advance release is completed, all of those are in place,
3 that's kind of a baseline where we're at.

4 The levee modification plans, those three can
5 reduce that risk from a range of about one -- increasing
6 it to about a 1 in 170 chance in any one year to about
7 1 in 190 chance in any one year. There's three plans
8 there and they range in that vicinity.

9 The dam raise plans range from reducing it from
10 about 1 in 190 to 1 in 230. They have a little greater
11 capability of reducing the risk of flood in Sacramento.

12 Again, as I mentioned, the upstream retention dam
13 following the NED plan, they can reduce that risk to
14 about a 1 chance in 500 as defined back in 1996.

15 A little bit about cost. What are the costs of
16 these plans? The levee plans range in cost from about
17 175 million is the first cost of what you'd expect to pay
18 if you went out and built them today. From about 175
19 million to 200 million for the three plans. The Folsom
20 raise plans range from about 175 million to 315 million
21 for the three, seven and twelve-foot raise.

22 The other thing that's probably of interest here is
23 the cost sharing of these particular projects and the
24 federal participation in these. Just because we identify
25 them as an alternative doesn't mean there's a federal
26 interest from the administrative perspective.

27 For there to be a federal interest in these plans,
28 basically, what we look at is there are benefits greater

1 than cost. In other words, you at least get a dollar --
2 over a dollar benefit for each dollar you spend. As long
3 as that's the case, then there is an interest in the
4 federal government in participating in these plans.

5 Now, for the downstream levee plans, none of these
6 plans have benefits greater than cost. So based on that
7 criteria, at this point without deviation from that
8 criteria, there would be no interest from the federal
9 government's perspective to participate in the cost
10 sharing of those three levee raise plans.

11 For the Folsom raised dam plans, the
12 three-and-a-half and seven-foot raise, both have benefits
13 that exceed the cost. And the seven-foot raise actually
14 is the one that provides the greatest excess benefits
15 over cost. So of the raised plans, that would be the one
16 that we would call our NED plan, if you understand that
17 terminology, but it's the one that we support the most of
18 those plans.

19 And we would cost share in that plan assuming it
20 gets authorized and constructed, and that cost sharing
21 typically is -- for this particular project would be --
22 65 percent of the total cost would be to federal
23 government and 35 percent would be the non-federal share
24 of that particular plan.

25 And the seven-foot plan is about 176 million
26 dollars so you could figure out the cost sharing on
27 those. That's if the plan is completely cost shared as a
28 flood control item.

1 There's one thing we ended up looking at the very
2 last -- very near the end of the study and we didn't put
3 the numbers in the report yet because we didn't have
4 them, but because of the fact there is a dam safety
5 problem -- an inadequacy problem, I should say, at Folsom
6 Dam for a very, very large event, we call a probable
7 maximum flood, something that is probably about three
8 times the size of the 1986 flood event, in other words,
9 very large, the current spillway cannot pass that flood
10 event.

11 So we have an obligation from a federal perspective
12 to remedy that situation and, therefore, the dam raise
13 plan will also do that as part of the process.
14 Therefore, we expect that we would cost share the plan
15 between flood reduction, which would be cost shared here
16 with the state and the local agencies, and the dam
17 safety, which would be cost shared differently between
18 the federal government and the current users of Folsom
19 Dam.

20 So the item there is that right now if you had no
21 change in the cost sharing, in other words, it was
22 entirely flood protection, then your share is 35 percent
23 of that 176 million dollars; but it's likely to go down
24 because of a portion of that 176 million would get
25 allocated to dam safety issues and would get cost shared.
26 We do not know what that exact number is until the Bureau
27 of Reclamation, working with us, come up with a final
28 plan of what would that dam safety cost be if we don't go

1 forward with this project; and we're working on that
2 right now but we don't have that information, but it
3 could go down.

4 The other item to note is the seven-foot dam raise,
5 the incremental cost to go from seven to twelve feet is
6 not justified. In other words, the additional benefits
7 you get out of that from going from seven feet to twelve
8 feet is not -- does not exceed the cost and, therefore,
9 it's not what we felt justified and we would not
10 participate in that particular increment of the raise.

11 We would participate -- if that plan were chosen,
12 the twelve-foot one, we could participate in the plan up
13 to what we would have spent on the seven-foot raise; but
14 the other part of the cost would be entirely non-federal,
15 and the cost of that plan is about 315 million dollars.
16 So the difference between 315 and 176 would be entirely a
17 non-federal cost.

18 Quickly, the other one is the ecosystem
19 restoration. I wanted to mention that again. Lower
20 American River identified four sites, essentially, the
21 Urrutia area, Woodlake area, Bushy Lake and Arden Bar
22 where there is opportunities to improve the habitat in
23 those areas in terms of creating additional wetlands,
24 native grasslands, riparian woodlands, upland woodlands,
25 a variety of those in those different areas and there
26 would be a federal interest in participating with a
27 non-federal sponsor in those -- improvement of those four
28 sites. The cost for those range from about two and a

1 half million to ten million dollars. All four total cost
2 about 21 million dollars.

3 We can proceed with any of those or all of those or
4 none of those depending upon the sponsors -- whether we
5 have a non-federal sponsor. So it's not all or none.
6 It's any one of those sites or any combination of them
7 that would be desired and, therefore, the improvement
8 there would be to improve the local habitat.

9 The other restoration feature is -- as I mentioned,
10 is a modification to the intake structures at Folsom Dam.
11 Right now those intake structures -- primarily all the
12 water during the summer and the fall get released through
13 the power penstocks to generate power.

14 Water from those comes through an intake tower and
15 currently has some shutters on there to try and determine
16 where you're gonna pull the water from within the
17 reservoir so you can get the right temperature water out
18 of the reservoir to do two things: One, try and maintain
19 the water in the Lower American River. And the other
20 one, to conserve as much of that cold water at the same
21 time so you can use that again late in the summer and
22 fall.

23 Right now it takes upwards of a week or more to
24 make those changes to those gates. If we can automate
25 those gates, they would be able to make those changes in
26 the matter of an hour or so. We could substantially
27 improve the ability of that system to handle and to pull
28 out the cold water from the part of the coolant that you

1 want it to, meet the requirement of the time, plus allow
2 yourself to save more of that cold water later in the
3 summer to meet the cold water requirements on the Lower
4 American River.

5 There again, this first cost of this particular
6 item is about 20 million dollars. We'd have to do some
7 more detailed design for it to be authorized; but, here
8 again, this is an item we'd have an interest in
9 participating in as long as we have a non-federal sponsor
10 to participate. Here again, on these particular items,
11 the cost share is 65 percent federal and 35 percent
12 non-federal sponsor participation in those particular
13 items.

