Postcards from Michael Turner, Charisma Goudreau, and Mark Duncan

Official Public Comment 379

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Michael Turner

Address: 2550 Wrigley Road

City/State/Zip: Eureka, CA 95503

379-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 380

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Charisma Goudreau

Address: 1416 Elizabeth St

City/State/Zip: Eureka, CA. 95503

380-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 381

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: MARK DUNCAN

Address: 415 MARINA BLVD.

City/State/Zip: SUISUN CITY, CA. 94585

381-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 382

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Dick Leahy

Address: 4288 Lentell Rd

City/State/Zip: Eureka CA 95503

Official Public Comment 383

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Steve L. Brown

Address: PO Box 3477

City/State/Zip: Napa, CAL 94558

Official Public Comment 384

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Marjorie Hurd

Address: 1748 Deer Canyon Rd.

City/State/Zip: Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Postcards from Dick Leahy, Steve L. Brown, and Marjorie Hurd

382-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

383-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

384-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Frank Coppel
Address: 1890 Star Crest Drive
City/State/Zip Grants Pass, OR 97527

Official Public Comment 386

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Christine Fong
Address: 390 Bella Vista Way
City/State/Zip: San Francisco CA 94127

Official Public Comment 387

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: JAN CLIFTON
Address: 240 RIDGETOP DR
City/State/Zip: REDDING, CA 96003

Postcards from Frank Coppel, Christine Fong, and Jan Clifton

385-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

386-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

387-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 388

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: *Frank K. Coppel*
White Water Manufacturing, Inc

Address: 1700 S. W. Nebraska Ave.,
Grants Pass, OR 97527

City/State/Zip: *1-800-467-6827 Ext. #15*

Official Public Comment 389

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: *Frank K. Coppel*
White Water Manufacturing, Inc

Address: 1700 S. W. Nebraska Ave.,
Grants Pass, OR 97527

City/State/Zip: *1-800-467-6827 Ext. #15*

Official Public Comment 390

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: MICHAEL G. FOSTER

Address: PO BOX 133

City/State/Zip: MIRANDA, CA. 95553

Postcards from Frank K. Coppel, Frank K. Coppell, and Michael G. Foster

388-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

389-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

390-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 391

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: SHIRLEY C. FOSTER

Address: P.O. BOX 133

City/State/Zip: MIRANDA, CA 95553

Official Public Comment 392

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: CLAUDE E. YOUNG

Address: 3420 ROCKSPRING ROAD

City/State/Zip: Hydesville, CA 95547

Official Public Comment 393

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Andy Lane

Address: ~~859-2263~~

City/State/Zip: ~~690 Hunts~~ Dr.
McKinleyville
Calif. 95519-9225

Postcards from Shirley C. Foster, Claude E. Young, and Andy Lane

391-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

392-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

393-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Postcards from Willard Thompson, Carolyn Frazee, and June Thompson

394-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

395-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

396-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 394

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Willard Thompson

Address:

City/State/Zip:

Official Public Comment 395

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Carolyn Frazee

Address: 499 Redmond Rd

City/State/Zip: Eureka CA 95503

Official Public Comment 396

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: June Thompson

Address: 3084 Hockey Creek Rd

City/State/Zip: Bayside CA 95524

Postcards from Carl Tuck and Michael Morrison

Official Public Comment 397

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Carl Tuck

Address: 5075 Echo Ln

City/State/Zip: Bayside, CA 95524

397-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 398

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: MICHAEL MORRISON

Address: PO BOX 265

City/State/Zip: BAYSIDE CA 95524

398-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 399

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Paul Springer (USFWS retired)

Address: 1610 Panorama Drive

City/State/Zip: Arcata CA 95521

Please keep restore the Trinity River fishery population, and prevent the continued wasteful diversion to the CVP

Postcard from Paul Springer

399-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 400

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Jeanne Hobar

Address: Box 86

City/State/Zip: Mineral Ca. 96063

Official Public Comment 401

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: ERIC WHITE

Address: 5315 WOODSTOCK DR

City/State/Zip: MT. SHASTA, CA 96067

SISKIYOU COUNTY

Official Public Comment 402

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: HILARY HACKER

Address: PO BX 1254

City/State/Zip: REDWAY CA 95560

Postcards from Jeanne Hobar, Eric White, and Hilary Hacker

400-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

401-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

402-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 403

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: TOM CLIFTON
Address: 260 RINGSTOP DR
City/State/Zip: REDDING, CA 96003

Official Public Comment 404

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: KAREN TENBROECK
Address: PO BOX # 2019
City/State/Zip: MINDEN, NV 89423

Official Public Comment 405

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: GREG TENBROECK
Address: 1134 WISTERIA
City/State/Zip: MINDEN, NV 89423

Postcards from Tom Clifton, Karen Tenbroeck, and Greg Tenbroeck

403-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

404-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

405-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Official Public Comment 406

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Frank Coppel

Address: 1890 Star Crest Drive

City/State/Zip: Grants Pass, OR 97527

Official Public Comment 407

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Sandy McKinley

Address: 1507 SS Bar Ranch Rd

City/State/Zip: Horn Brook, Ca. 96044

Official Public Comment 408

Dear EIS/EIR Team Members:

I support a diversion of no more that 30 percent of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin. While I support the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. Legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and additional legislation clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative does not go far enough to achieve a legally mandated restoration of the ecosystem.

Thank You,

Name: Norman M. Christensen

Address: 900 Barry Rd.

City/State/Zip: Kneeland CA 95549

Postcards from Frank Coppel, Sandy McKinley, and Norman M. Christensen

406-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

407-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

408-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

409

Dear Mr. Polos,

Please restore water to the Trinity River, at least 70% of its original flow. Bring back the salmon that were once plentiful, and other species that rely on salmon. That water was stolen for agri-business profits and Justice demands it be returned.

Thanks, [redacted], Dave

409-1

Letter from David Ross

409-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

410

SIX RIVERS PADDLING CLUB

c\o 3359 18th Street, Eureka, CA 95501

November 23, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
US Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th Street, Room 209
Arcata, California 95521

Dear Mr. Polos:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the public draft of the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration environmental impact statement/report (EIS/R).

We are going to comment on the recreational use of the Trinity as white water canoeists. We think that white water canoeist where left out of your list on recognized recreational users in Tables 3-32 and 3-33. In our opinion, there is a big difference between "canoeist and white water canoeist" in their preferred flow ranges.

We believe that the habitat in the Trinity River needs improvement, and from our uneducated interpretation of the document, we are going to support the preferred alternate. Along with the fisheries restoration, we think that the preferred alternative would also improve the whitewater recreational opportunities on the Trinity River. 410-1

My comments deal primarily with the analysis of whitewater recreation opportunities that are affected by the proposals in the EIS/R.

As white water canoeists, the three primary whitewater runs on the mainstem of the Trinity River in the reach affected by these proposals are Pigeon Point (junction with North Fork of the Trinity to Big Flat); Hayden–Cedar (Hayden Flat campground to Cedar Flat bridge); and the Hawkins Bar to Salyer (Hawkins Bar USFS river access to the

Trinity River Fishery Restoration EIS/R
6 Rivers Paddling Club
Arcata, CA

1

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club Dated November 23, 1999

410-1 Thank you for your comments regarding leaving white-water canoeists out of Tables 3-32 and 3-33 of Section 3.8 Recreation in the DEIS/EIR. Although not specifically called out, white-water canoeists were assumed to be a subset of "white-water" activities in these tables. Table 3-32 lists the preferred flow range for "white-water (i.e. kayaking and rafting)" as 300-800 cfs. Accordingly, impacts to white-water canoeists are summarized as a subset of "white water" in Tables 3-32 and 3-33. However, revisions have been made to include white-water "canoeists" in these tables in the FEIS/EIR. Please see Chapter 2 of the FEIS/EIR, Changes to the DEIS/EIR.

public access at Sharbour (sp?) Slough on Fountain Ranch Road). Under the International Scale of Difficulty, Pigeon Point is rated class 3, or intermediate; Hayden-Cedar is rated class 2, or advanced beginner; and Hawkins Bar is rated class 1+, or intermediate beginner.

These runs provide easily accessible whitewater for users at a variety of skill levels and the first two are used extensively throughout the year by whitewater boaters from northern and central California, southern Oregon,

The increased flows into the river would provide additional water that will increase the opportunities for whitewater recreation on all three of these runs. These increased flows are particularly beneficial to recreation during critically dry and dry years when other regional rivers may not have boatable flows, and late in the season (June-October) when other snowmelt and rain-fed rivers no longer have boatable flows.

Recreational season of Memorial Day through Labor Day, the period defined as the primary recreation season in the EIS/R, is not accurate in our opinion. Many whitewater boaters who use the Trinity River believe that the whitewater recreation season can run year around depending on how much winter rain runoff effects the flow into the Trinity. Because the analysis defines the primary recreation season as the summer, the conclusion is that the flow evaluation alternative constrains whitewater recreation for one week. If the analysis compared whitewater boating opportunities on the Trinity with opportunities throughout the year at other regional rivers, the conclusion would likely be that the increased flows under the maximum flow and flow evaluation alternatives enhance rather than constrain whitewater recreation. The analysis summarized in Table 3-33 shows only constraints on recreation, but under NEPA, beneficial effects must also be considered. 410-2

We believe that the preferred recreation flow ranges/thresholds given in Table 3-32 incorrectly assign 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) as the lower limit of the preferred flow range for kayaking, rafting or whitewater canoeists on these runs.

