

Issues and Responses to Public Scoping Comments

Summary

The Sierra National Forest listed the Crane Valley Seismic Retrofit Project in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) starting in June of 2009, and it is still listed. A web link to the SOPA can be found on the Sierra NF projects web page: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/sierra/projects/>.

Also, on March 8, 2010 over 300 letters were mailed to interested participants. The letters requested public comment on the Forest Service proposed action and described how to receive additional information on the project, the comment period, and included a link to the Environmental Assessment.

The Forest Service presented the project to local Native American communities at Tribal government quarterly meetings. Several visits with representatives from Tribal governments, PG&E and Forest Service were made to the project area to discuss various aspects of the project relative to tribal interests.

A legal notice for this project was published in the Fresno Bee. The notice requested public comments from March 8, 2010 to May 6, 2010. Public comments received during the comment period were reviewed by the District Ranger and issues raised were evaluated for significance, as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Response to Comments

The Forest received comment letters from the following individuals and groups: James Stahl, Chairman Wishon Tract Homeowners' Association, Manselian Family, Krikorian Family, Gary Bengel, Barbara Bengel, the Meeks Family, James Stahl, Peggy Abels, and Dino Cosma.

Public comments are summarized below and exact quotes from public comment letters are used wherever possible to most accurately capture public concerns. The District Ranger and the ID Team reviewed all public comments received, extracted comments relating to potential issues about the project, and developed a response. Issues are points of concern or debate over the environmental effects of a project. In most cases, general statements of support or disapproval that do not provide sufficient project-specific information from which to respond are not included here. All information presented in public letters was considered during environmental analysis, although every item does not appear in this summary. Original full-text comment letters are available in the project record.

DRAFT Response to Crane Valley Seismic Retrofit Project Scoping Comments

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
1	<p>LETTER 1 Wishon Tract Homeowners Association (HOA) February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>Dynamite blasts will not only disrupt our peaceful environment but may damage our homes, most of which are now 100 years old.</p>	<p>Construction noise and vibration impacts are described in detail in the Noise Technical Report dated December 2009, supporting the EA. The Blasting Plan prepared for the EA stipulates that the blasting contractor prepare a procedure for monitoring and controlling vibration (peak particle velocity).</p> <p>Section 4.14 (Noise) and Section 4.10 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) issued by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) further defines the method of monitoring and other steps that shall be taken to maintain vibration levels below thresholds established by the U.S. Bureau of Mines.</p> <p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 14.</p>
2	<p>LETTER 1 Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>Trucks rumbling through every 6-8 minutes will create significant dust and noise and will also cause delays in accessing our cabins.</p>	<p>The Wishon Quarry Haul Road has been realigned to follow County Road 222; the haul road will be further away from the cabins and will not intersect the Wishon Tract Road. The ponding basin depicted in the EA will not be constructed. Trees and shrubs that would have been removed to accommodate the haul road alignment and catch basin will not be removed, thereby preserving existing vegetative screening. County Road 222 is paved therefore dust resulting from rock haul should be minimal. Homeowners may experience occasional delays accessing or leaving the tract road. Delays of 5-8 minutes may occur, which is no more or less than the general public would experience.</p>
3	<p>LETTER 1 Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>The destruction of 2,300 trees and creation of a 38-foot-wide roadway for truck traffic will change the beautiful natural landscape around our homes for our lifetimes, if not forever. The quiet seclusion that we have enjoyed will be destroyed.</p>	<p>The number of trees to be removed from NFS lands and inside the FERC licensed-area has increased to approximately 2,750 to accommodate adjustments to the project boundary. Visual and aesthetic effects of the project are described in Section 6.9 of the EA and Section 4.1 of the EIR. The Vegetation Management Plan and the Wishon Quarry Operation and Reclamation Plan describe revegetation of the areas where trees and vegetation will be removed to accommodate construction. The width of the Wishon Quarry Haul Road will vary, depending on the road segment, but will be approximately 20 to 36 feet wide. The haul road has been realigned to follow County Road 222; the haul road will not intersect the Wishon Tract Road and will be further away from the cabins. The ponding basin will not be built. In addition, the stockpile area has been relocated to provide a 250 foot buffer of vegetation between the Wishon Quarry soil stockpile and the Wishon Tract Cabins. No trees inside the Wishon Tract will be removed during the Action.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