14 Those are quickly -- I didn't want to take a long
15 time with this -- a little summary of what's in the
16 report, why we're looking at these particular items that
17 we were asked to look at by Congress as opposed to the
18 vast array that we've looked at previously in both '92
19 and '96.

20 We had that specific charge and to report back, and
21 we're at the point now we're doing the draft report for
22 comments. Ultimately, I think some others are going to
23 talk about the process from here over the next several
24 months and then the local sponsors are going to have to
25 make some decisions as to what plan they'd like to go
26 with, and then based upon that plan we'd complete a final
27 report and move that through the system, hopefully, for
28 consideration by Congress about next summer, which is

1 when Congress takes up what we call Water Resource
2 Development Act, which occurs every two years. So the
3 next opportunity is about the summer of 19 -- about 2002,
4 about nine months from now.

5 So that's real quick a summary. I know Mike from
6 the State's going to talk a little bit about some of the
7 comments we've had so far.

8 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Yes, Bob.

9 MR. CHILDS: Is there anything else?

10 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Before we ask for questions, I
11 think we have some more introductions.

12 CHAIRMAN COHN: Yes. We've been joined by a number
13 of my colleagues on the SAFCA Board. Roger Dickinson,
14 from the County Board of Supervisors. Amy Dean and Jon
15 Chase from RD-1000 Board. Ray Tretheway -- where are
16 you, Ray? Oh, here he is, from City Council of
17 Sacramento. And, also, Dan Silva from Sutter County.

18 So welcome. They all were running on North Sac
19 time -- or Sutter County time.

20 MR. SILVA: Sutter County time.

21 CHAIRMAN COHN: Okay, there you go.

22 MR. SILVA: Farmer time.

23 CHAIRMAN COHN: There you go.

24 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Boy, am I glad we got the
25 seating worked out. As we said, this is new for us. So
26 stick with us. I apologize, but we'll get everybody
27 hopefully with an appropriate seat, if we can.

28 At this time are there any questions from any Board

1 members for Mr. Childs on his presentation?

2 Thank you, Bob.

3 MR. CHILDS: You're welcome.

4 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: All right. Now, Mike is going
5 to be next. Mike's last name is hairy. I think I call
6 him Mike M. is going to make the next presentation.

7 Mike.

8 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: Thank you, Madam President. I'm
9 Mike Mirmazaheri. I'm the project manager representing
10 the Reclamation Board on the American River Watershed,
11 and for interest of time I'm going to present to you a
12 very brief summary of the highlights of the activities
13 that the Reclamation Board staff is involved in regards
14 to the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

15 I must say it's been a pleasure to work with the
16 staff and the Corps and SAFCA. Everyone worked very
17 hard, and as a result they were able to prepare the draft
18 EIR/EIS and release it to the public in the middle of
19 September.

20 For us on the State side, to be in compliance with
21 the CEQA, we need to follow some steps; and first one was
22 to file the report with the State Clearinghouse, and that
23 was done on September 13. On the Corps' side, they filed
24 with Federal Registry about same time or later. I think
25 it was September 21st.

26 The end of comment period is October 29th, and
27 we're encouraging everybody to offer their comments on
28 this project. We had three workshops since -- one in

1 City of Folsom, second one in City of Davis, and third
2 one was in Sacramento. They were on October the 9th,
3 10th and 11th and this is, actually, No. 4 public
4 meeting.

5 In order to be in compliance with the CEQA we had
6 to send public notices out. It was posted in various
7 cities and counties within the Basin and we also sent
8 copies to the local newspapers: Sacramento Bee, Folsom
9 Telegraph, El Dorado Hills Telegraph, Mountain Democrat
10 in Placerville and Woodland Daily Democrat.

11 In addition to that, we had a news advisory to make
12 sure that there is enough attention to that and everybody
13 aware of the location and time of the public meetings.

14 To date, we have no more than 15 comments maybe.
15 We haven't really received many comments on this, and
16 those comments are in a few areas. I was reviewing them
17 and I can categorize them in pretty much five different
18 areas.

19 There were comments concerning erosion and
20 sedimentation and whether dredging in the channel would
21 be helpful. There was a question on seismicity in the
22 vicinity of the Folsom Dam and Folsom Lake. There was
23 concern as far as raising the levee and perhaps including
24 the visual for the residents. There were also concerns
25 expressed on the impact of the project on mature trees
26 along the American River, and there were few comments on
27 multipurpose Auburn Dam as far as water storage and power
28 and everything else.

1 So this pretty much summarizes the comments that we
2 have received. We anticipate to receive comments perhaps
3 on the bridge. As you know in your report, we'll be
4 talking about temporary bridge during the construction,
5 and that might be an area we receive comments. We
6 anticipate that. We anticipate to receive comments on
7 borrow material and hauling issue from one point to
8 another within City of Folsom.

9 And the water supply and water storage is another
10 area that they would anticipate perhaps to receive
11 comments. Although this is a flood control project and
12 we do not -- are not authorized to look into it, but I'm
13 sure the public may want to address that in terms of
14 concern and questions. And one other issue that we may
15 anticipate some comments in the future would be the dam
16 safety issue.

17 Next step for us is to obviously wait until October
18 29th to get all the comments together and to prepare a
19 response to all the comments in preparation of the final
20 EIR/EIS. Our anticipation is that perhaps in time frame
21 of January/February we'll go and proceed and have the
22 final EIR ready. I think I'll address the Board at a
23 later time after the comments.

24 If there is any question, I'll be more than happy
25 to answer.

26 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you, Mike.

27 Are there questions for Mike about his
28 presentation?

1 Yes, Bill.

2 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: Mike alluded to the two
3 questions that I had, and one relates to dam safety and
4 the other relates to whether the extra space in the dam
5 as a result of the levee raising can be used for water
6 supply?

7 I think those are two crucial issues that at some
8 point, I don't know when, we ought to have the Department
9 of Water Resources Dam Safety Division at least give us
10 what their position is on the dam safety issue, both the
11 seven and the twelve-foot alternative.

12 And then the second question -- I know this is a
13 flood control project and I know the authorization -- I
14 believe the authorization can be requested for flood
15 control; but what would be necessary, if anything, to use
16 the extra space to fill it for water, which I think would
17 create a lot of problems if we were to do that, but we
18 need to know what the process is for this? Is this a
19 flood control project? Does it have to have a separate
20 authorization to use it for water supply or what?

21 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: If I may address those issues.

22 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Yes.

23 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: On the water storage, as I said,
24 this project is not authorized to do any study beyond
25 flood control. So that issue may or may not be raised in
26 the future by whomever, you know, but it's actually
27 beyond this; and if it does become an issue, if it's
28 raised by any interested group, at which time they will

1 have to go back and look at the design and evaluate the
2 seismicity, the safety of dam and all the issues in order
3 to have any permanent storage out there.

4 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: Mike, would it need a separate
5 Congressional authorization?