At 300 cfs, the whitewater runs on the mainstem of the Trinity are considered marginal for all whitewater craft. At this low flow, rocks and other obstacles to navigate around are exposed or very close to the surface; some routes through rapids are not available; and shallow reaches of the river may not have enough water to float a boat such as the rapid on the Hayden-Cedar run commonly referred to as "Picket Fence. At 300 cfs, whitewater canoeists have to portage this long rapid as we can't negotiate the tight turns at the very bottom of the drop. Shallow water is more dangerous for whitewater canoeists as when a canoe turns over, the paddler is in danger of getting trapped under the canoe and getting "beat up" by the rocks. Shallow water is also dangerous for kayakers as there may not be enough water to complete an eskimo roll to bring the boat back upright. Inflatable rafts in particular have difficulty negotiating the shallow rocks and narrow channels on any of the three runs at 300 cfs. Inflatable rafts are susceptible to damage from sharp rocks that become more prominent at low flows. The danger of foot entrapment for boaters who have to exit their craft and swim to shore increases at lower flows. 410-3

Trinity River Fishery Restoration EIS/R
6 Rivers Paddling Club
Arcata, CA

2

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club continued

410-2 For the purposes of the DEIS/EIR, the primary recreation season is defined as Memorial Day to Labor Day, or approximately the last week in May to the end of the first week in September, because the majority of recreation use across all recreation user types takes place during this period. It is acknowledged, however, that recreation takes place on the Trinity River year-round. Please see page 3-263 of the DEIS/EIR which states that "during the primary recreation season, water-dependent and water-enhanced Trinity River recreation includes boating, kayaking, canoeing, rafting, inner-tubing, fishing, swimming, wading, camping, gold panning, nature study, picnicking, hiking and sight-seeing. In addition, fishing for chinook salmon, steelhead, and rainbow and brown trout is a major recreational activity on the Trinity River throughout the remainder of the year." The last sentence has been modified in the FEIS/EIR to include year-round boating activities as well. Please see Chapter 2 of the FEIS/EIR, Changes to the DEIS/EIR.

Please note that the selection of the primary recreation season for recreation opportunities analysis was meant to provide a summary of impacts to a broad range of recreation opportunities on the Trinity River throughout the summer months. The primary recreation season was not intended to specifically capture the "primary white-water recreation season."

In addition, as the commentor accurately states, "many whitewater boaters who use the Trinity River believe that the whitewater recreation season can run year round depending on how much winter rain runoff effects the flow into the Trinity." It is very important to note that winter rain runoff plays a very key role in impacts to white-water activities on the Trinity River. During periods of high run-off, impacts from Lewiston releases play a less significant role in Trinity River flows. As stated on page 3-264 of the DEIS/EIR, "during the primary recreation season, Trinity River flows are most influenced by Lewiston releases in the summer months given tributary flow is generally not much of a factor during this period. Many of the recreation activities, in particular white-water kayaking and rafting, are most prevalent downstream of the river's confluence with the North Fork of the Trinity River." As such, Lewiston releases play a minor role in Trinity River flows compared to tributary inflows throughout the remainder of the year, especially downstream of the confluence with the North Fork of the

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club continued

410-2 cont'd

Trinity River where white-water activities generally occur. Therefore, the primary recreation season, i.e., a period of generally low rainfall and low tributary inflow, is the best period to evaluate the most significant and direct impacts to white-water activities for each of the alternatives because of the direct changes in the Lewiston release schedule. In summary, impacts to white-water activities on the Trinity River during the "non-primary" recreation season (i.e., late fall, winter, early spring) cannot be determined by strictly analyzing Lewiston releases; tributary inflows would have to be considered as well. Such a detailed analysis was determined to be beyond the necessary scope of the DEIS/EIR by the lead agencies because white-water impacts are already addressed in the DEIS/EIR for the primary recreation season (the season when Lewiston releases play the greatest role in impacts to white-water recreation). Please also note that year-round Trinity River average weekly flow data is available in Recreation Resources Appendix D for further analysis.

In addition, the commentor is correct that under NEPA, beneficial impacts to white-water activities must be considered, and are in fact considered, in the DEIS/EIR. As such, potential beneficial impacts to white-water activities are noted in the DEIS/EIR on page 3-269 of the DEIS/EIR which states that "white water kayaking and rafting are constrained during the same week at the end of May during extremely wet water-year class when the Trinity River flows exceed the upper preferred threshold of 8,000 cfs for white-water activities. In general, however, those who prefer flows on the higher end of the preferred range would experience improved conditions compared to No Action." This last week in May is the only period during the primary recreation season under all the alternatives when the Trinity River flows exceed the 8,000-cfs white-water threshold. As such, it is noted in the DEIS/EIR that such an exceedance may indeed be beneficial to some white-water user groups. In addition, a footnote has been added to Table 3-33 to note this potential benefit more clearly. Please see Chapter 2 of the FEIS/EIR, Changes to the DEIS/EIR.

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club continued

410-3 Table 3-32 conservatively assigns 300 cfs as the lowest threshold for white-water activities because this flow range was intended to encompass the broadest range of white-water users on the Trinity River. In addition, by selecting a conservatively low threshold range, the worst-case impacts to white-water activities could be determined. However, the commentor's recommendation has been noted, and Tables 3-32 and 3-33 have been revised to incorporate a revised minimum white-water threshold of 450 cfs. Please see Chapter 2 of the FEIS/EIR, Changes to the DEIS/EIR.

It may be noted that using a higher minimum white-water threshold of 450 cfs does not change white-water impacts for the Maximum Flow Alternative, the Flow Evaluation Alternative, and the State Permit Alternative as compared to using the 300-cfs threshold. Please see the following tables.

Totals for DEIS/EIR Whitewater Query (Preferred Threshold = 300-8,000 cfs)

Average Weekly Flow Data (cfs) Used for Recreation Opportunities Analysis - Proposed Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration EIS/EIR Flow Alternatives (Excerpted from Recreation Resources Appendix D)

	No Action/ Existing Conditions	Maximum Flow Alternative					Flow Evaluation Alternative					Percent Inflow Alternative					State Permit Alternative
		Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	
26-May	**1086**	**7929**	**4286**	**2300**	**2000**	**2000**	**9810** [1]	**5285**	**2988**	**1503**	**1445**	**3745**	**2335**	**1241**	**1051**	**574**	150
02-Jun	**1000**	**5000**	**3714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**6476**	**3362**	**2309**	**1104**	**1104**	**3394**	**1813**	**1200**	**969**	**392**	150
09-Jun	**628**	**4286**	**2714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**5104**	**2179**	**2000**	**811**	**811**	**2805**	**1414**	**1041**	**723**	**303**	150
16-Jun	**450**	**2643**	**2400**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**3464**	**2000**	**2000**	**596**	**596**	**2257**	**1088**	**745**	**573**	267	150
23-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2355**	**2000**	**2000**	**461**	**461**	**1751**	**857**	**488**	**416**	273	150
30-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**900**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**450**	**450**	**1400**	**593**	**342**	285	146	150
07-Jul	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**1500**	**1500**	**900**	**1543**	**1543**	**1543**	**450**	**450**	**1116**	**430**	248	202	99	150
14-Jul	**450**	**1700**	**1800**	**1200**	**1100**	**900**	**696**	**696**	**696**	**450**	**450**	**818**	**313**	189	150	73	150
21-Jul	**450**	**1200**	**1000**	**800**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**579**	237	147	118	61	150
28-Jul	**450**	**629**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**443**	181	115	93	51	150
04-Aug	**450**	**450**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**312**	145	96	83	42	150
11-Aug	**450**	**450**	**800**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	233	118	84	72	38	150
18-Aug	**450**	**450**	**670**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	187	102	75	65	34	150
25-Aug	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	172	93	70	58	33	150
01-Sep	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	148	97	64	55	33	150
# Weeks Out of Preferred Range:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**7**	**9**	**10**	**12**	**15**
# Weeks In Preferred Range (bolded above):	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**11**	**8**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**0**

[1] Whitewater kayaking and rafting are constrained during the last week of May during the extremely wet water-year class when the Trinity River flows exceed the upper preferred threshold of 8,000 cfs for white-water activities. In general, however, those who prefer flows on the higher end of the preferred range would experience improved conditions compared to No Action.