4	<p>LETTER 1</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>Loss of the use of our cabins for weekends, vacations, and retirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The six homeowners in Wishon Tract each purchased our cabins as weekend/vacation/retirement retreats. The area has truly offered an idyllic get-away from the noise and hustle and bustle of the city. After hearing the description of the project on Saturday, we have come to the conclusion that Wishon Tract will not be a desirable vacation retreat, at least during the two plus years of the retrofit, and possibly beyond. • Each of the six homeowners will now have to pay to spend their weekends, vacations, and retirement time elsewhere, in addition to a maintaining significant ongoing financial investment in our Wishon Tract cabins. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, the Manselian's in Cabin #1 have just recently built a new cabin that they will not want to use for the duration of the project. ○ The Bengel's in Cabin #3 have done extensive interior remodeling in preparation for their retirement in 2001, but will now have to make alternative plans to spend retirement time elsewhere. • This results in a significant financial impact on each family. For an average cabin owner this means paying for hotels or vacation rentals for weekends throughout the year, as well as for an average of four weeks of vacation time per year. For retirees, it means even more days of hotels or long-term vacation rentals. 	<p>Effects to recreational residences are discussed in Section 6.8 (Recreation and Other Land Uses) of the EA and Section 4.17 (Recreation) of the EIR. As discussed in Section 4.15 (Population and Housing) and Section 4.17 of the EIR, no homes would be demolished, damaged, or otherwise altered as part of the project, and access to the Wishon Tract Cabins will be maintained throughout construction. Effects such as noise and dust will be reduced by mitigation and limited to the construction period; they will not be a permanent effect of the Action. Wishon Tract Cabin owners may choose to stay at their cabins or recreate elsewhere during the construction period.</p>
5	<p>LETTER 1</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>Increased vandalism and theft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, none of our Wishon Tract cabins are visible from Road 222. The destruction of trees and creation of the 38-foot-wide roadway will open our homes up to view from the road, making them more susceptible to vandalism and theft. • We are concerned about the security of our property for the duration of the project as well as afterwards. • PG&E is considering the possibility of after-hours security patrols in the cabin area during the project term however our homes will continue to be more vulnerable to crime since it will be more exposed to public view long term. 	<p>Trees and vegetation immediately adjacent to County Road 222 will be maintained providing a 50-foot visual screen for the cabins. The Wishon Quarry Haul Road has been realigned to follow County Road 222; the haul road will not intersect the Wishon Tract Road and will be further away from the cabins. Construction parking has been relocated from the Old Wishon Quarry to an area opposite the Wishon Point Launching Facility on the west side of County Road 222. For more information on visual screening, see Section 4.1 (Aesthetics) of the EIR.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
6	<p>LETTER 1</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>Decreased resale value of our cabins during project period and beyond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabin owners face the prospect that the value of our homes will decrease due to the changes in the beautiful natural landscape. The cabins will not be as desirable as when originally purchased. • If any cabin owner wanted or needed to sell our property during the project term, it would most likely be very difficult to sell and most certainly be worth less. 	<p>As stated in Section 6.9 of the EA and Section 4.1 of the EIR, visual effects will be most substantial at the quarry site, which will be restored and revegetated as discussed in the Wishon Quarry Operations and Reclamation Plan. Visual changes at the lake and the dam will be minor. The Wishon Tract Cabins will be buffered by existing vegetation.</p> <p>Comments on real estate value are noted.</p>
7	<p>LETTER 1</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 15, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin and Christine Krikorian • John Manselian • James Stahl • Peggy Abels • Gary and Barbara Bengel 	<p>We also request that the Forest Service negotiate with PG&E to request fair compensation for the financial impact on each homeowner.</p>	<p>The Forest Service has no authority to negotiate with PG&E for compensation. The homeowners are financially responsible for their cabins.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