6 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: I would assume so because --
7 let's get Bob to tell you.

8 MR. CHILDS: I'll tell you, Bill, yes, it would
9 require additional authorization because the current
10 authorization for the particular project has specific
11 storage space conservation pool, Chapter 466, and to go
12 above that, yes, you'd have to get additional
13 authorization, Bill.

14 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: Okay. I think that's
15 important.

16 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: And the second issue, the Safety
17 of Dam is -- as a consultant to the Rec Board is looking
18 at the issue. It will come back to us with conclusive
19 opinion.

20 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: So we don't have an opinion on
21 that?

22 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: At this point in time I would say
23 that we're still studying the issue.

24 MR. NIELLO: Madam Chair --

25 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Yes, Roger.

26 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: -- follow-up question to
27 that. We discussed this at the SAFCA Board meeting last
28 week relative to water supply. Understanding that it is

1 problematic in and of itself, but there was a comment
2 made just then that implied that the dam safety issue
3 could be a factor in retaining water behind the dam other
4 than just for the instant of a flood event, meaning that
5 it is not at all presumptive that building the dam
6 enables the investigation of water supply capability
7 after the project as a separate question from flood
8 control; is that correct?

9 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: I think so, and I would invite
10 Bob Childs to help me out with this. As I understand it,
11 before the flood control issue, because the event is
12 rare, the parameters to look at the seismic issue might
13 be different than permanent storage; but, again, the
14 Safety of Dam is looking at that issue.

15 MR. CHILDS: Yeah, Roger, that's true because when
16 you're looking at seismic issues and the size of earth
17 movement or the earthquake size that you're analyzing
18 against, it's different depending upon which storage
19 you're looking at. If it's a conservation storage or a
20 storage you're likely to be at during the summertime and
21 be at during a large portion of the year, you analyze it
22 under a certain criteria.

23 For those flood events that are very, very rare,
24 that you expect to happen maybe once in a hundred years
25 or -- and only last a for a day or so at the high levels,
26 you would analyze those somewhat differently and look at
27 different criteria.

28 So right now when you look at seismic analysis of

1 the dam, you look at different ground motions for
2 Elevation 466, which is called a conservation pool, in
3 which we are not changing with this project so that
4 analysis would be the same. Then you'd look at it for,
5 say, the seven-foot raise, which is going up to Elevation
6 482, that's analyzed differently.

7 So if you change the conservation pool, which means
8 add permanent water storage to above the 466, then you'd
9 have to analyze the dam using those design parameters as
10 opposed to the ones for the flood control parameters.

11 Does that help a little bit?

12 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: Yes. In essence, just to put
13 it in simple terms for a simple person, if one were to
14 move forward with the -- a mini raise of whatever height,
15 just say seven feet since that -- the data seems to point
16 in that direction and at some point in the future after
17 the project's completed if there were some political
18 support for the question of additional water supply and
19 if the issues behind the dam were addressed, mitigated,
20 settled or whatever the message at that point could very
21 well be, "Well, sorry, you can't do it anyway because the
22 dam can't hold it."

23 MR. CHILDS: Or it might -- we don't know the
24 answer yet. Or it might just require additional
25 modification to the structure to ensure that you can,
26 which is then a cost issue.

27 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: But it's not accurate to say
28 that moving forward with this project provides the

1 capability for that in the future?

2 MR. CHILDS: I don't think we can say one way or
3 the other because we haven't -- nobody's really actually
4 analyzed it at the higher levels yet, but there's no
5 question you would have to look at that and you have to
6 evaluate and it could require additional modifications to
7 make it adequate to hold the higher water pool, yes.

8 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: Another very important
9 question is the bridge, which I know you anticipate
10 getting questions on that, but finding some way to build
11 a permanent bridge as opposed to just the temporary
12 bridge, which I think is in the cost estimates for the
13 project is going to be a very important issue, at least
14 politically, but that's going to be a very important part
15 of the project to work out somehow.

16 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: That's true. And I think we
17 understand that, Roger.

18 Are there any other questions for Mike or Bob from
19 the Board at this time?

20 All right. Seeing none, thank you very much, Mike.

21 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: Thank you.

22 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: We're going to move to the
23 public comment part now, and we have eight cards here.
24 I'm going to kind of mention how we're going to proceed
25 and hope that is agreeable to all.

26 We'll call the person's name to come up and would
27 you come up to the microphone and give us your comment.
28 Would you please try to keep it from three to five

1 minutes so that everyone has an opportunity to speak. If
2 you have a question of staff, please ask it through the
3 Chair, myself or Mr. Cohn, please, so that we can get the
4 question to the right person and get it answered.

5 So your cooperation in this would be most helpful.
6 We don't have too many cards so if you want to speak this
7 is it, folks. Get your card in to Lori, our assistant
8 here who's raising her hand.

9 All right. The first person that we're going to
10 call is a Mr. Michael A-u-i-t -- A-u-l-t, okay, thank
11 you.

12 MR. AULT: My writing's terrible, excuse me.

13 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Well, my reading isn't so
14 good.

15 MR. AULT: Madam Chair, Members of the Board,
16 Michael Ault. I represent the Downtown Sacramento
17 Partnership. We are a property-based business
18 improvement district downtown that represents over 800
19 merchants and property owners.

20 At last week's Board meeting we had an opportunity
21 to discuss the issue of flood control. While I would
22 tell you that we're not experts, obviously, in the field
23 of flood control management, we did go over the
24 alternatives and the proposals and voted unanimously as a
25 board to support the seven-foot extension of Folsom Dam.

26 We believe that SAFCA believes that giving over a
27 200-year flood protection in downtown Sacramento is
28 critical for us. We've made tremendous progress in the

1 downtown area and feel that the -- an issue of the flood
2 known only to the region and downtown would be
3 catastrophic, in our opinion, to the region and to our
4 efforts downtown. We we would like to express our
5 support for the seven-foot extension on behalf of our 800
6 merchants and property owners.

7 Thank you.

8 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Well, thank you very much.

9 The next card I have is from a Mr. Larry Sadler.

10 Mr. Sadler, welcome.

11 MR. SADLER: Good evening, Board.

12 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Hello.

13 MR. SADLER: I'm a citizen of Citrus Heights. I
14 just moved down here from El Dorado County. El Dorado
15 County, as you know, is a thirst-starved county, also.

16 Read the draft report and talked with a couple of
17 the engineers at the Davis meeting, and within the
18 perimeters that were handed to them they did a fantastic
19 job on this report. And who laid out the perimeters,
20 perhaps, is who I should be directing my comments toward.

21 All of these alternatives, including raising the
22 levees, raising the dams, all have a net benefit,
23 according to the report, if it rains. If it doesn't rain
24 excessively, there's no benefit. We just threw the money
25 away, and to an old country boy that doesn't hardly make
26 sense.

