

## Beverly Bell

---

**From:** 'FERC eSubscription' [eSubscription@ferc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 25, 2008 5:20 PM  
**Subject:** Comment on Filing submitted in FERC P-2079-000 by INDIVIDUAL (NO DETAILED AFFILIATION GIVEN)

On 9/24/2008, the following Filing was submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), Washington D.C.:

**Filer:** INDIVIDUAL (NO DETAILED AFFILIATION GIVEN)

**Docket(s):** P-2079-000

**Filing Type:** Comment on Filing

**Description:** Comments of Patricia Gibbs re the Middle Fork Relicensing Project under P-2079.

To view the document for this Filing, click here

[http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file\\_list.asp?accession\\_num=20080925-0124](http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20080925-0124)

To modify your subscriptions, click here: <https://ferconline.ferc.gov/eSubscription.aspx>

-----  
Please do not respond to this email.

Online help is available here:

<http://www.ferc.gov/efiling-help.asp>

or for phone support, call 866-208-3676.

Comments and Suggestions can be sent to this email address: <mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@Ferc.gov>

ORIGINAL

September 19, 2008  
Mal Toy and Trail User Focus Group participants  
Middle Fork Relicensing Project #2079  
P.O.Box 6570  
Auburn, CA. 95604

FILED  
SECRETARY OF THE  
COMMISSION

2008 SEP 24 P 2:33

FEDERAL ENERGY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Toy,

Thank-you for sending, via email August 11, 2008, the finalized Trail User stream crossing spreadsheet notes generated during the Trail User Focus Group meeting held on May 12, 2008. It is difficult, indeed, to capture such a dynamic discussion with so many people in real time.

As you know the Focus Group was intended to capture not only stream crossing locations and conditions but also to capture and study other potential opportunities such as a bridge crossing. (March 4, 2008 Scoping Meeting transcript page 83 & 84) Thus, I would like to add, as a Focus Group participant, my summary of the comments that did not neatly fit any particular stream crossing parameter. In addition, as a REC TWG participant, I have included some comments regarding the REC TWG meeting materials.

My summary is not exhaustive nor do I represent this as a consensus of the group. However, I feel it is important, for the relicensing record, to recount the additional comments as I heard them, in an effort to provide some background and context to the trail/stream crossing spreadsheet summary.

As I recall, and per my rough notes, the additional comments discussed but generally not made part of the stream crossing spreadsheet are as follows:

1. Desire to maintain trail connectivity for all user groups.
2. Clear frustration with the loss of the unofficial, 'temporary' 30+ year old multiuse dry land river crossing created by the Auburn Dam river diversion tunnel and a corresponding lack of any obligation by any party to mitigate the loss of this crossing which had been characterized as a significant impact of the American River Pump Station / River Restoration Project.
3. Clarification that PCWA set aside of a maximum of \$500,000 towards future construction of a river crossing or similar mitigation which would only be used if and when the Bureau of Reclamation and State Parks chooses to proceed with a crossing or other mitigation.
4. Clarification that any crossing construction that might occur as a result of the American River Pump Station Project would not be a PCWA project thus PCWA would not be the lead agency under those circumstances.
5. Brief discussion regarding the partition of the licensing process wherein the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission has jurisdiction on Project lands, reservoirs, tunnels etc controlled by the NEPA process and downstream lands, necessary for Project operations is controlled via the CEQA process. PCWA is the lead agency, the State Water Board is the responsible agency in the downstream area.

6. There was no discussion regarding an assessment of downstream impacts or mitigation measures that are a result of this relicensing Project.
7. There was frustration that roadways created for the Pump Station/River Restoration Project at the new China Bar access area displaced trail users in the area.
8. There was discussion that a multiuse bridge at the Coffey Dam/ China Bar/Birdsall area would be a solution to river crossing issues that affect trail users throughout the area.

PCWA presented its' summary of potential protection, mitigation and enhancement (PM&E) measures derived from the focus group meeting at the Recreation Technical Working Group (REC TWG) on May 29, 2008. The potential PM&E list included the following:

- Reconstruction Nevada Point Crossing foot bridge
- Reconstruct the Greenwood Bridge at Ruck-a-Chucky
- Create a crossing at the Coffey Dam site
- Install staff gauges near crossings at Ruck-a-Chucky, Poverty Bar and Oregon Bar
- Provide user-friendly flow information

With respect to the Coffey Dam site, it is not clear what 'creating a crossing' means. My recollection is that there was a stated desire for a year round, safe, multiuse bridge to serve access and trail connectivity.

I hope that the above information assists in capturing some of the additional focus group discussion. I welcome any corrections or additional comments by the Focus Group.

I offer my comments so that the upcoming negotiations regarding Project impacts, enhancements and mitigations will be more broad based.

Sincerely,



Patricia Gibbs

Cc:

Via email, REC TWG, Trail User Focus Group

Written correspondence: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission