

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20426

DATE: February 11, 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: The Agency/Party Addressed

SUBJECT: Scoping of environmental issues for new licenses for the Middle Fork American River Project, FERC No. 2079; and the French Meadows Transmission Line Project, FERC No. 2479, California.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is conducting National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping on the anticipated license applications for the existing Middle American River Project (FERC No. 2079), located in Northern California on the Middle Fork American River and the French Meadows Transmission Line Project (FERC No. 2479).

The Middle Fork American River Project is located in Placer and El Dorado counties, almost entirely within the Tahoe and El Dorado National Forests. Placer County Water Agency (Placer County), the licensee for the project, filed its Notice of Intent and Pre-Application Document (PAD) on December 13, 2007 and will use the Commission's Integrated Licensing Process (ILP) for the project's licensing. Under the ILP, Placer County must file their preliminary licensing proposal or a draft license application by October 1, 2010; the final license application must be filed with the Commission by February 28, 2011, two years before the license expires.

The French Meadows Transmission Line Project, located in Placer County, is owned by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). The project's transmission lines transmit power from the Middle Fork American River Project to PG&E's interconnected transmission facilities. PG&E plans to file its Notice of Intent and PAD by mid-February 2008 and will also use the Commission's ILP process for the project's licensing. PG&E must file their final license application with the Commission by February 28, 2011, two years before the license expires.

Pursuant to NEPA, we intend to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the projects, which would be used by the Commission to determine whether, and under what conditions, to issue new hydropower licenses for the projects. To support and assist our environmental review, we are beginning the public scoping process to ensure that all pertinent issues are identified and analyzed.

We invite you to participate in the scoping process and are circulating the attached Scoping Document 1 (SD1) to provide you with information on the projects and to ask for comments and suggestions on our preliminary list of issues and alternatives to be addressed in the EIS. Please review this SD1 and, if you wish to provide comments, follow the instructions included in section 5.0 *Request for Information*. Besides our request for information in Section 5.0 of SD1, the Commission's regulations for the ILP require that parties wishing to submit comments on the PAD or staff's SD1, or wishing to request studies, do so within 60 days of the issuance date of SD1.<sup>1</sup>

As part of our Scoping process and in an effort to identify issues, concerns, and opportunities associated with the proposed action, we will hold two scoping meetings on March 4, 2008, to receive comments on the scope of the EIS. A daytime meeting, focused on resource agencies, tribes, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), will begin at 9:00 AM. An evening meeting, primarily for the public, will start at 6:30 PM. Both meetings will be held at the Auburn Recreation District-Canyon View Community Center, located at 471 Maidu Drive in Auburn, California. The public, agencies, Indian tribes and NGOs may attend either or both meetings. More information on the meetings is available in the attached SD1.

A site visit is typically held in conjunction with the scoping meeting. However, because most of the project sites will not be accessible in March, the site visit for the projects is scheduled to take place on June 25, 2008, starting at 8:00 AM. Placer County will provide transportation. Anyone interested in attending the site visit should contact Mal Toy, Project engineer for Placer County, at (530) 823-4889 by June 11, 2008.

Please direct any questions about the licensing of the projects to Jim Fargo at (202) 502-6095, [james.fargo@ferc.gov](mailto:james.fargo@ferc.gov).

enclosure: Scoping Document 1

cc: Placer County Water Agency  
144 Ferguson Road  
Auburn, CA 95603

Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Power Generation, Mail Code N11C  
P.O. Box 770000  
San Francisco, CA 94177

Mailing List  
Public Files

---

<sup>1</sup> CFR 18 Section 5.9 *Comments and information or study requests*

---

---

**SCOPING DOCUMENT 1**

**MIDDLE FORK AMERICAN RIVER PROJECT  
And  
FRENCH MEADOWS TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT  
CALIFORNIA**

**FERC PROJECT Nos. 2079-061 and 2479**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Office of Energy Projects  
Division of Hydropower Licensing  
Washington, DC

February 2008

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>2.0 SCOPING</b> .....	3
2.1 Purposes of Scoping.....	3
2.2 Comments and Scoping Meetings .....	4
<b>3.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES</b> .....	6
3.1 Placer County’s Proposed Action .....	6
3.2 PG&E’s Proposed Action .....	7
3.3 Staff’s Modification of the Proposed Actions .....	7
3.4 No Action Alternative.....	8
<b>4.0 SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS AND RESOURCE ISSUES</b> .....	8
4.1 Cumulative Effects.....	8
4.1.1 Geographic Scope .....	8
4.1.2 Temporal Scope .....	9
4.2 <b>Middle Fork American Project Resource Issues</b> .....	9
4.2.1 Geology and Soil Resources .....	9
4.2.2 Water Resources.....	9
4.2.3 Aquatic Resources.....	10
4.2.4 Terrestrial Resources.....	10
4.2.5 Threatened and Endangered Species.....	11
4.2.6 Recreation and Aesthetics .....	11
4.2.7 Land use .....	11
4.2.8 Cultural Resources .....	12
4.2.9 Developmental Resources.....	12
4.3 Proposed Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures .....	12
4.4 <b>French Meadows Transmission Line Project Resource Issues</b> .....	12
4.4.1 Terrestrial Resources.....	13
4.4.2 Threatened and Endangered Species.....	13
4.4.3 Land Use .....	13
4.4.4 Cultural resources .....	13
4.5 Proposed Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures .....	14
<b>5.0 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION</b> .....	14
<b>6.0 EIS PREPARATION SCHEDULE</b> .....	15
<b>7.0 EIS OUTLINE</b> .....	16
<b>8.0 LIST OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b> .....	18
<b>9.0 MAILING LIST</b> .....	20
APPENDIX A: PROCESS PLAN AND SCHEDULE.....	31

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC), under the authority of the Federal Power Act (FPA),<sup>1</sup> may issue licenses for up to 50 years for the construction, operation, and maintenance of non-federal hydroelectric projects. Placer County Water Agency (Placer County), licensee for the existing Middle Fork American River Project (FERC Project No. 2079), filed a Pre-Application Document and a Notice of Intent to file an application for a new license with the Commission on December 13, 2007. In mid-February, 2008, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), licensee for the existing French Meadows transmission Line Project (FERC Project No. 2479), plans to file a Pre-Application Document and a Notice of Intent to file an application for a new license with the Commission.