27 The Auburn Dam, however, gives us a chance to
28 invest considerably more up front, no doubt, but we get

PH-1
(Cont.)

PH-2

PH-3

PH-1

1 benefits immediately. We get electric power. We get
2 water storage. We get recreation enhanced. It doesn't
3 alter the Lower American River basin. It allows for
4 summer cooling of the American River, all of the benefits
5 plus we get our money back and eventually make a profit.

6 I think it's time for the Board to stand up and go
7 to bat and do something that's practical for the citizens
8 and the electric power and the thirst-starved people of
9 the area and push this Auburn Dam and let's get it built.

10 Thank you.

11 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you very much,
12 Mr. Sadler.

13 The next person that I would like to call is
14 Mr. George Basye.

15 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: I do want to say for my
16 colleagues on the SAFCA Board I did not arrange for that
17 gentleman to come down here.

18 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: But he was very articulate.

19 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: He was.

20 CHAIRMAN COHN: We've also been joined by our
21 colleague from Sacramento County Board of Supervisors,
22 Don Nottoli.

23 BOARD MEMBER NOTTOLI: I didn't mean to make a
24 scene either. I just meant to quietly join in.

25 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Well, you know there's been a
26 lot of scenes up here as we've been trying to figure out
27 this seating, so why not you.

28 Okay. I'm sorry, George. Go ahead and tell us

PH-3
(Cont.)

1 about it.

2 MR. BASYE: Thank you, President Marchand and
3 Chairman Cohn and Members of the Board. I'm George
4 Basye. I'm attorney for the California Central Valley
5 Flood Control Association. I'm also a resident of
6 Sacramento for 40 years and live behind these levees and
7 look for improvement from the standpoint of protection
8 from the American River, which Sacramento badly needs.

9 Our association of flood control agencies consist
10 of about 70 reclamation and levee districts and cities
11 and counties. The County of Sacramento and the City of
12 Sacramento are both members of the Flood Control
13 Association.

14 The Association strongly supports the proposal for
15 a seven-foot raise in Folsom Dam. It's time that we had
16 some additional protection for Sacramento from the
17 American River, and this would appear to offer the best
18 approach, the most feasible and the most easily
19 accomplished.

20 It does leave something to be desired in the way of
21 flood control certainly, because we would like to see
22 something more than 200-some years at some point. I
23 don't expect to see it, but I hope Sacramento will
24 because that's still only about half of what the City of
25 St. Louis and the City of New Orleans have from their
26 respective flood threats. And Sacramento, as the capitol
27 of California, ought really to have comparable protection
28 at some point to that enjoyed by those of other cities.

PH-4

PH-5

1 I'd like to indicate to you the historic basis for
2 our quandary on the American River. We are protected
3 here in Sacramento, of course, by the Sacramento River
4 Flood Control Project, the Federal Project, which is
5 constructed by the Corps of Engineers, was designed about
6 1914, was built in the '20s and '30s -- 1920's and
7 '30s -- and it was based upon a -- that design was based
8 upon the floods of 1907 and 1909. And they were 600 --
9 roughly, 600,000 cubic feet per second produced in those
10 two floods leading from the Sacramento Valley into the
11 Delta.

12 So that was the basis for the design of the
13 Sacramento River Flood Control Project, which now
14 provides protection to the Sacramento Valley, most of it.
15 Unfortunately, for Sacramento, the flow on the American
16 River in each of those two floods was only 100,000 cubic
17 feet per second. We now know that's not nearly enough to
18 protect the City of Sacramento from the American River as
19 a result of experiences since then.

20 It would have been rough on the occupants of
21 Sacramento at the time but very fortunate for us if it
22 had been 200,000 second feet flow down the American River
23 in 1907 and 1909. Then we would have had already
24 capacity to move at least 200,000 second feet past the
25 City. We don't have it. The only way to get that --
26 and, of course, built into the system below Sacramento is
27 the limited capacity to carry the American River Water.

28 If you're going to increase the assumption of water

1 down the American River through Sacramento, you have to
2 enlarge the Sacramento Weir and the Yolo Bypass capacity
3 in order to get that additional water all the way out to
4 the Delta.

5 And so the easiest way to accomplish some
6 additional protection, much-needed protection for
7 Sacramento is what's being proposed here, which is the
8 seven-foot raise to Folsom, which would give additional
9 protection without requiring the expansion of the
10 downstream capacity, which unhappily as a result of the
11 1907 and 1909 floods is, from our standpoint, limited.

12 And by increasing the capacity of Folsom, we can at
13 least achieve maybe a little more than half of the kind
14 of protection that we ought to have ultimately for the
15 City of Sacramento. It's well worth doing. It's
16 important. It's essential to the protection of the City.
17 We know that the American River -- I might mention
18 reference was made to the 1986 flood.

19 The Department's report on the 1997 flood, which
20 was centered over the Feather River, indicates that the
21 center, of course, the intensity of that flood was over
22 the watershed of the Feather, and we saw what happened
23 below Marysville. They had levee breaks on the Feather
24 River.

25 If the center of that storm and the intensity of
26 that storm had been over the American River watershed,
27 we'd have had flooding all around the State Capitol.

28 So we were that close in '97 to being flooded in

1 Sacramento as a result of our limited capacity through
2 the City and downstream. We urge your support for a
3 seven-foot raise in Folsom Dam.

4 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you, George. It's
5 always a pleasure to have you appear before our Board.

6 MR. BASYE: Thank you.

7 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Next is Mr. Ron Stork, Friends
8 of the River.

9 MR. STORK: Good afternoon. My name is Ron Stork.
10 I'm on the conservation staff of Friends of the River,
11 and I've had the chance to address you many times before
12 in the past and I think I've been working on this issue
13 long enough that I didn't have gray hair when I started
14 working on this issue.

15 I think this is one of the first times that -- I
16 was reflecting in the audience -- that I'm approaching
17 you where -- to talk American River issues and basically
18 make a project decision for which there may be
19 substantial consensus. I'm sure there's never any such
20 thing as unanimous consensus, but I think there's
21 substantial consensus that the project that is emerging
22 from your report, a seven-foot raise with some
23 restoration projects, is going to be a project that both
24 your Boards are going to feel comfortable with, and I
25 think there's going to be substantial support in the
26 flooded area community.

27 I live -- I guess like George I guess I have to
28 confess I live about the five-foot depth mark in the City

PH-7

PH-8

1 of Sacramento so that's one of my sins. So I have a
2 personal interest in this project as well.

3 I am -- I think that, frankly, the Friends of the
4 River and other members of the environmental community, I
5 think one might say, really have no objections to the
6 flood control parts of this project. I think that there
7 are still some issues associated with mitigation, both
8 construction mitigation and potentially some
9 environmental impact associated with brief inundations of
10 the area around Folsom, Folsom reservoir. That may not
11 have been completely worked out, but I have confidence
12 that those details are going to be successfully addressed
13 as both the Reclamation Board, the Corps and SAFCA work
14 through their process.