1	LETTER 2 Barbara and Gary Bengel February 15, 2010	<p>Dynamite blasts will not only disrupt our peaceful environment but may damage our cabin, which is now 100 years old. Trucks rumbling through every 6-8 minutes will create significant dust and noise and will also cause delays in accessing our cabins. The destruction of 2,300 trees and creation of a 38-foot-wide roadway for truck traffic will change the beautiful natural landscape around our homes for our lifetimes, if not forever. The quiet seclusion that we have enjoyed will be destroyed. Our three major concerns about this project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of the use of our cabins for weekends, vacations, and retirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We purchased our cabin as weekend/vacation/retirement retreat. The area has truly offered an idyllic get-away from the noise and hustle and bustle of the city. After hearing the description of the project on Saturday, we have come to the conclusion that Wishon Tract will not be a desirable vacation retreat, at least during the two plus years of the retrofit, and possibly beyond. • We will now have to pay to spend our weekends, vacations, and retirement time elsewhere, in addition to a maintaining significant ongoing financial investment in our Wishon Tract cabin. We have done extensive interior remodeling in preparation for our retirement in 2001, but will now have to make alternative plans to spend retirement time elsewhere. • This results in a significant financial impact on our family, paying for hotels or vacation rentals for weekends throughout the year, as well as for an average of four weeks of vacation time per year. When we retire in 2011, it means even more days of hotels or long-term vacation rentals. 2. Increased vandalism and theft <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, none of our Wishon Tract cabins are visible from Road 222. The destruction of trees and creation of the 38-foot-wide roadway will open our homes up to view from the road, making them more susceptible to vandalism and theft. • We are concerned about the security of our property for the duration of the project as well as afterwards. • PG&E is considering the possibility of after-hours security patrols in the cabin area during the project term however our homes will continue to be more vulnerable to crime since it will be more exposed to public view long term. 3. Decreased resale value of our cabin during project period and beyond <p>We face the prospect that the value of our home will decrease due to the changes in the beautiful natural landscape. The cabins will not be as desirable as when originally purchased.</p>	<p>See responses to Letter 1 Comments 1 through 7.</p> <p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 14.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
1	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>The proposed quarry and soil locations proximity to the Wishon Tract. While we have been told the cabins will experience no sound or vibration from the dynamite blasts, we don't trust that comment. Many of the cabin sites are more than 70 years old. The vibration of dynamite blasts will surely impact the residences and homeowners. Since we are not at our cabin sites on a daily basis to assess activity, we may easily arrive to find damage after the fact How will these types of issues be addressed now and in the future during construction?</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 1, and Letter 3, Comment 14.</p>
2	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>The proposed 38-foot delivery and return truck-hauling route crosses the easement of the Wishon Tract access road. This route is a newly created road bed that not only disrupts the tranquil surroundings of nature, it adds increased dust particulates and diesel fumes to the air, creates additional vibration and noise as truck and trailer loads of rock are transported to the dam site at regular intervals. While water trucks may be used to assist with dust control, the addition of standing water will only breed more mosquitoes. Additionally, this roadbed encroaches on the Wishon Tract cabin owners' road and obstructs access to our property. This access road was given to the cabin owners' by the forest service for our use and it is our responsibility to maintain. We believe the encroachment on our road exceeds the scope of any easement provision for basic electric repair and meter check that may be held by PG&E.</p>	<p>See the response to Letter 1, Comment 2.</p>
3	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>The proposed "ponding basin" expansion situated in the creek bed of Lot 2. This site destroys hundreds of years of old growth trees and vegetation. The concrete "sand bag" slope stabilizing erosion control liner designed to support the proposed truck-hauling roadbed is the minimum requirement by CalTrans. There are no plans, as we understand, to re-vegetate the impacted area after construction. More than likely a fence will be constructed around this basin in an attempt to keep people, vehicles and other items from this area. This concrete basin will be present for many lifetimes to come. Recent discussions with area realtors have estimated a huge decrease in property values with the construction of this "ponding basin." This construction makes any possible property sale impossible. How do PG&E and the Forest Service plan to mitigate this concern?</p>	<p>Because of the realignment of the Wishon Quarry Haul Road, the ponding basin will not be constructed.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