The Middle Fork American River Project (figure 1) is located on the Middle Fork American River in Placer and El Dorado counties, California. Placer County proposes to continue to operate the 224-MW-hydropower facilities, which now generate an average of 1,030,000 megawatt-hours annually. The Middle Fork American River Project serves as both a water supply and a hydroelectric project. The project is designed to conserve and control waters of the Middle Fork American River, the Rubicon River, and several associated streams. Hydroelectric power from the project is produced at five powerhouses. With a combined gross storage capacity of 342, 583 acre-feet, the two principal storage reservoirs of the project are French Meadows and Hell Hole. We provide a more detailed description of the project in section 3 of this scoping document.

French Meadow Transmission Line Project is located in Placer County. The project consists of three transmission lines: a 60-kv line, about 13.1 miles long, extending from Placer County's French Meadows Powerhouse to Placer County's Middle Fork Powerhouse, a short 230-kV tap from Placer County's Ralston Powerhouse to a junction with PG&E's Middle Fork–Gold Hill 230 kV line, and a short tap from Placer County's Oxbow Powerhouse to a junction with PG&E's Middle Fork No.1 60-kV line.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA),<sup>2</sup> the Commission's regulations, and other applicable laws require that we independently evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed project and reasonable alternatives. Based on a

---

<sup>1</sup>16 U.S.C. §791(a) -825(r).

<sup>2</sup>National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (Pub. L. 91-190. 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94-52, July 3, 1975, Pub. L. 94-83, August 9, 1975, and Pub. L. 97-258, §4(b), Sept. 13, 1982).

preliminary analysis of the issues, Commission staff is proposing to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) that describes and evaluates the probable effects, including an assessment of the cumulative effects, if any, of the proposed action and alternatives considered. This scoping process will help us to identify the pertinent issues that we will need to analyze in the EIS.




Figure 1 Middle Fork American River Project and Vicinity

## 2.0 SCOPING

### 2.1 Purposes of Scoping

Scoping is the process used to identify issues, concerns, and opportunities associated with a proposed action. According to NEPA, scoping should be conducted early in the planning stage of a project. The purposes of scoping are as follows:

- invite federal, state, and local resource agencies, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and interested persons to help us identify significant environmental and socioeconomic issues related to the proposed action;
- determine the depth of analysis and significance of issues to be addressed in the EIS;
- identify how the project would or would not contribute to cumulative impacts in the project area;
- identify reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that should be evaluated in the EIS;
- ask participants for information they have available on the resources at issue; and
- determine the resource areas and potential issues that do not require detailed analysis during review of the project.

## 2.2 Comments and Scoping Meetings

Between now and the Commission's licensing decision, there will be the following opportunities to comment:

- During the public scoping process and study plan meetings, prior to the preparation of the EIS; so that the Commission staff can receive written comments regarding scope and content
  - In response to the Commission's ready for environmental analysis notice
  - After issuance of the draft EIS.

Besides the written comments we ask for in this SD1, Commission staff will hold two public scoping meetings in the vicinity of the projects. An evening meeting will

focus on the public's views, and a daytime meeting will focus on resource agency concerns. We invite all interested agencies, Indian tribes, NGOs, and individuals to attend one or both of the meetings to assist staff in identifying the scope of environmental issues that should be analyzed in the EIS.

The times and locations of the scoping meetings are as follows:

Daytime Scoping Meeting

Date and Time: Tuesday, March 4, 2008, 9:00 AM

Location: Auburn Recreation District-Canyon View Community Center

Evening Scoping Meeting

Date and Time: Tuesday, March 4, 2008, 6:30 PM

Location: Auburn Recreation District-Canyon View community Center

The licensees and Commission staff have scheduled a visit to the project sites on Wednesday, June 25, 2008, starting at 8:00 AM. All participants should meet at Auburn Recreation District-Canyon View Community Center, located at 471 Maidu Drive, Auburn, California. Placer County Water Agency will provide transportation for participants. Anyone interested in attending the site visit should contact Mr. Mal Toy of Placer county Water Agency at (530) 823-4889 by June 11, 2008.

The scoping meetings will be recorded by a court reporter, and all statements (oral and written) will become part of the Commission's public record for the project. Interested parties who choose not to speak or who are unable to attend any of the scoping meetings may provide written comments and information to the Commission as described in section 5.0. These meetings are posted on the Commission's calendar located on the internet at <http://www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventsList.aspx> along with other related information.

Meeting participants should come prepared to discuss their issues and concerns as they pertain to the projects. To prepare for the scoping meetings, we ask that participants review the Pre-Application Documents (PADs). A copy of the PADs are available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's website (<http://www.ferc.gov>), using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number, P-2079, or P-2479, to access the documents. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support at [FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov) or toll free at 1-866-208-3676, or for TTY, (202) 502-8659.



Following the scoping meetings and comment period, all issues raised will be reviewed and decisions will be made about the level of analysis needed. If preliminary analysis shows that any issues presented in this scoping document have little potential for causing significant effects, the issue(s) will be identified and the reasons for not providing a more detailed analysis will be given in the EIS.

If we receive no substantive comments on this Scoping Document 1, then we will not prepare a Scoping Document 2. The EIS will address the major issues identified during the scoping process.

### **3.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

In accordance with NEPA, our environmental analysis will consider the following alternatives, at a minimum: (1) the licensees' proposed action, (2) alternatives to the proposed action, and (3) no action.

#### **3.1 Placer County's Proposed Action**

The Middle Fork American River Project consists of a series of seven diversions and five powerhouses with a nameplate generating capacity of 223,750 kilowatts (KW). Water from the diversions is controlled and conveyed through seven tunnels. At the end of the system, Project water is released to the Middle Fork American River about 29 miles upstream of Folsom Reservoir.

The Project includes two principal water storage reservoirs, French Meadows and Hell Hole (combined gross storage of 342,583 acre-feet), two limited storage afterbays, Interbay and Ralston (combined storage of 2,959 acre-feet), and three small diversions, Duncan Creek Diversion, North Fork Long Canyon Diversion and South Fork Long Canyon Diversion.