15 So that's good, and I also think that this project
16 is emerging with some important restoration elements or
17 mitigation elements, depending on how you want to
18 characterize that, that will be good for the natural
19 resources in the American River, the American River
20 Parkway and, once again, I think will be considered by
21 this community and hopefully by the State and the federal
22 government as desirable project features.

23 So that one combined project, I think, is going to
24 get fairly strong endorsement by most, if not all,
25 environmental groups that work on this issue. So I guess
26 I bring you good news there.

27 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Absolutely.

28 MR. STORK: It's news anyway.

PH-9

PH-10

PH-11

PH-12

1 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: No, it's good news. It's good
2 news.

3 MR. STORK: My sense is that there is perhaps not
4 unanimity with regard to the analysis of what the next
5 steps are beyond this project, but I'd remind everyone in
6 the audience that we authorize an important project to
7 improve the outlet works at Folsom Dam. It's still five
8 or six years from being constructed and this project may
9 be -- you know, may take a decade to construct. So we'll
10 have our hands full for a considerable period of time as
11 we get past what may or may not be needed in the future.

12 So thanks for letting me chat with you, and I'm
13 sure there are other people in the audience that will
14 offer equally informative comments.

15 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you very much. That was
16 very nice of you to come by.

17 The next person is Tim James. Mr. Tim James, Sac
18 Metro Chamber.

19 MR. JAMES: Thank you very much. My name is Tim
20 James with the Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
21 representing the 2,000 member businesses in the six
22 county Sacramento region.

23 The Sacramento Metro Chamber recognizes that
24 adequate flood protection for the people of the
25 Sacramento region is our number one public safety
26 infrastructure concern. Additionally, we also recognize
27 that this community and the region needs to meet its
28 self-imposed minimum goal of reaching a 200-year flood

1 protection, and we see this opportunity at Folsom Dam as
2 a way of achieving that.

3 The Sacramento Chamber Board of Directors has taken
4 a position and fully supports Folsom Dam improvement
5 alternatives that are outlined in this study that meet
6 two criteria.

7 Those are, one, that the improvements achieve at
8 least that minimum 200-year flood control protection and,
9 two, are justified by having the optimum cost benefit
10 ratio for the taxpayers and the citizens of the region.

11 In addition, there's been some comments made about
12 the transportation portion of the project -- of the
13 potential project with the dam, a temporary or permanent
14 dam. The Sacramento Metro Chamber's currently taking a
15 look at that position, and my understanding is our
16 ultimate position will be in favor of trying to put in a
17 permanent structure there.

18 So we have -- the Board of Directors has put forth
19 those two criteria and leave that to the Board of
20 Reclamation and the SAFCA Board to pick the appropriate
21 alternative that meet both those criteria.

22 Thank you.

23 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you very much. That was
24 very helpful.

25 The next person is Eric Rasmusson, the Sacramento
26 Association of Realtors.

27 MR. RASMUSSON: Good afternoon, Madam President,
28 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board of Reclamation,

1 Members of the SAFCA Board. I'm Eric Rasmusson, and I'm
2 here today representing the Sacramento Association of
3 Realtors.

4 Earlier this month the leadership of the
5 Association received a briefing. It was brief only in
6 name. It was rather extensive, as you can imagine. The
7 report that's before you contained certainly a huge
8 amount of detail, and you've heard groups come up and say
9 that, you know, they don't pretend to be experts and, you
10 know, to the extent possible they've sifted through the
11 information.

12 My client and the 3500 members that the Association
13 represents would claim the same. However, if any of you
14 have been through a real estate transaction lately, you
15 must understand that they are expected to be experts on
16 all of this and disclose to you all of the information
17 pertaining to it. So they take this issue very, very
18 seriously and pay particular attention to the details
19 included in the SAFCA briefing that they received.

20 Following that meeting, the Association leadership
21 voted unanimously to support the seven-foot Folsom raise
22 alternative and has sent me here today to urge that you
23 do the same.

24 Thank you very much for your time.

25 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you. Yes, and those
26 reports are voluminous, you are right. Thank you.

27 The next person is Mr. Stan Spalding.

28 Mr. Stan Spalding, welcome.

1 MR. SPALDING: Welcome. Good afternoon, Madam
2 Chairman and the Board. I'm Stan Spalding. I'm a
3 retired engineer and have worked and done a lot of work
4 on the American River, specifically back in 1977, and my
5 concern was mentioned on the erosion of these rocks and
6 cobbles and sand that is moving downstream.

7 And back -- and I just want to make sure, and I
8 haven't seen anything, that this is being addressed. And
9 I feel once you get below Paradise Beach you have fill-in
10 of these materials. And I was just -- in fact, I visited
11 it last Friday and I took some pictures. You know, at
12 Discovery Park, you know, there's a sand bar that has
13 gotten quite large since 1977. I looked for my notes
14 from 1977, but the firm I used to work for has moved
15 twice and I think they've been lost and I couldn't find
16 them.

17 But, you know, in the report -- I sent this letter,
18 actually, a couple years ago and I never received any
19 comments back from it. And I really haven't had a -- I
20 got a -- I said this at the October 9th meeting and Butch
21 Hodgkins did reply to me and gave me a couple other
22 reports, and outside of the fact in the glossary the new
23 word for me was agradation or material moving downstream,
24 but it didn't address this.

25 And it showed pictures of the flood and then the
26 mines, but when the mining -- the hydraulic mining was
27 done, that was only silt that was washed downstream. Now
28 when you have these higher flows, you know, when you get

1 flows over 80,000 cfs material does move down and it's
2 gonna deposit. And you do not allow dredging in the
3 Sacramento River now and you don't allow -- and I'm just
4 concerned that the capacity of the channel which, by the
5 way, has now been limited, you know. You now have
6 levees. You didn't have those -- they weren't as
7 extensive back in the hydraulic mining days, and I just
8 want to make sure the issue is addressed.

9 To me, the more flow you put down the river, like
10 if you increase it to 160,000 cfs, it's only gonna move
11 more and larger rocks farther down and plug up the
12 Sacramento River and the Lower American River.

13 And thank you.

14 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you. Your comment is
15 noted, and that's why we have these hearings, and I'm
16 sure that it will be responded to in the appropriate
17 document.

18 The next card that I have is for Mr. Brian May.

19 Mr. May, welcome. Cal Expo.

20 MR. MAY: Yeah, good afternoon. I'm Brian May.
21 I'm representing Cal Expo. I would be remiss, however,
22 if I didn't say as a citizen of Sacramento, personally
23 speaking, I do support the recommendation for the
24 seven-foot raise.