4	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>The proposed employee parking lot on the original quarry site. No additional truck/boat trailer parking area has been slated when Parsons' takes over the current overflow parking area for their maintenance yard. Parsons' does not anticipate employees on site during weekends. This leaves the original quarry site/Parsons' employee parking area available for "no fee" parking. It will become an unprotected campsite raising issues of illegal burns and possible damage to our property. Again, there is no plan to re-vegetate the area after construction. No plan is offered to control the ongoing mosquito population that thrives in the remaining open quarry space. Finally, we anticipate a construction fence will be installed around the border of the quarry to keep unfamiliar employees from driving into the quarry when parking their vehicles. This creates another eyesore for cabin owners.</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 4.17 (Recreation) of the EIR, Wishon Point Launching Facility has adequate capacity for parking during the recreational season, excepting the 4th of July when the lot usually reaches capacity.</p> <p>Construction parking has been relocated from the Old Wishon Quarry to an area opposite the Wishon Point Launching Facility on the west side of County Road 222. No fencing would be constructed in or adjacent to the Wishon Tract.</p> <p>A culvert would be installed to drain water from the old Wishon Quarry to prevent water encroachment onto Road 222 during the Action. The culvert would remain in place after the Action is completed.</p>
5	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>The proposed cutting of 2,300 trees. Understandably, trees will have to be cut to make way for rock harvesting. This cutting includes trees, which currently create privacy and protection of the Wishon Tract from would-be thieves and vandals. These trees create a sound buffer between the lake and the cabin tract. It will be many years for new trees to recreate this forest seclusion. In the meantime, the Wishon Tract cabins visibility from Road 222 is increased 100%. The entire tract is now more susceptible to vandalism and theft.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 5.</p>
6	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>We also lose the enhanced aesthetic value the trees provide to our cabins. Even with replanting of the acreage, it will be years, if not lifetimes for the forest to recover. What considerations will be given for the new conditions? Why does the plan not allocate for a more environmentally friendly solution to the removal of trees? Do all of the trees really need to be removed?</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 3. As stated in Section 3.3.11 of the EIR, approximately 8.7 acres of trees would surround the quarry site as a tree line barrier. This vegetation buffer will maintain the forest aesthetics surrounding the Wishon Tract; help reduce noise and dust infiltration from quarry development and rock hauling.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
7	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>We acknowledge that it is in everyone’s best interest for the dam to be repaired in a cost-effective and timely manner. It is only Saturday, February 13, 2010, that became engaged in discussions about the plans and subsequent impacts of this proposed project. Because of the proposed plan choice(s), the six cabin owners are placed in the center of the construction project. We have now, regardless of our choice, become your partners in this dam retrofit project. We have been asked to sit quietly during the proposed 18-month construction without any considerations given for our inconvenience.</p>	<p>This action was originally listed as a proposal on the Sierra National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions and updated periodically during the analysis. People were invited to review and comment on the proposal through the following public meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 4, 2009: Bass Lake Boat House Pines Resort – Bass Lake Stake Holders Meeting • April 1, 2009: Pines Resort Bass Lake – Public Information Meeting • April 2, 2009: North Fork Town Hall – Public Information Meeting • June 6, 2009: Bass Lake Ranger District North Fork Recreation Residence Meeting • June 24, 2009: North Fork Town Hall – California Department of Water Resources CEQA Public Scoping Meeting • A Notice of Availability for the EA was published in the Federal Register on June 8, 2009 (Volume 74, Number 108, Federal Register Docket E9–13235). The EA was made available for public review on the PG&E Crane Valley website www.cranevalleydam.com and the FERC website www.ferc.gov. The EA was subsequently revised to reflect the results of consultation with public agencies. The USFS made this revised EA available for public review from March 8 to May 6, 2010 at the Sierra National Forest Office, at the PG&E website www.cranevalleydam.com, and on the USFS website at http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/sierra/projects/crane-valley/index.shtml. • A community update meeting was held on April 7, 2010 at The Pines Resort, Lakeview Room.