Totals for Revised FEIS/EIR Whitewater Query (New Preferred Threshold = 450-8,000 cfs)

Average Weekly Flow Data (cfs) Used for Recreation Opportunities Analysis

	No Action/ Existing Conditions	Maximum Flow Alternative					Flow Evaluation Alternative					Percent Inflow Alternative					State Permit Alternative
		Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	
26-May	**1086**	**7929**	**4286**	**2300**	**2000**	**2000**	**9810** [1]	**5285**	**2988**	**1503**	**1445**	**3745**	**2335**	**1241**	**1051**	**574**	150
02-Jun	**1000**	**5000**	**3714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**6476**	**3362**	**2309**	**1104**	**1104**	**3394**	**1813**	**1200**	**969**	392	150
09-Jun	**628**	**4286**	**2714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**5104**	**2179**	**2000**	**811**	**811**	**2805**	**1414**	**1041**	**723**	303	150
16-Jun	**450**	**2643**	**2400**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**3464**	**2000**	**2000**	**596**	**596**	**2257**	**1088**	**745**	**573**	267	150
23-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2355**	**2000**	**2000**	**461**	**461**	**1751**	**857**	**488**	416	273	150
30-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**900**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**450**	**450**	**1400**	**593**	342	285	146	150
07-Jul	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**1500**	**1500**	**900**	**1543**	**1543**	**1543**	**450**	**450**	**1116**	430	248	202	99	150
14-Jul	**450**	**1700**	**1800**	**1200**	**1100**	**900**	**696**	**696**	**696**	**450**	**450**	**818**	313	189	150	73	150
21-Jul	**450**	**1200**	**1000**	**800**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**579**	237	147	118	61	150
28-Jul	**450**	**629**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	443	181	115	93	51	150
04-Aug	**450**	**450**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	312	145	96	83	42	150
11-Aug	**450**	**450**	**800**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	233	118	84	72	38	150
18-Aug	**450**	**450**	**670**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	187	102	75	65	34	150
25-Aug	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	172	93	70	58	33	150
01-Sep	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	148	97	64	55	33	150
# Weeks Out of Preferred Range:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***6***	***9***	***10***	***11***	***14***	**15**
# Weeks In Preferred Range (bolded above):	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**9**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**1**	**0**

[1] Whitewater kayaking and rafting are constrained during the last week of May during the extremely wet water-year class when the Trinity River flows exceed the upper preferred threshold of 8,000 cfs for white-water activities. In general, however, those who prefer flows on the higher end of the preferred range would experience improved conditions compared to No Action.

Average Weekly Flow Data[1] (cfs) Used for Recreation Opportunities Analysis - Proposed Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration EIS/EIR Flow Alternatives

Totals for Whitewater Query (Preferred Threshold = 300-8,000 cfs)

	No Action/ Existing Conditions	Maximum Flow Alternative					Flow Evaluation Alternative					Percent Inflow Alternative					State Permit Alternative
				Refined					Refined								
		Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	
30-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	111	82	70	54	61	200
07-Oct	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	111	75	77	69	88	200
14-Oct	328	300	300	300	300	300	321	321	321	321	321	271	200	82	86	75	200
21-Oct	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	177	126	129	78	70	200
28-Oct	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	429	149	93	158	65	200
04-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	266	366	134	122	116	250
11-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	982	289	194	169	127	250
18-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1845	375	291	312	122	250
25-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1055	590	275	230	99	250
02-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	937	726	284	232	111	200
09-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	593	868	263	383	171	200
16-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1410	900	227	358	187	200
23-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1661	1595	324	268	118	200
30-Dec	300	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1238	1019	311	241	125	200
06-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	826	820	313	256	142	150
13-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1064	859	770	273	149	150
20-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	3123	1307	634	271	140	150
27-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	1900	300	300	300	300	300	300	1421	1345	558	384	169	150
03-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	1950	300	300	300	300	300	300	1231	1316	635	314	212	150
10-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1666	1454	835	519	408	150
17-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1872	1469	738	617	246	150
24-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2132	1349	1110	513	245	150
03-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2456	1401	1120	565	210	150
10-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1788	1156	1311	763	381	150
17-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1660	1038	1296	792	429	150
24-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1582	1018	1156	770	567	150
31-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2087	1429	1306	880	491	150
07-Apr	300	4441	3631	3000	2100	300	300	300	300	300	300	1982	1393	1406	1085	565	150
14-Apr	300	5882	4262	3000	2500	300	300	300	300	300	300	1788	1635	1563	1235	542	150
21-Apr	300	7323	4893	3000	2900	300	500	500	500	557	1243	1949	1873	1740	1282	518	150
28-Apr	300	8764	5524	4215	3800	300	1500	2000	2500	4071	1500	2202	2068	1551	1266	578	150
05-May	1714	10205	6155	5429	2500	300	2000	2500	5683	3788	1500	2613	1994	1569	1306	696	150
12-May	2000	11643	6786	4000	2300	1250	2000	5857	5006	2783	1500	2968	2287	1613	1234	608	150
19-May	1700	27857	6429	2714	2100	2000	7786	7071	3867	2045	1500	3164	2476	1555	1198	562	150
PRIMARY RECREATION SEASON FLOWS:																	
26-May	**1086**	**7929**	**4286**	**2300**	**2000**	**2000**	**9810 [2]**	**5285**	**2988**	**1503**	**1445**	**3745**	**2335**	**1241**	**1051**	**574**	150
02-Jun	**1000**	**5000**	**3714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**6476**	**3362**	**2309**	**1104**	**1104**	**3394**	**1813**	**1200**	**969**	**392**	150
09-Jun	**628**	**4286**	**2714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**5104**	**2179**	**2000**	**811**	**811**	**2805**	**1414**	**1041**	**723**	**303**	150
16-Jun	**450**	**2643**	**2400**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**3464**	**2000**	**2000**	**596**	**596**	**2257**	**1088**	**745**	**573**	267	150
23-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2355**	**2000**	**2000**	**461**	**461**	**1751**	**857**	**488**	**416**	273	150
30-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**900**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**450**	**450**	**1400**	**593**	**342**	285	146	150
07-Jul	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**1500**	**1500**	**900**	**1543**	**1543**	**1543**	**450**	**450**	**1116**	**430**	248	202	99	150
14-Jul	**450**	**1700**	**1800**	**1200**	**1100**	**900**	**696**	**696**	**696**	**450**	**450**	**818**	**313**	189	150	73	150
21-Jul	**450**	**1200**	**1000**	**800**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**579**	237	147	118	61	150
28-Jul	**450**	**629**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**443**	181	115	93	51	150
04-Aug	**450**	**450**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**312**	145	96	83	42	150
11-Aug	**450**	**450**	**800**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	233	118	84	72	38	150
18-Aug	**450**	**450**	**670**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	187	102	75	65	34	150
25-Aug	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	172	93	70	58	33	150
01-Sep	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	148	97	64	55	33	150
08-Sep	450	300	650	650	700	900	450	450	450	450	450	150	84	58	52	30	150
15-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	168	81	55	50	29	150
22-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	116	92	73	50	50	150
# Weeks Out of Preferred Range:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**7**	**9**	**10**	**12**	**15**
# Weeks In Preferred Range	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**11**	**8**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**0**

[1] Average weekly flows are shown for the entire year. However, whitewater flows are only evaluated in the DEIS/EIR for the Primary Recreation Season because this is the period in which Lewiston releases play the greatest role in Trinity River flows. Tributary in-flows play a much greater role in Trinity River Flows during the remainder of the year.

[2] Whitewater kayaking and rafting are constrained during the last week of May during the extremely wet water-year class when the Trinity River flows exceed the upper preferred threshold of 8,000 cfs for white-water activities. In general, however, those who prefer flows on the higher end of the preferred range would experience improved conditions compared to No Action.

Average Weekly Flow Data[1] (cfs) Used for Recreation Opportunities Analysis - Proposed Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration EIS/EIR Flow Alternatives

Totals for Whitewater Query (Preferred Threshold = 450-8,000 cfs)

	No Action/ Existing Conditions	Maximum Flow Alternative					Flow Evaluation Alternative					Percent Inflow Alternative					State Permit Alternative
		Refined					Refined										
		Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	Ex. Wet	Wet	Normal	Dry	Crit. Dry	
30-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	111	82	70	54	61	200
07-Oct	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	111	75	77	69	88	200
14-Oct	328	300	300	300	300	300	321	321	321	321	321	271	200	82	86	75	200
21-Oct	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	177	126	129	78	70	200
28-Oct	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	429	149	93	158	65	200
04-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	266	366	134	122	116	250
11-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	982	289	194	169	127	250
18-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1845	375	291	312	122	250
25-Nov	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1055	590	275	230	99	250
02-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	937	726	284	232	111	200
09-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	593	868	263	383	171	200
16-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1410	900	227	358	187	200
23-Dec	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1661	1595	324	268	118	200
30-Dec	300	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1238	1019	311	241	125	200
06-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	826	820	313	256	142	150
13-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	1064	859	770	273	149	150
20-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	3123	1307	634	271	140	150
27-Jan	300	3000	3000	3000	1900	300	300	300	300	300	300	1421	1345	558	384	169	150
03-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	1950	300	300	300	300	300	300	1231	1316	635	314	212	150
10-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1666	1454	835	519	408	150
17-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1872	1469	738	617	246	150
24-Feb	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2132	1349	1110	513	245	150
03-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2456	1401	1120	565	210	150
10-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1788	1156	1311	763	381	150
17-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1660	1038	1296	792	429	150
24-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	1582	1018	1156	770	567	150
31-Mar	300	3000	3000	3000	2000	300	300	300	300	300	300	2087	1429	1306	880	491	150
07-Apr	300	4441	3631	3000	2100	300	300	300	300	300	300	1982	1393	1406	1085	565	150
14-Apr	300	5882	4262	3000	2500	300	300	300	300	300	300	1788	1635	1563	1235	542	150
21-Apr	300	7323	4893	3000	2900	300	500	500	500	557	1243	1949	1873	1740	1282	518	150
28-Apr	300	8764	5524	4215	3800	300	1500	2000	2500	4071	1500	2202	2068	1551	1266	578	150
05-May	1714	10205	6155	5429	2500	300	2000	2500	5683	3788	1500	2613	1994	1569	1306	696	150
12-May	2000	11643	6786	4000	2300	1250	2000	5857	5006	2783	1500	2968	2287	1613	1234	608	150
19-May	1700	27857	6429	2714	2100	2000	7786	7071	3867	2045	1500	3164	2476	1555	1198	562	150
PRIMARY RECREATION SEASON FLOWS:																	
26-May	**1086**	**7929**	**4286**	**2300**	**2000**	**2000**	**9810 [2]**	**5285**	**2988**	**1503**	**1445**	**3745**	**2335**	**1241**	**1051**	**574**	150
02-Jun	**1000**	**5000**	**3714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**6476**	**3362**	**2309**	**1104**	**1104**	**3394**	**1813**	**1200**	**969**	392	150
09-Jun	**628**	**4286**	**2714**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**5104**	**2179**	**2000**	**811**	**811**	**2805**	**1414**	**1041**	**723**	303	150
16-Jun	**450**	**2643**	**2400**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**3464**	**2000**	**2000**	**596**	**596**	**2257**	**1088**	**745**	**573**	267	150
23-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2355**	**2000**	**2000**	**461**	**461**	**1751**	**857**	**488**	416	273	150
30-Jun	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**900**	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**450**	**450**	**1400**	**593**	342	285	146	150
07-Jul	**450**	**2000**	**2000**	**1500**	**1500**	**900**	**1543**	**1543**	**1543**	**450**	**450**	**1116**	430	248	202	99	150
14-Jul	**450**	**1700**	**1800**	**1200**	**1100**	**900**	**696**	**696**	**696**	**450**	**450**	**818**	313	189	150	73	150
21-Jul	**450**	**1200**	**1000**	**800**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**579**	237	147	118	61	150
28-Jul	**450**	**629**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	443	181	115	93	51	150
04-Aug	**450**	**450**	**900**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	312	145	96	83	42	150
11-Aug	**450**	**450**	**800**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	233	118	84	72	38	150
18-Aug	**450**	**450**	**670**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	187	102	75	65	34	150
25-Aug	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	172	93	70	58	33	150
01-Sep	**450**	**450**	**650**	**650**	**700**	**900**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	**450**	148	97	64	55	33	150
08-Sep	450	300	650	650	700	900	450	450	450	450	450	150	84	58	52	30	150
15-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	168	81	55	50	29	150
22-Sep	450	300	300	300	300	300	450	450	450	450	450	116	92	73	50	50	150
# Weeks Out of Preferred Range:	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**14**	**15**
# Weeks In Preferred Range	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**9**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**1**	**0**