25 But my primary purpose for being here today
26 representing Cal Expo is to ask you for your
27 consideration in supporting the environmental restoration
28 alternative of Bushy Lake. Cal Expo floodplain and Bushy

PH-18
(Cont.)

PH-19

PH-20

PH-21

1 Lake represent about eight percent of the American River
2 Parkway. The improvements that are recommended in the
3 plan are significant enhancement to that eight percent of
4 the American River Parkway and, really, is the foundation
5 of a larger plan that we have discussed with
6 representatives of SAFCA, Sacramento County Parks and
7 Recation and representatives of the various environmental
8 groups, and it's the linchpin that we hope could jump
9 start considerable restoration for the 400 acres of Cal
10 Expo homes. So I would ask for your support in that
11 regard. Thank you.

12 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you very much. Sounds
13 like it's been discussed with the appropriate folks
14 already.

15 The next card I have is from Mr. Bill Center.
16 Mr. Center, American River Recreation Association and
17 former county supervisor. Welcome.

18 MR. CENTER: Thank you very much. My name is Bill
19 Center. I come down here from El Dorado County where I
20 am a resident and we do have a business on the south fork
21 of the American River. While we're no longer in the
22 white water rafting business, we have a campground that
23 caters to the white water rafting business and so I stay
24 closely in touch with them.

25 The American River Recreation Association has been
26 around since 1975, has been involved in a series of
27 environmental issues on the south fork of the American
28 River. Its primary involvement was with a series of dams

PH-21
(Cont.)

1 proposed by El Dorado County known as the So Far
2 (phonetic) Project.

3 I am here primarily to represent the interests
4 upstream of the reservoir. The impacts upstream could be
5 significant. There's approximately 80 acres impacted
6 under the seven-and-a-half-foot raise by construction and
7 there is up to a thousand acres impacted by, albeit
8 periodic, inundation; but that thousand acres includes
9 some very important habitat. It includes recreational
10 trails. It includes parking facilities, recreational
11 facilities and heretofore any type of mitigation or
12 restoration that addresses that upstream inundation has
13 not been offered.

14 I would also like to observe that I've spoken both
15 officially and unofficially to policy makers, including
16 elected officials in El Dorado County. And what's clear
17 to me is that El Dorado County is slowly but surely
18 becoming part of the regional discussion in issues
19 involving water, flood control and transportation. We
20 certainly welcome this as residents of El Dorado County
21 and El Dorado County certainly recognizes -- and I think
22 nobody recognizes it more clearly since the unfortunate
23 incident that happened on September 11th how important
24 the economic river in a region is to the region as a
25 whole, and El Dorado County certainly recognizes that a
26 flood event in Sacramento would have huge ripple effect
27 up the hill.

28 So El Dorado County supports flood control

1 absolutely, and El Dorado County is glad that the
2 discussion has moved beyond the very polarized discussion
3 that it seemed to center around in the previous decades.

4 However, El Dorado County officials that I spoke to
5 are also cognizant of the fact that this particular
6 project, once again, fails to recognize the impacts to El
7 Dorado County and fails to directly address those; and I
8 would propose that there are some significantly right
9 restoration/mitigation projects in El Dorado County which
10 bears the brunt, again, of the thousand acres because it
11 has the most shoreline of any county along Folsom
12 Reservoir.

13 While there are significant projects that are in
14 place and would not require additional environmental
15 review, they have non-federal partners, they address
16 issues that are directly involved with the projects such
17 as the inundation of Chapparell (phonetic) and the
18 potential impact of endangered species in the Pine Hill
19 and Gabriel (phonetic) Fall areas, as well as some
20 recreational habitat protection and acquisition
21 opportunities along the south fork of the American River
22 approximately six miles upstream from the project.

23 So there is a clear linkage, and what I would ask
24 is that the SAFCA Board if, as it appears, some of the
25 Lower American River restoration projects are not ripe
26 and there is money available in the five to ten million
27 dollar range for restoration projects upstream, I think
28 that could help accomplish something that isn't too

PH-22

PH-23

PH-23
(Cont.)

PH-24

PH-25

1 common in this region; and, that is, not only the
2 acquiescence, but potentially the act of support by El
3 Dorado County of a project put forward of significant
4 magnitude in Sacramento County.

5 And I would strongly urge the SAFCA Board to
6 encourage their staff to ask key El Dorado County people
7 about this and I would be happy -- and I have passed on
8 in personal discussions with staff, but I would be happy
9 to follow through with this. And I very much appreciate
10 the opportunity to speak to your Board.

11 And I would also like to make it clear that the
12 American River Recreation Association if it wasn't clear
13 in my earlier comments does support the raise, and our
14 key comments will go to the issue of ensuring that it
15 truly is a dry raise, that it doesn't get turned into a
16 wet raise.

17 And in our comments we will be looking very closely
18 at issues involving the changes to potential operations
19 and roll curves coming from the project that could result
20 in raised average reservoir levels, and we'll ask for
21 specifically on that; but that's a detail I just wanted
22 to bring up. In concept, again, we're happy. The flood
23 control problem appears to be solvable and we're a
24 hundred percent behind that.

25 Thank you.

26 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you, Bill, for coming
27 down.

28 The next card is from Bruce, whose last name I

PH-25
(Cont.)

PH-26

PH-27

PH-28

PH-29

1 never could pronounce, Bruce; but, anyway, with the BIA.
2 MR. HOUESHELDT: I'm going to give you the little
3 helper that I give everyone else: How to shout, how to
4 shop, How-de-sheldt.

5 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Okay, I'll practice that.

6 BOARD MEMBER NIELLO: I just call him Bruce.

7 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: That's what I want to do.

8 MR. HOUESHELDT: Bruce Houdesheldt, Director of
9 Government Affairs for the Building Industry Association.
10 Not only here in the Sacramento region, but
11 geographically we go all the way to the Oregon border.
12 We have a small chapter in Chico and a new chapter that's
13 starting in the Redding area, but we're primarily located
14 in the six-county region in Sacramento.

15 I hoped to come to you today with a recommendation
16 from our executive committee and our board, but was
17 unable to do that between their meetings. We got a
18 briefing from SAFCA on October 4th before our Sacramento
19 area council, which is our local area council, and their
20 recommendation based upon the cost benefit was to ask our
21 executive committee and our board to support the
22 seven-foot raise.

23 I'll be taking that to our executive committee next
24 week and our Board the following week, and we'll have
25 formal comments for you before your November 14th
26 meeting. So I didn't want to just -- everyone else here
27 expressing their views on it, I wanted to let you know
28 where we were in the process in evaluating it and let you

1 know that, as always, on flood control issues the
2 Building Industry is an active participant in the public
3 policy dialogue.