The headwaters of the Middle Fork American River and its tributaries drain into the French Meadows Reservoir. Placer County diverts water stored in French Meadows Reservoir to the Hell Hole Reservoir via the 2.6-mile-long French Meadows-Hell Hole Tunnel. Hell Hole Reservoir also stores water flowing from the upper reaches of the Rubicon River drainage.

Flow from French Meadows to the Hell Hole Reservoir passes through the French Meadows Powerhouse, which has a nameplate capacity of 15,300 KW from a single

generator. The Hell Hole Powerhouse, located at the base of the Hell Hole Dam, generates electricity from fish-flow releases into the Rubicon River, and has a nameplate generating capacity of 725 KW from a single generator.

Water stored in Hell Hole Reservoir is released through the 10.4-mile-long Hell Hole – Middle Fork Tunnel to the Middle Fork Powerhouse, with a nameplate generating capacity of 122,400 KW from two generating units. Middle Fork Powerhouse releases water to Middle Fork Interbay, an afterbay for the Middle Fork Powerhouse and a forebay for the inlet to the Middle Fork-Ralston Tunnel.

Water in the Hell Hole - Middle Fork Tunnel is augmented by diversions from the North and South Forks of Long Canyon Creeks. The 6.7-mile-long, Middle Fork-Ralston Tunnel terminates at the Ralston Powerhouse, with a nameplate electrical generating capacity of 79,200 KW from a single generating unit that discharges to the Ralston Afterbay. Ralston Afterbay supplies water to the Oxbow Tunnel, which leads to the Oxbow Powerhouse at the downstream end of the tunnel. Oxbow powerhouse has a nameplate electrical generating capacity of 6,100 KW from a single generator.

Water from the Oxbow Powerhouse is discharged back to the Middle Fork American River about 29 miles upstream of Folsom Reservoir.

### 3.2 PG&E's Proposed Action

As we've said, the French Meadows Transmission Line Project consists of three transmission lines: a 60-kv line, about 13.1 miles long, extending from Placer County's French Meadows Powerhouse to Placer County's Middle Fork Powerhouse, a short 230-kV tap from Placer County's Ralston Powerhouse to a junction with PG&E's Middle Fork–Gold Hill 230 kV line, and a short tap from Placer County's Oxbow Powerhouse to a junction with PG&E's Middle Fork No.1 60-kV line.

The applicants anticipate the relicensing process may result in changes to the existing license conditions to further protect and enhance the environmental resources affected by the project. However, the applicants can not determine the type and extent of any such changes until the proposed studies are complete.

### 3.3 Staff's Modification of the Proposed Actions

Staff will consider and assess all alternative recommendations for operational or facility modifications, as well as protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures identified by the staff, the agencies, Indian tribes, NGOs, and the general public.

### 3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, the projects would continue to operate under the existing license conditions. The no action alternative is our baseline to establish environmental conditions for comparison with other alternatives.

## **4.0 SCOPE OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS AND RESOURCE ISSUES**

### 4.1 Cumulative Effects

According to the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA (Section 1508.7), a cumulative effect is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time, to include hydropower and other land and water development activities.

Based on information in the Pre-Application Documents, agency comments, and preliminary staff analysis, we have not identified any resources as potentially cumulatively affected by the operation and maintenance of the Middle Fork American River Project and the French Meadows Transmission Project. By this document, we are asking for recommendations on resources that may be affected cumulatively.

#### 4.1.1 Geographic Scope

The geographic scope of the analysis defines the physical limits or boundaries of the proposed action's effect on the resources. Because the proposed action would affect the resources differently, the geographic scope for each resource may vary. For any resources that participants recommend we analyze for cumulative effects, we are also asking them to recommend the geographic scope that they think is appropriate.

#### 4.1.2 Temporal Scope

The temporal scope of a cumulative effects analysis includes a discussion of past, present, and future actions and their effects on each resource that could be cumulatively affected. For any resource that we identify as potentially having cumulative effects, our temporal scope will look 30-50 years into the future, based on the potential term of a new license, concentrating on the effect on the resource from reasonably foreseeable future actions. The historical discussion will, by necessity, be limited to the amount of available information for each resource area.

### 4.2 Middle Fork American Project Resource Issues

Environmental issues and concerns preliminarily identified by the staff are presented below. This identification of issues and concerns is not intended to be exhaustive or final, but is an initial listing of issues we have identified. For convenience, the issues have been listed by resource area. We have not identified significant socio-economic issues associated with relicensing the project.

#### 4.2.1 Geology and Soil Resources

- Effects of land-clearing and ground-disturbing activities during construction and use of recreation facilities on erosion, sedimentation, and slope stability.
- Effects of project operation on river and reservoir shoreline erosion and bank stability.
- Effects of project operations on stream geomorphic processes and features.
- Effects of reservoir level fluctuation on shoreline erosion.

#### 4.2.2 Water Resources

- The potential effects of proposed and alternative flow regimes on water temperature and DO concentrations in the reaches influenced by project operations.
- Effects of project operation on water quality, (including but not limited to: dissolved oxygen, temperature, nutrient loading, suspended sediments, and

turbidity), in the French Meadows and Hell Hole reservoirs, Middle Fork American River, Rubicon River, and affected tributaries.

- The effects of the project and proposed and recommended environmental measures on compliance with applicable state water quality standards and designated beneficial uses.

#### 4.2.3 Aquatic Resources

- Potential effects of project-related changes in streamflow, including minimum instream flows and ramping rates, on aquatic resources in project-affected reaches.
- Potential effects of project-related changes in water quality on aquatic resources in project reservoirs and project-affected reaches.
- The potential effects of project facilities and operations on fish given special status by appropriate resource agencies and appropriate measures to minimize project-related effects.

#### 4.2.4 Terrestrial Resources

- Effects of the inundation of riverine, riparian, wetlands, and upland habitats on wildlife.
- Effects of proposed water level fluctuations on wetland and riparian vegetation along the reservoir shoreline.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on vegetation in the Middle Fork American Project area, including special-species and noxious/invasive weed species.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on wildlife.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on resident and migratory game birds.