[1] Average weekly flows are shown for the entire year. However, whitewater flows are only evaluated in the DEIS/EIR for the Primary Recreation Season because this is the period in which Lewiston releases play the greatest role in Trinity River flows. Tributary in-flows play a much greater role in Trinity River Flows during the remainder of the year.

[2] Whitewater kayaking and rafting are constrained during the last week of May during the extremely wet water-year class when the Trinity River flows exceed the upper preferred threshold of 8,000 cfs for white-water activities. In general, however, those who prefer flows on the higher end of the preferred range would experience improved conditions compared to No Action.

The lowest preferred flow for the mainstem Trinity for rafting, kayaking, and whitewater canoeing should be noted as at least 450 cfs, rather than 300 cfs. 300 cfs is a minimal flow (low threshold) but is not preferred. } 410-3 cont'd

The adverse effect of low flows on whitewater recreation is reflected in the conclusions shown in Table 3-33 that the percent inflow alternative results in greater constraints over longer periods of time than other alternatives, except for the state permit alternative in which the flows are unacceptably low throughout the year.

The analysis in Section 3-8, Recreation, summarized in Table 3-33, is oversimplified with respect to constraints on whitewater boating under the maximum flow and flow evaluation alternatives. The analyses do not account for the skill level of whitewater boaters who would attempt any of the 3 whitewater runs at the higher end of the preferred flow range, nor for constraints due to changing difficulty of the runs at different flows. The conclusions are oversimplified by stating that there are no constraints during the primary recreation season under the maximum flow alternative during extremely wet years and that whitewater recreation is constrained for one week under the flow evaluation.

The analysis defines constraints on whitewater recreation as those flows outside the preferred flow range during the primary recreation season. Under the maximum flow alternative, a peak release of 30,000 cfs in extremely wet years is depicted on Figure 2-2 as occurring 5 days prior to May 27, decreasing to around 8,000 cfs on May 27 and to 5,000 cfs around June 1. Under the flow evaluation alternative for extremely wet years, a peak release of 11,000 cfs would occur from May 27 to June 1, leading to a conclusion that whitewater recreation is constrained for one week. 410-4

For flows greater than 3000 cfs at the Lewiston gage, the majority of whitewater canoeist would choose to boat on other rivers. We can't speak for other types of boaters, as kayakers and rafters are willing to boat higher flows than canoeists are comfortable with.

The analysis for the effects of the flow evaluation correctly notes that boaters who prefer higher flows would experience improved conditions compared to the no action alternative. The more skilled kayakers and rafters wouldn't have problems at the high flows in the preferred range. Advanced kayakers may even enjoy, with out problems, boating at 11,000 cfs (flow evaluation alternative).

The analysis should note that constraints on whitewater boating are dependent on boater skill level and difficulty of the whitewater run, and that low flows constrain whitewater recreation to a far greater extent than high flows.

In conclusion, 6 Rivers Paddling Club supports the proposal to increase flows into the Trinity River for the purpose of restoration of the anadromous fishery. In the absence of an alternative that would allow all the inflow into the Trinity River basin to be retained in

Trinity River Fishery Restoration EIS/R
6 Rivers Paddling Club
Arcata, CA
3

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club continued

410-4 The commentor is correct. The analysis in the DEIS/EIR generally does not account for the skill level of white-water boaters who would attempt any of the three white-water runs at the higher end of the preferred flow range, nor the constraints due to changing difficulty of the runs at different flows. The overall level of evaluation of the impacts to recreation opportunities in the DEIS/EIR was meant to serve as a broad measurement of impacts to an expansive range of recreational activities on the Trinity River. The intent of the DEIS/EIR was not to supply a detailed analysis of impacts to a particular recreational user group (i.e., white-water users), but instead to provide a broad view of impacts to an extensive spectrum of recreational users. Therefore, skill levels of the various white-water users, or other recreational users such as swimmers and waders, are not considered in the analysis provided in Section 3.8, nor the preferred threshold flow ranges listed in Table 3-33. The preferred flow ranges listed in the DEIS/EIR were intended to quantify the upper and lower flow limits as "worst-case" impacts to all types of recreational activities, regardless of skill levels. Please see revisions to Tables 3-32 and 3-33 as noted in Chapter 2 of the FEIS/EIR, Changes to the DEIS/EIR. Regarding beneficial impacts to white-water activities as noted in the DEIS/EIR, please see Response 410-2.

Letter from Six Rivers Paddling Club continued

the river, the preferred alternative appears to be the minimally acceptable compromise to promote the natural functions and values of the river.

In preparing these comments for 6RPC, I would like to inform you that I received a copy of the document on CD which was nice up to a certain point. I was unable to print out beyond page 3-272, so I tried to access the document on the web at **www.ccfwo.r1.fws.gov** and was unable connect after many tries over a period of a week. Therefore, I hope that my assesment of the information is correct.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Carol Krueger
6 Rivers Paddling Club

6 Rivers Paddling Club
c/o Carol Krueger
3359 18th
Eureka, Calif. 95501

PHONE (707) 442-5568

900 BARRY ROAD
KNEELAND, CALIFORNIA 95549

NORMAN M. CHRISTENSEN, M. D.

411

Mr. Joe Polos
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th Street, Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Re: Trinity River Flow
November 22, 1999

Dear Mr. Polos:

I write to urge that the Trinity River be restored to seventy (70) percent of its natural flow. I have fished the river since 1955 and I have seen the anadromous fish runs go from exceptional to very poor. This huge decline is due to a great extent to the marked reduction in flow. It is my recollection that the original compact called for maintenance, at pre-diversion levels , of the fish runs. The river is sick and the government needs to deliver on its promise. } 411-1

Sincerely yours,

N. M. Christensen

Norman M. Christensen

Letter from Norma M. Christensen, M.D., Dated November 22, 1999

411-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Letter from Robert A. Knight Dated November 17, 1999

November 17, 1999

412

Robert A. Knight, PE
649 South First Street
Dunsmuir, CA 96025
(530) 235-0945
bknight@cwo.com

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1655 Heindon Road
Arcata, CA 95521

RE: **COMMENTS ON THE TRINITY RIVER DRAFT EIS/EIR**

Dear Mr. Polos:

First, I want to thank your organization for the opportunity to provide comments at the November 16, 1999 Trinity River DEIS/EIR public hearing.

At the hearing, I kept my comments very brief and to the point. I will do the same here, only adding some explanation of my background in order to establish my qualifications. I am a Professional Engineer registered in California. For the past 21 years I worked in the public sector (County of Sacramento) in Environmental Management. In my professional capacity I prepared and reviewed a substantial number of EIRs, as well as directed the implementation of environmental legislation and regulations. Additionally, I served as the Conservation Chair for the Northern California Federation of Fly Fishers.

HISTORICAL SETTING

The 1955 Trinity River Act authorizing the construction of the dams specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the Trinity River basin not be harmed.

The Federal Government has trust obligations to two Native American Tribes (Hoopa and Yurok) in the area.

Since the construction of the dams on the Trinity River, up to 90% of the river's natural flow has been diverted to the Central Valley Project.

Since the construction of the dams, the fishery has declined nearly 90%, leading to the listing of Coho salmon under the Endangered species Act. Steelhead are a candidate for listing.