4 And I'd be remiss if I didn't -- if I walked away
5 from the podium and didn't say we've got to do something
6 about water supply. Whether that water supply is in a
7 dam in Auburn, whether that water supply is in
8 conjunctive use, California has a real infrastructure
9 crisis related to water supply; and so we don't view a
10 flood control protection program here for -- a very
11 important one for Sacramento as an either/or proposition
12 but part of a solution. Thank you.

13 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you very much, Bruce.

14 Is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to
15 give testimony before this Board at this time? I have no
16 more cards. Is there anyone who wishes to give
17 testimony? Hearing none, we're going to close this part
18 of the agenda and close the public comment section; and
19 at this time Bruce Hodgkins is going to give a brief
20 discussion and describe the future SAFCA actions.

21 Bruce.

22 CHAIRMAN COHN: Actually, it's Butch.

23 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: I'm sorry. It's getting late.
24 I've got Bruce on the brain. I'm sorry about that,
25 Butch.

26 BOARD MEMBER HODGKINS: Butch Hodgkins, Sacramento
27 Area Flood Control Agency, Executive Director.

28 CHAIRMAN COHN: His whole first name is Francis I.

1 Butch.

2 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: I know, and I actually knew
3 that. So that's one of the things that throw me off.

4 CHAIRMAN COHN: Go ahead, Francis.

5 BOARD MEMBER HODGKINS: Thank you. The actions
6 from here forward on SAFCA's part, just to describe them
7 briefly and not go over the same ground that Mike covered
8 earlier are (a) the identification for the Corps of
9 Engineers of a plan that we believe is going to be the
10 locally preferred plan on November 15th at our regular
11 meeting.

12 That enables the Corps to focus and finish their
13 study on the environmental document and will enable us,
14 we hope, in February to provide the Corps with a letter
15 stating our intent to serve as the local sponsor to the
16 project if the project is authorized by Congress.

17 With that letter and hopefully a similar letter
18 from the Reclamation Board, the report makes its way to
19 Washington and we're all set to try and convince Congress
20 that they need to take care of this issue in Sacramento
21 and get us out of their hair, get us over the 200-year
22 level of flood protection.

23 Any questions that I could answer? I've also been
24 asked -- and I have copies for all the Board members and
25 anybody else who would like one to let you know that we
26 have Yolo County on record in a letter as supporting in a
27 5-0 vote the -- either of the two smaller raises in
28 Folsom stating in the letter their support is because

1 they recognize that it also helps them in downstream
2 properties by controlling water that's in the system and
3 keeping it from flooding not only Sacramento, but Yolo
4 County as well.

5 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Yes. I have a comment on that
6 that I have heard that the Yolo Board was very pleased
7 with your presentation and were just very -- very, very
8 welcoming of this project, and they have unanimous action
9 supporting it, as I recall. So I think that's good.

10 Bill, did you have a question?

11 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: Excuse me, on the
12 identification of the preferred alternative, how are we
13 going to deal with the dam safety report that isn't in
14 yet? Are we going to condition our selection on that or
15 how's that gonna work?

16 BOARD MEMBER HODGKINS: Well, I -- let me give you
17 my view of where we are on dam safety, which might be a
18 little different than your own.

19 The Corps has, I believe, conducted a very thorough
20 review of the dam safety issues, and from the Corps'
21 standpoint they are satisfied that this project meets all
22 dam safety requirements.

23 We have the State Department of Dam Safety
24 conducting their own almost independent and very detailed
25 review of the Corps' work, and because it is very
26 technical and complicated work and because, you know, we
27 are all pressed here for enough time to do the work we
28 have in front of us they just haven't completed their

1 analysis.

2 I believe that they will be able before the Rec
3 Board is asked to identify a locally preferred plan offer
4 you their opinion as to whether there is any reason to be
5 concerned about this project.

6 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Butch, Mr. Pete Rabbon, the
7 General Manager for the Reclamation Board, would like to
8 speak to this issue as well.

9 GENERAL MANAGER RABBON: Butch is correct, that we
10 will have a presentation to you with a conclusion prior
11 to making a formal decision for the local preferred plan.

12 BOARD MEMBER EDGAR: Thanks, Pete.

13 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: That has been pushed by DWR.

14 Butch, did you have anymore comments? Were there
15 anymore questions for Butch now that I've got his name
16 right?

17 BOARD MEMBER HODGKINS: One clarification. We are
18 in November, hopefully, identifying for the Corps which
19 alternative they need to focus on to finish this report.

20 Any decision that says we're actually prepared to
21 move forward with this project really doesn't happen
22 until February. So we have additional time if for some
23 reason there were concerns that still had to be worked
24 out.

25 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you.

26 Mike, did you wish to make some comments now about
27 the future actions of the Reclamation Board?

28 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: Yes, if I may. Thanks again.

1 Just pretty much in line with what Butch indicated
2 with SAFCA, the goal is for the Corps to be able to get
3 the authorization in Water 2002. That's Water Resources
4 Development Act, and what they have to do is after the
5 preparation of the final EIR, then the chiefs, of course,
6 will have to go to Washington, I believe, if I'm not
7 mistaken, and from there they would have to work, you
8 know, with the people in the capitol and try to get the
9 authorization.

10 So what would help them -- help the Corps to go
11 forward with that plan is to -- perhaps to get some
12 indication from the Reclamation Board as far as being a
13 non-federal sponsor of the project.

14 The staff recommendation actually includes three
15 steps from now on. One is if it could get -- offer some
16 sort of support in the November Board meeting, November
17 16th Board meeting, the Reclamation Board offer some
18 support to the Corps. And next step would be after the
19 review of the comments and response to the comments and a
20 resolution of the other issues when the EIR is out in
21 time frame of about February sometime, perhaps do a
22 letter of intent for a specific project to the Corps.

23 And we all recognize that prior to the completion
24 of the CEQA process the Board will not be able to make a
25 decision. So the final step would be resolution by the
26 Board, which would be toward the end of year, that time
27 frame, and that would be along with the certification of
28 the EIR.

1 So if we go forward with that plan, you know, with
2 the tight schedule the way it is, it would help the Corps
3 staff to go forward and try to get Water 2002
4 authorization.

5 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Yes. Are there questions of
6 Mike on his presentation as to primarily schedule, trying
7 to meet the big picture schedule that will help move this
8 project forward, which it seems appropriate to do so?
9 Are there concerns about that or questions?

10 I don't hear any, Mike.

11 MR. MIRMAZAHERI: Thank you.

12 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Thank you.

13 I'm going to ask Mr. Rabbon if he has any comment
14 he wishes to make at this time?

15 GENERAL MANAGER RABBON: I have no further
16 comments.

17 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Okay. Do any of the Members
18 of the Board wish to make any comments?