- Effects of project operations on wildlife given special status by appropriate resource agencies, including but not limited to: Northern goshawk, California spotted owl, Great gray owl, American marten, osprey, and Pacific fisher.
- Effects of project operations on plant species given special status by appropriate resources agencies, including but not limited to: Pleasant Valley mariposa lily, Red Hills soaproot, Yellow bur navarretia, and Stebbins' phacelia.

#### 4.2.5 Threatened and Endangered Species

- Effects of proposed construction, operation, and environmental measures and project-related human disturbance on federally listed plant species including but not limited to: Webber's mousetail, Layne's ragwort, and Tahoe yellow cress.
- Effects of proposed construction, operation, and environmental measures and project-related human disturbance on federally listed wildlife species including but not limited to: Bald eagle, Pacific fisher, and Valley elderberry longhorn beetle.

#### 4.2.6 Recreation and Aesthetics

- Effects of existing operation and maintenance and proposed improvements on public access and recreational opportunities within the project area.
- Adequacy of existing and proposed public access and recreational facilities within the project area to meet current and future recreational demand.
- Effects of the existing project operation and proposed betterments on the quality and availability of flow-dependent river recreation opportunities, including: whitewater boating, fishing, and swimming.
- Effects of existing project and proposed improvements on aesthetics.

#### 4.2.7 Land use

- Whether the project is consistent with the Tahoe National Forest Land and

Resource Management Plan, the Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, and any other pertinent plans and planning efforts.

- Whether the project would have any effects on the eligibility of wild and scenic river designation for nominated segments of the Rubicon River and the Middle Fork American River.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on wildfire risk and fire management.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on land uses adjacent to the FERC project boundary and within the watershed—such as recreation, timber management, and natural resource protection.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance on shoreline buffer zones.

#### 4.2.8 Cultural Resources

- Effects of operation and maintenance of the existing project and the proposed construction and operation of project improvements on historic, archeological, and traditional resources that may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

#### 4.2.9 Developmental Resources

- Effects of any recommended environmental measures on the project's economics.

#### 4.3 Proposed Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancement Measures

After review of the findings of the studies Placer County completes and the recommendations of stakeholders, Placer County will consider and propose measures to protect, mitigate, and enhance environmental resources affected by the project.

#### 4.4 **French Meadows Transmission Line Project Resource Issues**

Environmental issues and concerns preliminarily identified by the staff are presented below. This identification of issues and concerns is not intended to be

exhaustive or final, but is an initial listing of issues we have identified. For convenience, the issues have been listed by resource area. We have not identified significant geological, water quality, aquatic or socio-economic issues associated with relicensing the project.

#### 4.4.1 Terrestrial Resources

- Effects of project operations and maintenance in the transmission corridor on botanical resources, wildlife, and raptors.

#### 4.4.2 Threatened and Endangered Species

- Effects of project operations and maintenance in the transmission corridor on federally listed plant species including but not limited to: Webber's mousetail, Layne's ragwort, and Tahoe yellow cress.
- Effects of project operations and maintenance in the transmission corridor on federally listed wildlife species including but not limited to: Bald eagle, Pacific fisher, and Valley elderberry longhorn beetle.

#### 4.4.3 Land Use

- Whether the project as proposed is consistent with the Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, the Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and any other pertinent plans and planning efforts.
- Effects of project operations on wildfire risk and fire management.
- Effects of project operations on land uses adjacent to the FERC project boundary.

#### 4.4.4 Cultural resources

- Effects of operation and maintenance of project on historic, archeological, and traditional resources that may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.



#### 4.5 Proposed Protection, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

After review of the studies PG&E completes and the recommendations of stakeholders, PG&E will consider and may propose measures to protect, mitigate and enhance environmental resources affected by the project.

### **5.0 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

We are asking federal, state, and local resource agencies, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations, and other entities and individuals to forward to the Commission any information that will assist the staff in conducting an accurate and thorough analysis of the site-specific and cumulative effects of licensing the Middle Fork American River Project and the French Meadows Transmission Line Project. Types of information that we seek include, but are not limited to:

- information, quantified data, or professional opinion that may contribute to refining the geographic scope of the analysis, including the analysis of cumulative effects, and identifying significant environmental issues;
- identification of, and information from, any other environmental document or similar study (previous, ongoing, or planned) relevant to the proposed licensing of the projects;
- existing information and any data that would help to describe the past, present and future actions and the effects of the projects and other developmental activities on environmental and socioeconomic resources;
- information that would help characterize the existing environmental conditions and habitats;
- identification of any federal, state, or local agency or Indian tribe resource plans and future project proposals in the affected resource area, such as proposals to construct or operate water treatment facilities, recreation areas, water diversions, timber harvest activities, or fish management programs;
- documentation of cumulative effects of basin-wide activities, including the projects operation, on resources; and

- documentation that would support a conclusion that the projects do or do not contribute to adverse or beneficial effects on resources and should therefore be excluded from further study or included for further consideration of cumulative effects. Documentation should include, but need not be limited to: how the projects interact with other hydropower projects in the area and other developmental and non-developmental activities; results from studies; resource management policies; and reports from federal, state, and local agencies and Indian tribes.

The requested information should be submitted in writing to the Commission no later than April 11, 2008. All filings must clearly identify the following on the first page: Middle Fork American River Project No. 2079-061 or French Meadows Transmission Line Project No. 2479 or both. Address all communications to:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E., Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

All filings sent to the Secretary of the Commission should contain an original and eight copies. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. See 18 CFR 85.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's website (<http://www.ferc.gov>) under the "e-filing" link. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at [FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov) or toll-free at 1-(866) 208-3676, or for TTY, (202) 502-8659.

Register online at <http://ferc.gov/esubscribenow.htm> to be notified via e-mail of new filing and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

Any questions concerning scoping or preparation of the EIS for this proposed action should be directed to Jim Fargo at (202)502-6095 or [james.fargo@ferc.gov](mailto:james.fargo@ferc.gov).

## **6.0 EIS PREPARATION SCHEDULE**

At this time we anticipate the need to prepare an EIS (we show our preliminary Outline in chapter 7). We will prepare a draft EIS, which will be sent to all persons and entities on the Commission's service and mailing lists for the Middle Fork American

River Project and the French Meadows Transmission Line Project. The draft EIS will include recommendations for operating procedures, and environmental protection, mitigation and enhancement measures that should be part of any licenses issued by the Commission. Recipients will then have 60 days to provide the Commission with written comments on the draft EIS. All comments on the draft EIS filed with the Commission will be considered in the Commission’s decision on the license applications.