The Trinity River and its restoration program are independent from the CALFED process. The restoration process is mandated by the 1955 Trinity River Act, the 1984 Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife management Act, and the later Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). The CVPIA reaffirms the Trinity River's unique position within the Central Valley Project, and clearly sets forth that the restoration of the Trinity River be considered independently from the other California water issues.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

It is my understanding that the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS/EIR targets a fisheries restoration of 66%. This would be accomplished by reducing water diversions (from up to 90% to 52%), and by mechanical restoration of the streambed. First, a 66% restoration fails to meet the legislative mandate, and while no project can guarantee full restoration, planning for less than full restoration of the fishery does guarantee failure to meet legislative mandates. 412-1

Secondly, mechanical restoration is expensive. The DEIS/EIR doesn't address the source of funding these restoration projects. To assume local funding would be available is not reasonable, and neither the State nor the Federal governments have been willing to make funding available in the past. It is recommended that the final EIS/EIR change the Preferred Alternative to once that more closely matches the legislative mandate, and has significantly less reliance on extensive mechanical stream bed restoration. 412-2

Secondly, since the Trinity River Fishery has been denied appropriate water flows for the past 36 years, and since the restoration project, including the Flow Evaluation Study and Report has been going on for 15 years, the current time frame for review of the DEIS/EIR is justified. It is recommended that no extension to the time to review the DEIS/EIR be granted.

Letter from Robert A. Knight continued

412-1 Please see the thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

412-2 Please see thematic response titled "Implementation Funding and Relationship to Repayment, Reimbursement, and the CVPIA Restoration Fund."

Letter from Robert A. Knight continued

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Trinity River DEIS/EIR. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions regarding my comments.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Knight, PE
649 South First Street
Dunsmuir, CA 96025
(530) 235-0945
bknight@cwo.com

November 19, 1999

413

Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Dear Mr. Polos,

I am writing you to comment on the current plans for the Trinity River. As someone who visits the Trinity River and its tributaries regularly I urge you to please consider the following points while determining the fate of this precious region:

1) The Trinity River Act of 1955, that authorized the dams, specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the basin not be harmed. The Interior Secretary was directed to ensure that fish and wildlife in the basin were protected. However, since the dams were completed in 1963, water diversions led to a nearly 90 percent decline in the fisheries by the early 1990's. The coho salmon is now listed under the Endangered Species Act, and steelhead are a candidate for listing.

2) The federal government's trust obligations to two Native American Tribes has gone unfulfilled for more than 36 years because of excessive water diversions from the Trinity River. The time has come for the federal government to begin fulfilling its legally mandated responsibilities to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes. } 413-1

3) Two decades of study and scientific evidence have given us the needed information to make a good decision for the Trinity. While the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report are sound, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. However, more water can be made available since the legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and later legislation, clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the CVP.

4) When the Trinity is restored, the commercial and sport fishing, rafting, and tourism economies of the Northern California and Southern Oregon will rebound.

Letter from David Luther Dated November 19, 1999

413-1 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

Letter from David Luther continued

5) The Trinity River and its restoration program are completely independent of the CALFED process. Restoration of the Trinity River is mandated in the 1955 legislation authorizing construction of the Trinity River Division, the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). The CVPIA reaffirms the Trinity's unique position within the Central Valley Project (CVP) and clearly sets forth that restoration of the Trinity is to be considered independently from other California water issues.

6) The federal government's promise to maintain a healthy fishery in the Trinity River has been disregarded for the last 36 years, and past legislation mandated a flow decision by the end of 1996. If these legislated promises are not finally fulfilled, why should we believe any promises developed through CALFED? A restored Trinity River will allow Californians to have faith that the ongoing CALFED negotiations will produce meaningful improvement in our state's water policies.

Please consider the aforementioned points when deciding the fate of this river and the people on it. You can write back to me at 12 Rosewood Court, San Rafael, CA 94901

Sincerely,

David Luther

November 17 1999

414

Joe Polos
U.S. Fish + Wildlife Service
1125 16th St Rm 209
Arcata CA 95521

Sir, please allow the trinity to flow to the ocean. This pristine mountain water belongs to fish, not farms. Have spent much time on Stuarts Fork, and Cherry flat above the new "1963" Dam. I know how beautiful this river is. Water needs are not just for population centers or farmers. 414-1

Thank you
Kay August S
Kay August Sullivan
938 Ripley St.
Santa Rosa CA
95401

Letter from Kay August Sullivan Dated November 17, 1999

414-1 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

Letter from Clear Creek Community Services District
Dated November 19, 1999

415

CLEAR CREEK
Community Services District

5880 Oak Street
Anderson, CA 96007-9216

Fax: (530) 357-3723
Telephone: (530) 357-2121

November 19, 1999

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Attn: Mr. Joe Polos
1655 Heindon Road
Arcata, CA 95521

Dear Mr. Polos;

On behalf of the Clear Creek Community Services District, we submit the following comments to become a part of the permanent record for the Trinity River Mainstream Fishery Restoration EIS public hearings.

The Clear Creek Community Services District, established in 1963, entered into a water service/repayment contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation in 1967 to divert agricultural water from the Trinity South Unit of the Central Valley Project, to the Happy Valley area, a community approximately nine miles southwest of Redding, California. This delivery was made possible thought 45 and 42 inch conduit installed through mountainous terrain to the head of the district, some eight miles from the point of diversion at Whiskeytown Dam.

The original size (acreage) of the District and water made available under the contract was established on a repayment feasibility basis and groundwater study. The long term contract established a maximum annual allocation of 15,300 acre feet. That original contract expired in 1992 and the District has been operating under short term interim renewal contracts since. While the original size of the District was approximately 13,000 acres, it is now approaching 20,000.

Through education, conservation and several other factors, we have reduced the average annual deliveries from an historical high of 13,000 acre feet to a current average of 7,000 acre feet. We have made available, through transfers, a portion of this unused allocation to other CVP contractors. The Board of Directors of Clear Creek Community Services District would be remiss in their fiduciary responsibilities if they did not preserve the

Serving the Community of Happy Valley

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mr. Joe Polos
November 19, 1999
page 2

balance of this allocation for future growth. They firmly believe this demonstrates good stewardship of the supply, and that the District should not be penalized through reduced allocation, nor should this water be viewed as "found water" to use for purposes other than originally established in the District's long term contract with USBR.

While we share the concern of restoring flows for the health of the fisheries and the Trinity River, our major concern is that this District, and its population base of 8,000 individuals, not be harmed by virtue of carrying more than an equitable share of the burden associated with the solution to this restoration project. } 415-1

Clear Creek Community Services District entered into a good faith contract with the USBR, with our ability to repay the federal government for project construction costs directly associated to the amount of water delivered. This is a closed system from which we deliver approximately 25% domestic and 75% agricultural water. Due to the evolution of domestic demands, the District was required by the State Department of Health Services to expand the filtration facilities. We are currently repaying a $5 million dollar debt for this expansion. If the allocation is substantially reduced, it will, in effect, remove the District's ability to repay long term debts and fixed costs directly associated with diverting and delivering water, and this District will no longer be a viable entity. **It should be noted that this water is the sole source of supply for this District.**

We are requesting that the public comment period be extended to a period of 90 days, due to the complicated nature of the issues. **Also, that assurances be given to all beneficiaries of Trinity River water, that based on individual circumstances, they will share equally in the burdens, as well as solutions, to restore the flows to the Trinity River.** } 415-2

Sincerely,

Char Workman-Flowers

Char Workman-Flowers,
General Manager

cc: Clear Creek Board of Directors

Letter from Clear Creek Community Services District continued

415-1 The modeling effort used in the DEIS/EIR to identify potential impacts to M&I customers such as the CCCSD assumed contractual amounts, terms of the water service contract, and historic use in the analysis. This approach was applied the same across all CVP M&I and agricultural contractors.

415-2 As discussed in Response 415-1, the contractual amount and historic use for the CCCSD was used in the modeling analysis.

Dean Schneider
3038 Terra Linda Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

416

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Dear Mr. Polos,

River management is an important part of maintaining healthy fisheries and ensuring adequate water supply to communities. **I am writing in support of restoring the Trinity River and its entire ecosystem by implementing a flow regime of at least 70 percent.** 416-1

The Trinity River Act of 1955, authorizing dam construction, specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the basin not be harmed. The Interior Secretary was directed to ensure that fish and wildlife in the basin were protected. However, since the dams were completed in 1963, water diversions led to a nearly 90 percent decline in the fisheries by the early 1990s. **The coho salmon is now listed under the Endangered Species Act, and steelhead are a candidate for listing.**

Futhermore, two American Indian tribes have been denied water rights to the Trinity River because of excessive water diversions to the Central Valley. It is important that the federal government honor its trust obligations to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok American Indian tribes. The time has come for the federal government to begin fulfilling its legally mandated responsibilities to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes. 416-2

Restoration of the Trinity River is mandated in the 1955 legislation authorizing construction of the Trinity River Division, the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). I urge you to take steps toward restoring the Trinity River. When the Trinity River is restored, the commercial and sport fishing, rafting, and tourism economies of the Northern California and Southern Oregon will rebound. Take steps to increase the health of fisheries and to increase water flow in the Trinity River. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Dean Schneider

Letter from Dean Schneider

416-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

416-2 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

417

Jerry Aspinall
P.O. Box 803
Lincoln, CA 95648

Mr. Joe Polos
Fish & Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Subject: Legislation to restore flows in the Trinity River

Dear Sirs:

The CVA and the promulgation of the CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN of 1957 - outlined in State Bull. #3 - have rearranged natural waterflows into both the Delta and the Pacific Ocean. These outflows normally produced sustaining avenues for migrating spawning Anadromous fish.