8	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>It is shocking that while we, as cabin owners, must maintain our facilities according to our lease agreements including items such a painting our cabin exteriors with Forest Service approved paint colors, removing all non-native plants like apple trees and berry bushes and incur cost for the removal of diseased trees. PG&E and Parsons can leave behind a concrete swimming pool in our front yard and call it a “ponding basin.” This behavior does not appear to bother the Forest Service and gives cabin owners the impression there is a double standard.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 3.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
9	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>We respectfully request, in order to make this partnership a collaborative effort, an alternate new truck hauling route that does not affect any area of the Wishon Tract [including the creek bed in front of Lot #2 and the access road to Wishon Tract]; and, save as many trees as possible – with special attention to leave intact the trees closest to Lot #1, #2, and #6 [the lots exposed to the uttermost boundaries of the project]. This request is only what was promised in June 2009.</p>	<p>See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3 and 5.</p>
10	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>Security of our cabins during the project and after the project is finished; Provide free utilities, Forest Service permit usage fees and reimbursement for property tax and insurance during the entire construction period. Many of us will lower and not use our cabins during the duration of the construction. There is a serious financial burden of maintaining a property for non-use</p>	<p>Several changes have occurred to the Action resulting from Permit holders comments. The haul road, ponding basin and employee parking will no longer occur within or immediately adjacent to the Wishon Tract. Vegetation screening will not be removed between the tract and County Road 222.</p> <p>The Forest Service does not have the authority to compensate the cabin owners for loss of use, as the Action does not eliminate the use of your improvements located on NFS lands.</p> <p>The Forest Service does not have the authority to require the proponent to compensate Permit holders for utilities, tax or permit fee relief. Because no part of the project will occur inside or immediately adjacent to the Wishon Tract, the proponent is not obligated to provide security patrols inside the Tract during the project.</p> <p>PG&E will provide a Forest Service standard gate to be installed on the Tract road. The gate will be located between Road 222 and the entrance to the Old Wishon Quarry. The gate must accommodate 3 locks; one for the Tract Association members, one Forest Service lock, and one PG&E lock for the duration of the project. PG&E may want their gate back at the conclusion of the project. The District Ranger may or may not continue authorization of a gate on the Tract road after completion of the project.</p>
11	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>Provide site elevation plans exhibiting the post construction terrain of the area including the reconstruction of the truck haul road crossing through the Wishon Tract.</p>	<p>The Wishon Quarry Haul Road design has been realigned, will not intersect the Wishon Tract Road, and will be further away from the cabins. This design is discussed in Chapter 3 (Description of the Project and Alternatives) of the EIR.</p> <p>Restoration is discussed in Section 6.0 of the Wishon Quarry Operation Reclamation Plan, which is available as Appendix F of the EIR. Reclamation grading of the quarry is shown in Figure 5 of the plan. Roads located on National Forest System lands built or used to support the Action will be reclaimed as specified in the Road Use Permit issued for the project.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
12	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>Provide security to the Wishon Tract throughout the duration of the construction as well as a minimum of one year after construction to discourage would-be vandals/thieves.</p> <p>Additionally, at the end of construction, provide an automated security gate at the site of the Wishon Tract road entrance to slow theft departures.</p>	<p>See Letter 3, Comment #10 above.</p>
13	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>Provide a designated telephone Hotline, within the California time zone, with not less than a 48-hour response time to handle damage claims due to any construction activity.</p> <p>Additionally, a time frame window of a minimum of two years for damage claims that may result due to this retrofit project.</p>	<p>A Sign and Notification Plan was prepared for the Project as required by the EA. The plan is Appendix AA of the EIR. As noted in Section 6 of the plan, a telephone contact number will be posted for public concerns related to project construction activities.</p> <p>The proponent has agreed to preconstruction inspections of lot improvements by an independent inspector. Inspections will be conducted with cabin owners and PG&E representatives present. All inspection results will be documented.</p> <p>Cabin owners will be provided with copies of the PG&E claims process including addresses, telephone and email contacts.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
14	<p>LETTER 3</p> <p>Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	<p>Provide a weekly, emailed, work schedule of anticipated quarry blasts, truck haul times and employee presence around the Wishon Tract. Within this schedule include information of administrative staff to be contacted in case of an emergency created by the construction activity.</p>	<p>As discussed in the Noise Technical Report and Appendix E (Blasting Plan) of the EIR :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby landowners must be notified 24 hours in advance of blasting activity. • Blasting must be concluded by 4:00 p.m. each day that blasting occurs. • Contractor must ensure that no member of the general public using FERC or USFS lands is within 1000 feet of the quarry when blasting occurs. • Contractor will post flagmen on County Road 222 within the determined blast safety radius of the blast area roadways to stop all traffic during blasting activity. <p>As stated in Section 4.14 (Noise) of the EIR, airblast and vibration monitoring will take place at the residence, recreational dwelling, or other occupied structure nearest the blasting area. If vibration levels are expected to be too low to trigger the seismograph at that location, recording shall be accomplished at some closer site in line with the structure.</p> <p>The Wishon Quarry Haul Road has been realigned to follow County Road 222; the haul road will not intersect the Wishon Tract Road and will be further away from the cabins. Construction parking has been relocated from the Old Wishon Quarry to an area opposite the Wishon Point Launching Facility on the west side of County Road 222. This reduces the likelihood of worker activity in the Wishon Tract. See Chapter 3 (Description of the Project and Alternatives) in the EIR for a description of the Action area and construction activities.</p> <p>As discussed in the EA and Section 4.10 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of the EIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Temporary Emergency Action Plan (TEAP) will be submitted to the Commission at least 60 days before the start of construction. • The TEAP establishes emergency notification requirements and identifies the Project Safety Officer, the Project Manager, and the Safety Manager as those to be notified in the event of an emergency.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
15	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	Provide a schedule of construction power outages and guarantees of swift restoration of that power.	No power outages associated with the Action are planned. If there are any anticipated power outages, the owners will be notified in advance. Power outages (planned and not planned) will be restored as soon as possible according to PG&E's standard policy.