Appendix A contains the Process Plan and schedule for pre-application activity. Our preliminary schedule for processing the license applications is as follows:

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>TARGET DATE</b>
Scoping Meeting	March 2008
License Application Filed	February 2011
Issue Ready for Environmental Analysis Notice	April 2011
Deadline for Filing Preliminary Agency Recommendations	June 2011
Draft EIS Issued	December 2011
Deadline for Filing Modified Agency Recommendations	February 2012
Final EIS Issued	May 2012

## **7.0 EIS OUTLINE**

The preliminary outline for the EIS is as follows:

COVER SHEET  
 FOREWORD  
 TABLE OF CONTENTS  
 LIST OF APPENDICES  
 LIST OF FIGURES  
 LIST OF TABLES  
 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS  
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. Application
- 1.2. Purpose of Action and Need for Power
- 1.3. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements
  - 1.3.1. Federal Power Act
    - 1.3.1.1. Section 18 Fishway Prescriptions
    - 1.3.1.2. Section 4(e) Conditions
    - 1.3.1.3. Section 10(j) Conditions
  - 1.3.2. Clean Water Act
  - 1.3.3. Endangered Species Act
  - 1.3.4. National Historic Preservation Act
- 1.4. Public Review and Comment

- 1.4.1. Scoping
- 1.4.2. Interventions
- 1.4.3. Comments on the Application
- 1.4.4. Comments on Draft EIS
- 2. PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES
  - 2.1. No-action Alternative
    - 2.1.1. Existing Project Facilities
    - 2.1.2. Current Project Operation
    - 2.1.2. Current Environmental Measures
  - 2.2. Applicant's Proposal
    - 2.2.1. Proposed Project Facilities
    - 2.2.2. Project Safety
    - 2.2.3. Proposed Project Operation
    - 2.2.4. Proposed Environmental Measures
    - 2.2.5. Modifications to Applicant's Proposal—Mandatory Conditions
  - 2.3. Staff Alternative
  - 2.4. Other Alternatives (as appropriate)
  - 2.5. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study
    - 2.5.1. Federal Government Takeover of the Project
    - 2.5.2. Issuing a Nonpower License
    - 2.5.3. Retiring the Project
- 3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
  - 3.1. General Description of the River Basin
  - 3.2. Scope of Cumulative Effects Analysis
    - 3.2.1. Geographic Scope
    - 3.2.2. Temporal Scope
  - 3.3. Proposed Action and Action Alternatives
    - 3.3.1. Geologic and Soil Resources
    - 3.3.2. Aquatic Resources
    - 3.3.3. Terrestrial Resources
    - 3.3.4. Threatened and Endangered Species
    - 3.3.5. Recreation and Land Use
    - 3.3.6. Cultural Resources
    - 3.3.7. Aesthetic Resources
    - 3.3.8. Socioeconomics
  - 3.4. No-action Alternative
- 4. DEVELOPMENTAL ANALYSIS
  - 4.1. Power and Economic Benefits of the Project
  - 4.2. Cost of Environmental Measures
  - 4.3. Comparison of Alternatives
- 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
  - 5.1. Comparison of Effects of Proposed Action and Alternatives
  - 5.2. Comprehensive Development and Recommended Alternative
  - 5.3. Unavoidable Adverse Effects
  - 5.4. Recommendations of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
  - 5.5. Consistency with Comprehensive Plans
- 6. LITERATURE CITED
- 7. LIST OF PREPARERS
- 8. LIST OF RECIPIENTS

## APPENDICES

### 8.0 LIST OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

Section 10(a)(2) of the FPA requires us to consider whether or not, and under what conditions, relicensing the project would be consistent with relevant comprehensive plans on the Commission's Comprehensive Plan List. The plans that we consider to be relevant to this project are listed below. We ask agencies to review this list and to inform FERC of if any changes are needed. If there are plans that should be added to the list, agencies should file the plans according to 18 CFR 2.19

- California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout. 1988. Restoring the balance: 1988 annual report. Sausalito, California. 84 pp.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1979. Rubicon River wild trout management plan. Sacramento, California. July 1979. 46 pp
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1979. South Fork Merced River wild trout management plan. Sacramento, California. July 1979. 26 pp.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1979. Nelson Creek wild trout management plan. Sacramento, California. July 1979. 27 pp.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1981. Yellow Creek wild trout management plan. Sacramento, California. August 1981. 18 pp. and appendix.
- California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and Bureau of Reclamation. 1988. Cooperative agreement to implement actions to benefit winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River Basin. Sacramento, California. May 20, 1988. 10 pp. and exhibit.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1990. Central Valley salmon and steelhead restoration and enhancement plan. Sacramento, California. April 1990. 115 pp.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 1993. Restoring Central Valley streams: A plan for action. Sacramento, California. November 1993. 129 pp.

- California Department of Fish and Game. 1996. Steelhead restoration and management plan for California. February 1996. 234 pp.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1998. Public opinions and attitudes on outdoor recreation in California. Sacramento, California. March 1998.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1980. Recreation outlook in Planning District 2. Sacramento, California. April 1980. 88 pp.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1980. Recreation outlook in Planning District 3. Sacramento, California. June 1980. 82 pp.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1994. California outdoor recreation plan, 1993. Sacramento, California. April 1994. 154 pp. and appendices.
- California Department of Water Resources. 1983. The California water plan: Projected use and available water supplies to 2010. Bulletin 160–83. Sacramento, California. December 1983. 268 pp. and attachments.
- California Department of Water Resources. 1994. California water plan update. Bulletin 160–93. Sacramento, California. October 1994. Two volumes and executive summary.
- California Department of Water Resources. 2000. Final programmatic environmental impact statement/environmental impact report for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. Sacramento, California. July 2000. CD Rom, including associated plans.
- California State Water Resources Control Board. 1975. Water quality control plan report. Sacramento, California. Nine volumes.
- California—The Resources Agency. Department of Parks and Recreation. 1983. Recreation needs in California. Sacramento, California. March 1983. 39 pp. and appendices.
- California—The Resources Agency. 1989. Upper Sacramento River fisheries and riparian habitat management plan. Sacramento, California. January 1989.