The impact of dams on the Trinity River and resultant diminished downstream flows caused the narrowing of the stream, loss of spawning areas and allowed the intrusion of flora and Willows into the main channel. Siltation settling was increased with lack of scouring thru normal Winter runoff. Also, replenishment of valuable spawning gravels could not continue below the impoundments, the impoundments themselves becoming a reservoir of residues.

Therefore, any reconfiguration the Government authority can do by volume water increases will certainly correct imbalances for wild fish migration and aid survival numbers. The river itself will engineer most of the required changes. Only God can make a tree, but man continues to try to remake rivers.

We're all in favor of putting the CVPIA Improvement Act into force immediately. And I am not in favor of selling the fishery "down the river" as has happened so often in the past. Look at the Mendocino Dam on the Russian River without a fish ladder.

417-1

Sincerely yours,

Gerald A. Aspinall
Angling CA streams
for 65 years.

Letter from Gerald A. Aspinall

417-1 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

November 19th, 1999

418

Mr. Joe Polos
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th Street, Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Mr. Polos,

I will be unable to attend in person the Trinity River Public Hearings so I am writing to express my views for the official Public Comments record. I am in favor of restoring the Trinity River fisheries by returning water flows to the river. Since the Trinity dam was completed in 1963 90% of the Trinity River has been diverted. This decrease in flows has resulted in dramatic declines in fish populations. This decline represents a serious threat to biological diversity and a healthy ecosystem. It has also had a negative impact on recreational opportunities and the economies it supports.

Let me remind you that the Trinity River Act of 1955, authorizing the dams, specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the basin not be harmed. The Interior Secretary was directed to protect the fish and wildlife in the basin. Since the diversions in 1963 the decline in the fisheries has been so dramatic that coho salmon have been listed under the Endangered Species Act and steelhead are a candidate for listing.

Furthermore, the federal government's trust obligations to two Native American Tribes has gone unfulfilled for more than 36 years because of excessive water diversions from the Trinity River. It is time for the federal government to fulfill its legally mandated responsibilities to the Hoopa and Yurok Tribes. } 418-1

Additionally, twenty years of scientific study and evidence have armed us with the necessary information to make sound decisions for the Trinity River. While the science and observation that produced the Flow Evaluation Report are sound, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be made available to the river. However, more water can be made available since the legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and later legislation, clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the Central Valley Project (CVP).

Also, the country is currently experiencing a budget surplus, however, funds allocated for restoration of the Trinity River have been cut and continued funding for mechanical restoration projects appears tenuous. We need more than 48% of the annual watershed runoff prescribed in the Preferred Alternative to ensure that the river will have adequate flows to restore, as prescribed by law, the Trinity's fisheries and wildlife. } 418-2

Importantly, the Trinity River and its restoration are completely independent of the CALFED process. Restoration of the Trinity is mandated in the 19555 legislation authorizing the construction of the Trinity River Division, the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984 and the central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). The CVPIA reconfirms the Trinity's unique status within the CVP and clearly delineates that restoration of the Trinity is to be considered independently of other California water issues.

Moreover, the federal government's promise to maintain a healthy fishery in the Trinity River has been disregarded for the last 36 years, and past legislation mandated a flow decision by 1996! If these legislated obligations are not fulfilled, how can the people be expected to believe promises developed via CALFED? A restored Trinity River would provide Californians with faith that CALFED negotiations will result in improved state's water policies.

And finally, when the Trinity is restored, the commercial and sport fishing, rafting and tourism economies of Northern California and Southern Oregon will rebound.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Schramm
205 Cosky Drive, #2
Marina, CA 93933

Letter from Steve Schramm Dated November 19, 1999

418-1 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

418-2 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

419

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Lee P. Gooding
P.O. Box 1195
Forestville,Ca. 95436

Dear Mr. Polos,

River management is an important part of maintaining healthy fisheries and ensuring adequate water supply to communities. **I am writing in support of restoring the Trinity River and its entire ecosystem by implementing a flow regime which allows the Trinity to keep at least 70 percent of its flow.** However, since the on the Trinity River were completed in 1963, water diversions led to a nearly 90 percent decline in the fisheries by the early 1990s. The coho salmon now is listed under the Endangered Species Act, and steelhead are a candidate for listing. The decline of 90 percent of the fish population by the 1990's is cause to increase the flow of the Trinity River to at least 70% of its original capacity. } 419-1

Restoration of the Trinity River is mandated in the 1955 legislation authorizing construction of the Trinity River Division, the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). I urge you to take steps toward restoring the Trinity River. When the Trinity River is restored, the commercial and sport fishing, rafting, and tourism economies of the Northern California and Southern Oregon will rebound. Take steps to increase the health of fisheries and to increase water flow in the Trinity River. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Letter from Lee P. Gooding

419-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

420

Sacramento CA
November 18, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St.
Arcata, CA 95521-5582

Dear Mr. Polos,

We were unable to attend today's public comment hearing on the plan to increase flows to the Trinity River. (Unfortunately, we found out about the hearing after it was held.) However, we want to register our strong support for substantial increases to the Trinity River. After all, the plan would merely restore (in part) flows that nature all along intended for that river. Hopefully, the restoration will eventually repair some of the severe ecological damage wrought by the massive diversions of water from the Trinity watershed into the central valley, and also repair some of the unconscionable harm done to the tribes living in the Trinity watershed. Thank you for considering our comments. } 420-1

Sincerely,

Robert Turnage and Kristina Somma

Cc:
President Clinton
Senator Feinstein
Senator Boxer
Robert Matsui, Member of Congress

Letter from Robert Turnage and Kristina Somma Dated November 18, 1999

420-1 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

Letter from Carol and Dave Krueger Dated November 23, 1999

CAROL AND DAVE KRUEGER
3359 18th Street, Eureka, CA 95501

421

November 23, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
US Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th Street, Room 209
Arcata, California 95521

Dear Mr. Polos:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the public draft of the Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration environmental impact statement/report (EIS/R).

As white water canoeists, we are going to comment on the recreational use of the Trinity We think that white water canoeist where left out of your list on recognized recreational users in Tables 3-32 and 3-33. In our opinion, there is a big difference between "canoeist and white water canoeist" in their preferred flow ranges. Whitewater canoeist should be included with kayaking and rafting in their preferred flow ranges.

The habitat in the Trinity River needs improvement, and we are going to support the preferred alternate. Along with the fisheries restoration, we think that the preferred alternative would also improve the whitewater recreational opportunities on the Trinity River. } 421-1

My comments deal primarily with the analysis of whitewater recreation opportunities that are affected by the proposals in the EIS/R.

As white water canoeist, we have three favorite runs on the mainstem of the Trinity River that will be affected by the proposals in the EIR/R. These runs are: Pigeon Point (Pigeon Point campground to Big Flat); Hayden–Cedar (Hayden Flat campground to Cedar Flat bridge); and the Hawkins Bar to Salyer (Hawkins Bar USFS river access to the public access at Sharbour (sp?) Slough on Fountain Ranch Road). Under the International Scale of Difficulty, Pigeon Point is rated class 3, or intermediate; Hayden-Cedar is rated class 2, or advanced beginner; and Hawkins Bar is rated class 1+, or intermediate beginner.
These runs provide easily accessible whitewater for users at a variety of skill levels and the first two are used extensively throughout the year by whitewater boaters from northern and central California, and southern Oregon.

We believe that the preferred recreation flow ranges/thresholds given in Table 3-32 incorrectly assign either 200 or 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) as the lower limit of the preferred flow for whitewater canoeists or kayaking at on these runs. } 421-2

421-1 Please see Response 410-1.

421-2 Please see Response 410-3.

At 300 cfs, the whitewater runs on the mainstem of the Trinity are marginal whitewater canoes. At this low flow, navigating around rocks and other obstacles to navigate around are exposed or very close to the surface; some routes through rapids are not available; and shallow reaches of the river may not have enough water to float a boat such as the rapid on the Hayden-Cedar run commonly referred to as "Picket Fence. Even at current releases of 400-450 cfs, whitewater canoeists have to portage this long rapid as we can't negotiate the tight turns at the very bottom of the drop. Shallow water is more dangerous for whitewater canoeists as when a canoe turns over, the paddler is in danger of getting trapped under the canoe and getting "beat up" by the rocks.

We feel that the lowest preferred flow for the mainstem Trinity for rafting, kayaking, and whitewater canoeing should be noted as at least 450 cfs, rather than 200 - 300 cfs. 300 cfs is a minimal flow (low threshold) but is not preferred.

421-2 cont'd

Recreational season of Memorial Day through Labor Day, the period defined as the primary recreation season in the EIS/R, is not accurate in our opinion . We think that the whitewater recreation season on the Trinity River can run year around depending on how much winter rain runoff effects the flow into the Trinity. For flows greater than 3000 cfs at the Lewiston gage, the majority of whitewater canoeist would choose to boat on other rivers. We can't speak for other types of boaters, as kayakers and rafters are willing to boat higher flows than canoeists are comfortable with.

The analysis should note that constraints on whitewater boating are dependent on boater skill level and difficulty of the whitewater run, and that low flows constrain whitewater recreation to a far greater extent than high flows.

421-3

In conclusion, we, support the proposal to increase flows into the Trinity River for the purpose of restoration of the anadromous fishery. In the absence of an alternative that would allow all the inflow into the Trinity River basin to be retained in the river, the preferred alternative appears to be the minimally acceptable compromise to promote the natural functions and values of the river.