19 CHAIRMAN COHN: Well, let me just say we want to
20 thank you for hosting this meeting and having this
21 meeting and we'll, of course, report to you after our
22 next Board meeting on November 15th, which will be 3:00
23 o'clock. I believe your meeting is scheduled the
24 following day so hopefully we can have good news to
25 report to you at that time.

26 PRESIDENT MARCHAND: Any other Board members wish
27 to make comments?

28 I would also like to thank you for coming over;

1 and, you know, we're gonna get better at this seating. I
2 want to guarantee it, okay? But I think that's all we
3 have to come before this Board so we will stand
4 adjourned.

5 (Whereupon the proceedings adjourned.)

6 ---oOo---

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 ---oOo---

3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
4 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO) ss.

5
6 I, TERI L. VERES, certify that I was the Official
7 Court Reporter for the proceedings named herein, and that
8 as such reporter I reported in verbatim shorthand writing
9 those proceedings; that I thereafter caused my shorthand
10 writing to be reduced to typewriting, and the pages
11 numbered 1 through 50 herein constitute a complete, true
12 and correct record of the proceedings:

13 PRESIDING OFFICER: BETSY MARCHAND, President
14 PROCEEDINGS: American River Watershed, California
15 Long-Term Study.
16 DATE OF PROCEEDINGS: Wednesday, October 24, 2001
17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this

18 certificate at Sacramento, California, on this 4th day
19 of November, 2001.

20 *Teri L. Veres*
21 _____
22 TERI L. VERES, CSR NO. 7522
23
24
25
26
27
28

12.6.1 PH – Public Hearing, Joint Reclamation Board and SAFCA Hearing (October 24, 2001)**Response to Comment PH-1**

The Corps acknowledges the support of the Downtown Sacramento Partnership for Alternative 3, the seven-foot raise of the Folsom Dam.

Response to Comment PH-2

Chapter 8.0 in the Final SPFR/EIS/EIR describes the costs and benefits associated with each project alternative. As indicated in Chapter 8.0, only Alternatives 2, 3, and 5 would result in benefits exceeding costs. The remaining alternatives are not considered economically feasible.

Response to Comment PH-3

Please see Response to Comment SADLER-3.

Response to Comment PH-4

The Corps acknowledges the support of the California Central Valley Flood Control Association for Alternative 3, the seven-foot raise of the Folsom Dam.

Response to Comment PH-5

The Corps and SAFCA will continue to investigate additional flood control protection for the American River Basin, which may result in greater flood protection than that defined in the Final SPFR/EIS/EIR.

Response to Comment PH-6

Please see Response to Comment PH-4.

Response to Comment PH-7

Please see Response to Comment PH-4.

Response to Comment PH-8

The Corps recognizes the support of Friends of the River and the environmental community for Alternative 3 of the flood control project and the river restoration projects.

Response to Comment PH-9

Please see Response to Comment PH-8.

Response to Comment PH-10

Section 7.8, "Vegetation" includes an evaluation of effects on vegetation around Folsom Reservoir as a result of occasional inundation of lands between 466 feet and 487 feet above mean sea level. The analysis concluded that no substantial effect on vegetation is expected to occur during these events. However, the Corps and SAFCA will implement a vegetation monitoring and adaptive management program for lands around Folsom Reservoir. This program has been updated and included as part of the environmental commitments and best management practices section in Chapter 5.0, "Flood Control Alternatives."

Response to Comment PH-11

The Corps acknowledges the support of Friends of the River for the environmental restoration alternatives evaluated in the Draft SPFR/EIS/EIR.

Response to Comment PH-12

Please see Response to Comment PH-8.

Response to Comment PH-13

Chapter 8.0, "Evaluation and Comparison of Flood Control Alternatives," provides information on the economic benefits of each flood control alternative. The evaluation concluded that benefits that would occur under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would exceed the project costs. As shown in Table 8-14, only Alternatives 3 and 4 would provide protection from floods with a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any year.

Response to Comment PH-14

To avoid effects on traffic as a result of closing Folsom Dam Road, the Corps is proposing to construct a temporary bridge just downstream of the dam. The current plan is to remove the bridge and route traffic back to Folsom Dam Road once the dam raise is completed. Although not part of the flood control project, the Corps recognizes that there is interest in constructing permanent bridge downstream of the dam. Section 1.8 provides a discussion of the status of these planning efforts.

Response to Comment PH-15

Please see Response to Comment PH-13 and Response to Comment PH-14.

Response to Comment PH-16

The Corps acknowledges the support of the Sacramento Association of Realtors for Alternative 3, the seven-foot raise of the Folsom Dam.

Response to Comment PH-17

Comment noted. See Response to Comment SPALDING-1 and SPALDING-2.

Response to Comment PH-18

Comment noted. See Response to Comment SPALDING-3.

Response to Comment PH-19

Comment noted. See Response to Comment SPALDING-1 and SPALDING-2.

Response to Comment PH-20

The Corps acknowledges the support of Mr. May for Alternative 3, the seven-foot raise of the Folsom Dam.

Response to Comment PH-21

The Corps recognizes Cal Expo's support for the restoration of Bushy Lake and other areas within the American River Parkway. The Corps and SAFCA have updated the restoration plan for the Bushy Lake Restoration Site to include measures to further enhance water quality. These changes have been incorporated into Chapter 6.0 of the Final SPFR/EIS/EIR and Appendix A.

Response to Comment PH-22

Construction impacts associated with raising Folsom Dam would be temporary in nature. Impacts to recreation at Folsom Lake during the construction process will be mitigated by managing the timing and phasing of construction and providing alternate recreational facilities as appropriate to avoid or offset potential reductions in daily use projections for the affected areas (see response to comment CDPR-1). Permanent impacts to the landscape due to the expanded footprint of flood control facilities will be mitigated by replacing the resulting loss of vegetated habitat through additional plantings that will improve the value of existing Federal lands in the Folsom State Recreation Area (see response to comment CDPR-11). The project could cause inundation of the lands between elevation 475.4 and elevation 482 that would not otherwise be subject to flooding. However, the annual risk of such inundation would be small and the inundation would be brief. Hence, the resulting impacts are considered to be negligible (see response to comment CDPR-9).

Response to Comment PH-23

Comment noted.

Response to Comment PH-24

Comment noted. See Response to Comment PH-22.

Response to Comment PH-25

Comment noted. SAFCA has indicated its willingness to discuss environmental restoration and/or open space preservation opportunities with representatives of El Dorado County with the goal to identify measures that might fall within the ambit of recently enacted state cost-sharing provisions for Federal flood control projects.

Response to Comment PH-26

Please Response to Comment PH-25.

Response to Comment PH-27

The Federally supportable plan anticipates that the increased reservoir storage space created by raising Folsom Dam would be available for flood control storage only.

Response to Comment PH-28

Comment noted.

Response to Comment PH-29

Comment noted.

Response to Comment PH-30

Please see Response to Comment NN1-1.