- Forest Service. 1988. Eldorado National Forest land and resource management plan. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Placerville, California. December 1988. 752 pp.
- State Water Resources Control Board. 1999. Water quality control plans and policies adopted as part of the state comprehensive plan. April 1999.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, California Waterfowl Association, and Ducks Unlimited. 1990. Central Valley habitat joint venture implementation plan: A component of the North American waterfowl management plan. Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon. February 1990.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Final restoration plan for the anadromous fish restoration program. Department of the Interior, Sacramento, California. January 9, 2001.

## 9.0 MAILING LIST

### Parties from FERC Service and Mailing List

---

**Mobil Natural Gas, Inc.**  
12450 Greenspoint Drive  
Houston, TX 77060-1905

**Pacific Gas & Electric Company**  
Louis E. Vincent  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120-7442

**Placer County Water Agency**  
David A. Breninger  
General Manager  
P.O. Box 6570  
Auburn, CA 95604-6570

**Placer County Water Agency**  
Board of Directors  
Chairman  
P.O. Box 667  
Foresthill, CA 95631-0667

**Placer County Water Agency**  
Stephen Jones  
Manager  
P.O. Box 667  
Foresthill, CA 95631-0667

**Dave Steindorf**  
CA Stewardship Director  
American Whitewater  
4 Beroni Dr  
Chico, CA 95928

## Parties from FERC Service and Mailing List

---

**Director**

Bonneville Power Administration  
PO Box 3621  
Portland, Washington 97208-3621

**Chief**

California Dept. of Parks and Recreation  
PO Box 942896  
Sacramento, California 94296-0001

**Matthew R Campbell**

California Office of Attorney General  
1300 I St # 125  
Sacramento, California 95814-2919

**Secretary**

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Ave  
San Francisco, California 94102-3214

**Chairman**

Columbia River Gorge Commission  
PO Box 730  
White Salmon, Washington 98672-0730

**Donald E Kempf**

Environmental Specialist  
Stillaguamish Tribe  
PO Box 277  
Arlington, Washington 98223-0277

**US Bureau of Indian Affairs**

2800 Cottage Way  
Sacramento, California 95825-1846

**US Bureau of Land Management**

California State Office  
2800 Cottage Way Ste W1834  
Sacramento, California 95825-1886

**California Air Resources Board**

PO Box 2815  
Sacramento, California 95812-2815

**Atty. General**

California Office of Attorney General  
300 S Spring St Fl 2  
Los Angeles, California 90013-1230

**Cherilyn E Widell**

**Director**  
California Office of Historic Preservation  
1416 9th St  
Sacramento, California 95814

**California State Lands Commission**

Suite 100-South  
100 Howe Ave  
Sacramento, California 95825-8202

**Donn Furman**

**Committee to Save the Kings River**  
1390 Market Street, Suite 418  
San Francisco, California 94102

**Maria Cantwell**

**Honorable**  
United States Senate  
Washington, Washington 20515-0001

**District Chief-US Geological Survey**

Placer Hall  
6000 J St.  
Sacramento, California 95819

**Commander**

**US Army Corps of Engineers**  
San Francisco District Office  
1455 Market St, #1760  
San Francisco, CALIFORNIA 94103

---

## Placer County Outreach Federal Government/Representatives

---

**National Marine Fisheries Service**

501 W Ocean Blvd Ste 4200  
Long Beach, California 90802-4221

**National Marine Fisheries Service**

Habitat Manager  
777 Sonoma Avenue, Rm. 325



Parties from FERC Service and Mailing List

---

Santa Rosa, CA 95404

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - Fisheries**

Eric Theiss  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**National Park Service**

Stephen Bowes  
CA Hydro Program Wild & Scenic Rivers Coordinator  
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700  
Oakland, CA 94607

**Natural Resource Conservation Service**

Vern Finney  
251 Auburn Ravine Rd, Suite 106  
Auburn, CA 95603-3719

**US Army Corps of Engineers**

Patrick Dwyer  
Civil Works Office  
1325 J Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2928

**US Bureau of Land Management**

William Haigh  
63 Natoma Street  
Folsom, CA 95630

**US Bureau of Land Management**

Deane Swickard  
63 Natoma Street  
Folsom, CA 95630

**US Bureau of Reclamation**

Regional Director  
2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846

**US Environmental Protection Agency**

Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV)  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Placer County Outreach Federal Government/Representatives (continued)

---

**US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Amy Fesnock  
Senior Fish and Wildlife Biologist  
Endangered Species Division  
2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825

**US Fish and Wildlife Service**

William Foster  
2800 Cottage Way  
Room W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Katy Coulter  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Krista Deal  
Heritage Specialist  
7887 Hwy. 50  
Pollock Pines, CA 95726

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Millard Dorit  
Georgetown Ranger District  
7600 Wentworth Springs Road  
Georgetown, CA 95634

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Vicki Jowise  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Jon Jue  
7600 Wentworth Springs Rd  
Georgetown, CA 95634

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Tom Koler  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Dawn Lipton  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Lester Lubetkin  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Beth Paulson  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Mike Taylor  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Terry Tenley  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Patricia Trimble  
Georgetown Ranger District  
7600 Wentworth Springs Road  
Georgetown, CA 95634

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Janelle Walker  
7600 Wentworth Springs Rd  
Georgetown, CA 95634

**US Forest Service - El Dorado National Forest**

Jann Williams  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

Placer County Outreach Federal Government/Representatives (continued)

---

**US Forest Service - Region 5 - Regional**

Dennis Smith  
Regional Hydropower Assistance Team (RHAT)  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-200  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**US Forest Service - Region 5 - Regional**

Julie Tupper  
Regional Hydropower Assistance Team (RHAT)  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-200  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

John Babin  
Supervisor's Office  
631 Coyote Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Greg Connick  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Katie Crews  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Jan Cutts  
American River Ranger District  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

William Davis  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Donna Day  
631 Coyote Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Steve Eubanks  
Forest Supervisor  
631 Coyote St.  
Nevada City, CA 95959-2250

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Scott Husmann  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Bonnie Pettitt  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Carrie Smith  
9646 Donner Pass Road  
Truckee, CA 96161-2949