In preparing these comments, I would like to inform you that I received a copy of the document on CD which was nice up to a certain point. I was unable to print out beyond page 3-272, so I tried to access the document on the web at **www.ccfwo.r1.fws.gov** and was unable connect after many tries over a period of a week. Therefore, I hope that my assesment of the information is correct.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Carol and Krueger
3359 18th
Eureka, Calif. 95501

Trinity River Fishery Restoration EIS/R
Carol and Dave Krueger

2

Letter from Carol and Dave Krueger continued

421-3 Please see Response 410-2.

422

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St. Rm. 209
Arcata, CA 95521

James Brobeck
1605 Manzanita
Chico, CA 95926

November 10, 1999

Dear Mr. Polos,

I am writing to you to influence the Interior Secretary's decision on the future of the mighty Trinity River. My aim is to voice the public's concern for the health of the river and the associated species that depend on the river.

The Trinity River should be allowed to maintain at least 70 percent of its flow. Since the dams were completed in 1963 too much water has been diverted resulting in an estimated 90% decline in the fisheries. The Coho Salmon is now listed as an Endangered Species and steelhead are near listing status due to human caused alterations in their habitat, particularly water diversions. This is in violation of the Trinity River Act of 1955 which specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the watershed not be harmed. I demand that the Secretary ensure the protection and restoration of these important species and their associated habitat. } 422-1

Destruction of wildland habitat is a continuation of genocidal policies of our national government and we need to stop it now and try to live up to our responsibilities and obligations in relating to the Native American Tribes affected by Trinity water projects. The time has come for the federal government to fulfill legally mandated trust obligations to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes by ending excessive water diversions from the river. } 422-2

The importance of using the best available science in making land and water management decisions can not be under estimated. The only way to fulfill the mandates of NEPA, the Endangered Species Act and other conservation legalities is to use the best scientific evidence. Economic considerations must be flexible to ensure sustainability. The information contained in the Flow Evaluation Report must be used to provide the fullest protection for the fish and wildlife of the basin. The legislation that created the Trinity River Diversion clearly gives the priority to protecting the habitat needs of river dependent species over the delivery of water to the Central Valley Project. Humans must balance their desires with the continued survival of species associated with regions we have occupied. This balance is mandated by law, by common sense and by the wisdom of sustainability.

The economics of agribusiness, which takes undo advantage of water diversions, must be de-emphasized while the economies of fishing, rafting and tourism must be supported. The activities that can provide economic activity without destroying the resource are sustainable. The environmental attributes that create these activities are priceless.

As exciting as the CALFED process is to the future of California's water availability and health, it is not the answer to the problems facing the Trinity River. In fact the restoration of the Trinity is completely independent of the CALFED process. Restoration of the Trinity was mandated in the 1955 legislation that authorized the construction of the Trinity River Division as well as the 1984 Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Act and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). Restoration of the Trinity must therefore proceed immediately and independently from other California Water issues.

The public's faith in the CALFED process is being severely compromised by the failure of the federal government to fulfill the promise to maintain a healthy fishery in the Trinity River for the past 36 years. Legislation mandating a scientifically supported flow decision by 1996 has been disregarded as well. If the federal government could move ahead with meaningful restoration of the Trinity River then faith in the ongoing CALFED negotiations would be improved. Otherwise the public will think that continued environmental degradation will be the end product of any "collaboration" between the stakeholders.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration. The future of the river, our state and our planet is riding on the decisions being made as we enter the next century.

Sincerely,

James Brobeck

Letter from James Brobeck Dated November 10, 1999

422-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

422-2 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

Letter from Denver Nelson

RECEIVED
NOV 24 1999
US Fish & Wildlife Service
Arcata, CA

TRINITY RIVER EIS and FLOW STUDY 423

DENVER NELSON
HUMBOLDT COUNTY FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Thank you for coming to Humboldt County to hear public comments regarding the Trinity River. As you know, the Trinity River was devastated by the Trinity River Diversion project. Many millions of dollars have been spent trying to restore the Trinity River. The Trinity River has not been restored, and, in fact, has continued to decline. Many years of studying the Trinity River has shown that rivers need water to function. No amount of money without water will restore a river.

FISH

Much emphasis has been given to the decline of salmon and steelhead populations in our area. This decrease is well-documented by many studies and by my personal observations as a sport fishermen. Fish numbers are certainly one indicator of the health of our river environments. There are many other factors that influence the health and numbers of the salmonid populations.

A river is more than a natural fish hatchery. We must not over emphasize increasing fish numbers as the ultimate goal of restoring the Trinity River. If there are no fish returning to the Trinity River 20 years from now, does that mean that the entire flow of the Trinity River can then be diverted to the Central Valley? I certainly hope not.

MOVING GRAVEL

The concept of making the Trinity River 1/2 the river it was by giving it 1/2 the natural flow and spending millions to move gravel around is a noble experiment. The outcome of this experiment could be measured by the

Letter from Denver Nelson continued

numbers of fish returning. One could simply assume the goal would be to have 1/2 of the pre-diversion fish return. If 3/4 of the pre-diversion fish return, does that mean that 3/4 of the pre-diversion flow would be returned, and additional millions of dollars would have to be spent moving gravel? Or conversely if only 10 percent of the pre-diversion fish return, does that mean that 10 percent of the natural flow comes down the Trinity River, and fish restoration money is sharply cut back?

GREEN PORK

Between 1976 and 1998, $93,952,547 was spent on Trinity River restoration. During the same time., 648,457 naturally spawning chinook returned to the Trinity River. This amounts to $144.89 being spent per fish. There appears to be no correlation between dollars spent on restoration and numbers of fish returning to the Trinity River. A much better correlation is seen between river flows and fish returning to the Trinity River. Fish responded better to water than to dollars. It would be better to spend less money on fish restoration and increase the Trinity River flows.

HUMBOLDT COUNTY 50,000 ACRE FEET

Humboldt County was given 50,000 acre feet of water annually in the original legislation establishing the Trinity River Diversion. This water allocation has never been accounted for either by increasing the Trinity River flows or by Humboldt County being compensated for our 50,000 acre feet flowing down the Sacramento River. One of the cornerstones of the CalFed process is the sale of water by those with excess water to those who need more water. When the final Trinity River flow is selected, that flow number should be increased by 50,000 acre feet so that we in Humboldt County can use that water to further enhance our fisheries. Conversely, if our 50,000 acre feet is going down the diversion, we should be compensated for our water by the users of that water.

FISH LADDER

The Trinity dam eliminated 109 miles of steelhead and salmon habitat above the dam. The ideal restoration of this habitat would be to remove the dam. The next best restoration would be to install a fish ladder to bypass the dam. Serious consideration has not been given to this option. The fish ladder would be a more cost-effective way of restoring fish habitat.

RIVER FLOW

My preferred flow alternative would be the restoration of the natural Trinity River flows and diverting no more water to the Central Valley. My next best flow would be that promised in the original legislation. The promised diversion originally was to be no more than 30 percent of the Trinity River flow. The Preferred Flow as outlined in this EIS/EIR would be my third choice. The other studied flows are inadequate. } 423-1

No matter which flow is chosen, funding must be available for the bridge and structural removals needed to allow these increased flows.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management is the new buzzword of resource management. In this project, adaptive management should be the prime governing force. If a funded project does not increase the fish returns, the project should not be funded again. If a water flow pattern or volume does not result in increased fish returns, the flow should be changed. At a minimum, the outline of this adaptive management plan should be in place before any other changes are done.

Thank you for coming here and listening to our comments.

Denver Nelson
5240 Blackberry
Eureka, California 95503

Letter from Denver Nelson continued

423-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Letter from Arthur Wilner Dated November 23, 1999

424

From: Art Wilner 11/23/99
1451 Bay St #A
Alameda CA 94501

To: Trinity River EIS Review Committee
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1125, 16th St
Arcata, CA 95521

Trinity River EIS/R comment

I support a diversion of no more than 30% of the natural water flow from the Trinity River Basin to the CVP for irrigation.
I also support additional measures to achieve restoration of the ecosystem at an accelerated pace. This can most effectively be achieved by reducing diversion to 20% for the first five years of implementation. 424-1

Thank you
Arthur Wilner

424-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Letter from Nancy R. Ihara Dated November 23, 1999

231 Dean St.
Manila, Ca. 95521

November 23, 1999

425

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Attn: Joe Polos
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, Ca. 95521

Re: Trinity River flows, need to increase by 70%

Dear Mr. Polos,

When we build dams and constructed reservoirs we did not know what environmental havoc they would cause. We now are very much aware of the damage they cause. The impact on the salmon has been devasting.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service can play an important role in reversing the poorly conceived policies of the past. All of us know, I believe, that in the years to come we will have to drastically change many of the ways we have operated in this century.

Although increasing the natural flows of the Trinity River by 70% will have impacts on farmers and other water users to the south, the decision to do so is the right one. It is the decision that I urge the Service to make. } 425-1

Sincerely,

Nancy R. Ihara

Nancy R. Ihara

425-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

22 November 1999

Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

426

Dear Mr. Polos,

I am commenting on the Trinity River Mainstem Fisheries Restoration Environmental Impact Statement and Report (EIS/R). Unfortunately, the Preferred Alternative allows over half the water to be diverted from the basin while scientific evidence shows the Trinity River needs at least 70 percent of its flow to maintain a healthy fishery. Furthermore, the federal government must fulfill its water obligations to the Hoopa Tribe that have denied by excessive water diversions from the Trinity River. The legislation creating the Trinity River Division (Trinity River Act of 1955), and the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over diversions of water to the Central Valley Project. In fact, the CVPIA reaffirms the Trinity's unique position within the Central Valley Project (CVP) and clearly sets forth that restoration of the Trinity is to be considered independently from other California water issues.