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Nolan Smith  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Dan Teater  
American River Ranger District  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Mo Tebbe  
American River Ranger District  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Matt Triggs  
American River Ranger District  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

Placer County Outreach Federal Government/Representatives (continued)

---

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Rick Weaver  
Supervisor's Office  
631 Coyote Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**US Forest Service - Tahoe National Forest**

Marc Wolburn  
American River Ranger District  
22830 Foresthill Road  
Foresthill, CA 95631

**US House of Representatives**

John Doolittle  
Granite Bay, CA Office  
4230 Douglas Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Granite Bay, CA, 95746

**US Senate**

Barbara Boxer  
501 I Street, Suite 7-600  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**US Senate**

Dianne Feinstein  
One Post Street, Suite 2450  
San Francisco, CA 94104

---

Outreach State Government/Representatives

---

**California Department of Fish and Game**

Robert Hughes  
830 S Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**California Department of Fish and Game**

Stafford Lehr  
1701 Nimbus Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**California Department of Fish and Game**

MaryLisa Lynch  
1701 Nimbus Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**California Department of Fish and Game**

Beth Lawson  
1701 Nimbus Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**California State Parks**

Bill Deitchman  
501 El Dorado St  
Auburn, CA 95603

**California State Parks - Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA)**

Jay Galloway  
501 El Dorado St  
Auburn, CA 95603

**California State Parks - Folsom State Park**

Jim Michaels  
Recreation Area  
7806 Folsom Auburn Road  
Folsom, CA 95630

**Sam Aanestad**

State Senator  
200 Providence Mine, #108  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**Dave Cox**

State Senator  
2140 Professional Drive, Suite 140  
Roseville, CA 95661

**Ted Gaines**

State Assemblyman  
1700 Eureka Road, Suite 160  
Roseville, CA 95661

## Outreach State Government/Representatives

---

### **State Water Resources Control Board**

Camilla Williams  
Division of Water Rights  
PO Box 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

### **State Water Resources Control Board**

Russ Kanz  
Division of Water Rights  
PO Box 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

## Outreach Local Government

---

### **Auburn Area Recreation & Park District**

Kahl Muscott  
123 Recreation Drive  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **City of Auburn**

Robert Richardson  
City Manager  
1225 Lincoln Way  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **City of Colfax**

Joan Phillippe  
City Manager  
PO Box 702  
Colfax, CA 95713

### **City of Lincoln**

Gerald Johnson  
City Manager  
640 Fifth Street  
Lincoln, CA 95648

### **City of Roseville**

W. Craig Robinson  
City Manager  
311 Vernon Street,  
Roseville, CA 95678

### **County of Placer**

County Executive Office  
Brett Storey  
175 Fulweiler Ave  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **El Dorado Board of Supervisors**

Cindy Keck  
Clerk to the Board  
330 Fair LN  
Placerville, CA 95667

### **Foresthill Forum**

Larry Jordan  
PO Box 207  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **Foresthill Municipal Advisory Committee**

P. O. Box 207  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **Town of Loomis**

Perry Beck  
City Manager  
6140 Horseshoe Bar. Road, Suite K  
Loomis, CA 95650

## Outreach Public Agency

---

### **El Dorado County Water Agency**

Bill Hetland  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667-4103

### **El Dorado Irrigation District**

Cheri Jagers  
2890 Mosquito Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

## Outreach Public Agency

---

### **El Dorado Irrigation District**

Liz Mansfield  
2890 Mosquito Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

### **Georgetown Divide Public Utility District**

Henry White  
General Manager  
P.O. Box 4240  
Georgetown, CA 95634

### **Placer County Resource Conservation District**

Rich Gresham  
251 Auburn Ravine Road, Ste 105  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **Foresthill Public Utility District**

Kurt Reed  
General Manager  
PO Box 266  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **Nevada Irrigation District**

Ron Nelson  
PO Box 1019  
Grass Valley, CA 95945-1019

### **San Juan Water District**

Shauna Lorance  
General Manager  
9935 Auburn-Folsom Road  
Granite Bay, CA 95746

## Outreach Native American Tribes

---

### **Colfax-Todd Valley Consolidated Tribe**

LeVina Suehead  
P.O. Box 4884  
Auburn, CA 95604-4884

### **Miwok Tribe of the El Dorado Rancheria**

Jeri Scambler  
Tribal Chairperson  
PO Box 1284  
El Dorado, CA 95623

### **Shingle Springs Rancheria**

Jeff Murray  
P.O. Box 1340  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

### **Todd Valley Miwok-Maidu Cultural Foundation**

Bridget Zellner  
P.O. Box 1490  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria**

Shelly McGinnis  
Analytical Environmental Services  
1801 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### **El Dorado County Indian Council**

Don Yandell  
PO Box 564  
El Dorado, CA 95623

### **Shingle Springs Rancheria**

Nicolas Fonseca  
P.O. Box 1340  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

### **Todd Valley Miwok-Maidu Cultural Foundation**

Fern Brown  
P.O. Box 1490  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribal Office**

Don Ryberg  
Chariman  
438 Searls Avenue  
Nevada City, CA 95959

### **United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria**

Jessica Tavares  
Chairperson  
575 Menlo Drive #2  
Rocklin, CA 95765

## Outreach Native American Tribes

---

### **United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria**

Yolanda Chavez  
Analytical Environmental Services  
1801 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### **Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California**

Darrel Cruz  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
919 Highway 395 South  
Gardnerville, NV 89410

### **Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California**

Waldo Walker  
Chairman  
919 Highway 395 South  
Gardnerville, NV 89410

## Outreach Non-Governmental Organizations

---

### **American River Recreation Association and Sierra Nevada Alliance**

Bill Center  
PO Box 623  
Lotus, CA 95651

### **Auburn Chamber of Commerce**

Rich Johnson  
601 Lincoln Way  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **Auburn Flycasters Granite Bay Flycasters**

Larry Goodell  
PO Box 756  
Auburn, CA 95604

### **Audubon Society**

Don Rivenes  
711 University Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95825

### **California Hydropower Reform Coalition**

Laura Norlander  
2140 Shattuck Ave., Suite 605  
Berkeley, CA 94704

### **California Native Plant Society**

Sue Britting  
P.O. Box 377  
Coloma, CA 95613

### **California Outdoors**

Nate Rangel  
PO Box 401  
Coloma, CA 95613

### **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance**

Jerry Mensch  
1516 9th Street, Suite 401  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### **Canyon Keepers**