426-1

426-2

I wish to urge you to restore at least 70% of the natural flow to the Trinity River in order to restore the the endangered coho salmon and other threatened salmonid species in the Trinity watershed.

Thank you,

Kris Schmidt
10354 Danube Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344-7213

Letter from Kris Schmidt Dated November 22, 1999

426-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

426-2 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

Letter from Seth Norman Dated November 10, 1999

427-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

427

Mr. Joe Polos
US Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

November 10, 1999

Dear Mr. Polos:

For decades the heads of agribusiness have called our politicians and bureaucrats nasty variations of "boy." That 1955 mandate was a sop to fools: how else could such gross failures of stewardship fail to motivate reasonable change? A river is pumped over a mountain range, ultimately at public expense--at a cost better measured in the elimination of discrete races of fish--so that rice and cotton can be cultivated in country where they have no place. But that vast sucking noise you hear from the valley isn't made by roots of crops, Mr. Polos. It's the sound of our best resources going down some industry's hole.

Here's an idea: Honor a promise. Send as much of Trinity's water as you can down the canyon it carved, so that's what left of what is wild can survive. Keep the Trinity free from CALFED machinations--why compound dry rot with worms? Let's see what a restored fishery can do for some struggling coastal towns. } 427-1

And when those "captains of industry" bleat?

Why, Mr. Polos, you can just smile and say,

"Ain't it a shame, you good old boys."

Sincerely,

Seth Norman
Associate Editor

11/11/99 Trinity Polos letter Page 1

428

Nov. 21, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Dear Mr. Polos,

Please return the Eel River to a viable state by returning historic levels of water to the river.

I support the recommendation of "The Friends of the Eel River" proposal to return 70% of the water, so the river can be self-supporting. Thank you. 428-1

Sincerely,

Mrs. B. J. Yeager
4504 Westminster Dr.
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Letter from Mrs. B. J. Yeager Dated November 21, 1999

428-1 Thank you for your comment. Your comment has been noted. No response is required.

Greg La Canfora
1025 Amberwood Road
Sacramento, Ca. 95864

429

Dear Mr. Polos,

I'm writing to support the restoration of the Trinity River and to encourage you to please do the same by supporting the implementation of a flow regime that allows the Trinity to keep at least 70 percent of its flow. I understand the complexity of the water issues in the state but I believe the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) allows the restoration of the Trinity River to be considered independently from the CALFED process as well as other California water issues. } 429-1

Any effort on your behalf to restore the Trinity would also bring restoration to the states riparian environments, of which only ten percent are left, and would also help local economies rebound. I believe your decision in conjunction with the recently passed AB18 parks, water, and coastal protection act, the Villaraigosa-Keeley Act, can initiate restoration programs that will work and bring more community to those concerned. I also believe Hoopa Valley and Yurok tribes will be able to qualify for grants under the same act since diversions of the Trinity has had lasting effects on their communities.

Please look into the possibilities and choose in favor of restoration to the Trinity River. Your efforts will be appreciated by many. Remember restoration will tell our children we care about their future.

Sincerely,
Greg La Canfora
Greg La Canfora

Letter from Greg La Canfora

429-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Gerry Le Francois
P.O. Box 551
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

430

November 22, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th Street, Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Re: Trinity River Mainstem Fisheries Restoration EIS/R (TRMFR EIS/R)

Dear Mr. Polos,
Thank you the opportunity to comment on the TRMFR EIS/R. I support a maximum diversion rate of no more than 30 percent of the Trinity River to the Central Valley Project. The Trinity River needs to be restored. For too long in the west, water has been a cheap commodity to the end user (e.g. City of Sacramento still does not have water meters or agribusiness growing water intensive crops, rice/cotton, in the central valley). This cheap subsidized commodity has usually come at a very high price to the environment and the economies of rural counties. } 430-1

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has a unique opportunity to correct the problem of too much water being diverted into the Central Valley Project by enforcing the provisions under the Trinity River Act of 1955 (which allowed for the dams) to protect fish and wildlife. It appears that with the listing of the coho salmon and now the steelhead as a candidate species under the Endangered Species Act, the Trinity River Act of 1955 has not adequately protected the fish species of the Trinity River.

No more than 30 percent of the Trinity River's flow should be diverted to the Central Valley Project. A minimum flow of 70 percent should remain in the Trinity to improve the tourism based economies of the north coast counties and to help restore the fish and wildlife of this beautiful river.

Signed, a recreation user (kayaker) of the Trinity River,

Gerry Le Francois
P.O. Box 551
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-0551

Letter from Gerry Le Francois Dated November 22, 1999

430-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Ken Wells
1919 Lyon Ct.
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

431

November 23, 1999

Mr. Joe Polos
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1125 16th St., Room 209
Arcata, CA 95521

Re: Request to Interior Secretary to Return 70% of the Trinity River Flows

Dear Mr. Polos:

I am writing to urge the Interior Secretary to direct that at least 70% of the Trinity River's original flow be returned to the river to restore and maintain a healthy ecosystem, fishery, and local economy. } 431-1

As you know, since the Trinity Dam was completed in 1963, up to 90 percent of the Trinity River's water has been diverted for agriculture principally to the western San Joaquin Valley. As a result of decreased flows, fish populations declined by nearly 90 percent by the early 1990's.

Although the Preferred Alternative of the draft EIS/R recommends that over half the water be diverted from the basin, keeping only 48 percent in the river, we need more water to ensure the fisheries are truly restored. Studies have determined that a river needs at least 70 percent of its flow to maintain a healthy fishery.

My request is based on the following points:

1. The Trinity River Act of 1955, authorizing the dams, specifically mandated that the fish and wildlife of the basin not be harmed. The Interior Secretary was directed to ensure that fish and wildlife in the basin were protected. However, since the dams were completed in 1963, water diversions have led to a huge decline in the fisheries and the coho salmon now is listed under the Endangered Species Act, and steelhead are a candidate for listing.

2. The federal government's trust obligations to two Native American Tribes have gone unfulfilled for more than 36 years because of excessive water diversions from the Trinity River. The time has come for the federal government to begin fulfilling its legally mandated responsibilities to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes. } 431-2

3. Two decades of study and scientific evidence have given us the needed information to make a good decision for the Trinity. While the science and study that produced the Flow Evaluation Report are sound, the recommendations were limited by an assumption about the amount of water that could be available for the river. However, more water can be made available since the legislation creating the Trinity River Division, and later legislation, clearly gives Trinity fish and wildlife priority over the diversion of any water to the Central Valley Project.

Letter from Ken Wells Dated November 23, 1999

431-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

431-2 Please see thematic response titled "Tribal Trust."

4. Currently our country enjoys a budget surplus. However, funds allocated for restoration of the Trinity have been cut. Continued funding for mechanical restoration projects is at best unreliable. We need more than the 48 percent of the annual watershed runoff prescribed in the Preferred Alternative to ensure that the river will have sufficient flows to restore Trinity's fisheries and wildlife as prescribed by law. } 431-3

5. The Trinity River and its restoration program are completely independent of the CALFED process. Restoration of the Trinity River is mandated in the 1955 legislation authorizing construction of the Trinity River Division, the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). The CVPIA reaffirms the Trinity's unique position within the Central Valley Project and clearly sets forth that restoration of the Trinity is to be considered independently from other California water issues.

6. When the Trinity is restored, the commercial and sport fishing, rafting, and tourism economies of the Northern California and Southern Oregon will rebound.

Based on these points, I urge the Secretary to direct that at least 70% of the Trinity River's flow be restored to the river at soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Ken Wells

Letter from Ken Wells continued

431-3 Please see thematic response titled "Implementation Funding and Relationship to Repayment, Reimbursement, and the CVPIA Restoration Fund." Regarding the Preferred Alternative, please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Letter from Dana Silvernali

To: Joe Polos
US Fish & Wildlife Service
1125 16th St. Rm 209
Arcata, CA 95521

From: Dana Silvernale
2951 Barnside Rd.
Sebastopol, CA 95472

432

To Whom this May Concern

I am writing to support honoring the original commitment to protecting aquatic life on the Trinity River. I understand that there are plans which if implemented would restore 70% of the original flow to the river. I also understand that water that has been diverted to land in the Wetlands district, no longer productive land, is available for this restoration. 432-1

Please correct the situation which has cost so much to the life of the Trinity River and vote to restore water flow to 70% minimum.

Sincerely
Dana Silvernale

432-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."

Nov. 21, 1999

433

Dear Mr. Peters,

I am seriously concerned about the water diversions on the Trinity River which have led to a nearly 90% decline in the fisheries.

I support the implementation of a plan that allows the Trinity to keep at least 70% of its flow. This would be in keeping with Trinity River Act of 1955. Restoring the Trinity River would also boost the economies of Northern California and Southern Oregon by increasing commercial and sport fishing, rafting and tourism. 433-1

I hope you will keep to influence the Interior Secretary to restore these flows to our Trinity River.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Carol A Arnold
106 Valley Circle
Hercules, CA 94547

Letter from Carol A. Arnold Dated November 21, 1999

433-1 Please see thematic responses titled "Fisheries."