Jim Ferris  
501 El Dorado St  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **Dry Creek Conservancy**

Greg Bates  
P.O. Box 1311  
Roseville, CA 95678

### **Farm Bureau, Placer County**

Jim Bachman  
10120 Ophir Road  
Newcastle, CA 95658

### **FlyFishNorCal**

### **Northern California Fly Fishing**

Ben Rualo  
2 Moraine Court  
Hercules, CA 94547

## Outreach Non-Governmental Organizations

---

**Foothills Water Network**

Julie Leimbach  
PO Box 713  
Lotus, CA 95651

**Granite Bay Flycasters**

Heath Wakelee  
4120 Douglas Blvd. #306-356  
Granite Bay, CA 95746-5936

**Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association Association**

Patricia Gibbs  
5425 Lake Forest Dr  
Loomis, CA 95650

**Northern California Council, Federation of Fly Fishers**

Frank Rinella  
8450 Erika Jean Way  
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

**Pacific Gas & Electric**

Kevin Goishi  
343 Sacramento Street  
Auburn, CA 95603

**Pacific Gas & Electric**

Attn: Forrest Sullivan  
5555 Florin-Perkins Road  
Sacramento, CA 95826

**Sacramento Municipal Utility District**

David Hanson  
6201 S St, Sacramento  
Sacramento, CA 95817

**Sierra Club - Mother Lode Chapter**

Allan Eberhart  
1414 K Street, Suite 500  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Trout Unlimited**

Chuck Bonham  
California Director  
1808B 5th Street  
Berkeley, CA 94710

**Friends of the River**

Ron Stork  
915 20th St  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Horseshoe Bar Fly Fishing Preserve**

Gary Flanagan  
8459 Lakeland Drive  
Granite Bay, CA 95746

**Natural Heritage Institute**

Elizabeth Soderstrom  
409 Spring Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

**Northern California Council, Federation of Fly Fishers**

Jim Victorine  
4800 Hidden Oaks Lane  
Loomis, CA 95650

**Pacific Gas & Electric**

Steve Pierano  
Mail Code N11E  
PO Box 70000  
San Francisco, CA 94177-0001

**Protect American River Canyons**

Gary Estes  
4135 Eagles Nest  
Auburn, CA 95603

**Sacramento Municipal Utility District**

Jim Shetler  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
6201 S St, Sacramento  
Sacramento, CA 95817

**Sierra Club-Placer Group**

Marilyn Jasper  
P. O. Box 7167  
Auburn, CA 95604-7167

**Upper American River Foundation**

Bill Carnazzo  
5209 Crestline Drive  
Foresthill, CA 95631



## Outreach Non-Governmental Organizations

---

### **Western States Trail Foundation**

Gene Freeland  
1216 C High Street  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **Western States Trail Association**

Tony Rossman  
Counselor  
6442 Hillegass Ave  
Oakland, CA 94618

## Outreach Public

---

### **Neil Cochran**

5344 Crestline Drive  
Foresthill, CA 95631

### **Cramer Fish Sciences**

Bradley J. Cavallo  
1119 High St, Suite 2  
Auburn, CA 98603

### **Craig Crouch**

5307 Hawkhaven Court  
Rocklin, CA 95765

### **Jones & Associates**

Tom Jones  
12331 Incline Drive  
Auburn, CA 95603

### **Sierra Pacific Industries**

Tim Feller  
P.O. Box 496028  
Redding, CA 96049-6028

### **Fred Springer, C.E.**

Troutman Sanders LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
401 Ninth St., NW, Suite 1000  
Washington D.C. 20004-2134

APPENDIX A: PROCESS PLAN AND SCHEDULE

Below is the schedule for the Middle Fork American River Project pre-application activity.

Responsible Entity	Pre-Filing Milestone	Date	FERC Regulation
PCWA	Issue Public Notice for NOI/PAD	12/13/07	5.3(d)(2)
PCWA	File NOI/PAD with FERC	12/13/07	5.5, 5.6
FERC	Tribal Meeting		5.7
FERC	Notice of Commencement of Proceeding & SD1		5.8
FERC	Scoping Document 1 issued		5.8(c)
FERC	Scoping and Site Visit	3/4/08	5.8(b)(viii)
All stakeholders	NOI/PAD/SD1 comments due	4/11/08	5.9
FERC	Issue SD2 if needed		5.1
PCWA	File Proposed Study Plan	12/13/07	5.11(a)
All stakeholders	Study Plan Meeting		5.11(e)
All stakeholders	Study Plan Comments due	4/11/08	5.12
PCWA	File Revised Proposed Study Plan		5.13(a)
All stakeholders	Revised Proposed Study Plan Comments due		5.13(b)
FERC	Director's Study Plan Determination	10/27/07	5.13(c)
FS, FWS, CDEP	Any Study Disputes due <sup>1</sup>		5.14(a)
Study D. Panel	Third Panel Member selected		5.14(d)(3)
Study D. Panel	Panel Convenes		5.14(d)
PCWA	Applicant Comments on Study Dispute due		5.14(j)
Study D. Panel	Technical Conference held		5.14(j)
Study D. Panel	Panel Finding Issued		5.14(k)
FERC	Director's Study Dispute Determination		5.14(l)
		Spr/Sum 08	
PCWA	First Study Season		5.15(a)
PCWA	Initial Study Report		5.15(c)(1)
All stakeholders	Initial Study Report Meeting		5.15(c)(2)
PCWA	Initial Study Report Meeting Summary		5.15(c)(3)
All stakeholders	Study Disputes/Request to Modify Study Plan due		5.15(c)(4)
All stakeholders	Responses to Disputes/Study Requests		5.15(c)(5)
FERC	Directors Study Plan Determination		5.15(c)(6)
PCWA	Preliminary Licensing Proposal due	10/1/2010	5.16(a)
All stakeholders	Comments on Preliminary Licensing Proposal		5.16(e)
PCWA	License Application filed	2/28/11	5.17
PCWA	Public Notice of License Application filing	2/28/11	5.17(d)(2)