16	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	Provide restoration of the Wishon Tract road from Road 222 to Lot #6 due the increased traffic.	<p>Construction parking has been relocated from the Old Wishon Quarry to an existing parking area opposite the Wishon Point Launching Facility on the west side of County Road 222. The Wishon Quarry Haul Road has been realigned to utilize County Road 222 instead of intersecting the Wishon Tract Road.</p> <p>The only disturbance to the Tract road may be the installation of a culvert that would drain water from the Old Wishon Quarry. Following installation of the culvert the asphalt would be patched to match the existing road surface. No other use of the Tract road would be authorized. No additional asphalt work would be necessary.</p>
17	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	Provide vegetation replenishment at the original quarry site. We understand the quarry has lain dormant for many years and complete restoration may be difficult; however, some effort should be made.	Construction parking has been relocated from the Old Wishon Quarry to an existing parking area opposite the Wishon Point Launching Facility on the west side of County Road 222. The Old Wishon Quarry area will not be included in the Action. Revegetation of the original quarry is outside the scope of this project.
18	<p>LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	Provide new negotiations for additional compensation should the project be delayed.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 7, and Letter 2, Comment 10.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
19	LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	Please keep in mind that four of the six cabin owners are over 80 years of age. These cabin owners may never live to see the completion of this project. Their “golden years” of enjoying a forest they have spent most of their lives protecting has been encumbered by this project. The anticipation of passing this forest heritage to their future generations is gone. Yes, the Crane Valley Dam Retrofit Project must be completed, but the choice of how it is completed has unequally burdened the cabin owners over the commercial interests of PG&E.	See response to Letter 1, Comments 4 and 6. The Wishon Quarry Operation and Reclamation Plan describes the procedures that will be followed to restore the areas of vegetation removal – primarily the quarry and the dam – and the monitoring program to follow. This plan is available as Appendix F of the EIR. The forest will be restored for future generations. While it is stated in Section 4.1 (Aesthetics) of the EIR, the area will recover to preexisting conditions in approximately 20 years, the Forest Service anticipates the time scale is closer to 50 years.
20	LETTER 3 Wishon Tract HOA February 19, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Stahl, Chairman • Manselian Family, Lot 1 • Krikorian Family, Lot 2 • Meeks Family, Lot 4 • James Stahl and Peggy Abels, Lot 6 	We request the Forest Service negotiate with PG&E an alternative route that does not affect the Wishon Tract cabin owners and a fair compensation for the financial impact on each homeowner.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 7 and Letter 3, Comment 16.
1	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Summary (vii) – Within this section it states that the work is to take approximately 19 months this conflicts with Section 4.2.1 where it states 24 months, what is the expected timeline for this project? This is not the only item in this report that is not consistent.	As shown in Appendix 1 of the EA, construction is estimated at approximately 2-1/2 years from mobilization of equipment for vegetation clearing to demobilization of restoration equipment. Start and end dates have since been delayed to accommodate pre-construction environmental permitting and public review.
2	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.1 – Work is to be performed five to seven days per week, 10 to 12 hours. In the meetings I have attended it has been five days and only seven if absolutely necessary. Under most Conditions of Approval public agencies limit the working hours and days of construction to less than what is being stated here, and are only granted extensions by notifying the governing agency 72 hours in advance, in this case the Forest Service (FS). This report just states an approval with no restrictions. These working days and hours are extremely excessive and have no constraints for the FS to enforce.	Operations shall conform to the Forest Service Quiet Hours (7 AM to 10 PM) associated with the Bass Lake Recreation Area. Operations will be conducted Monday through Friday, generally between 7 AM to 5 PM, or conform to daylight hours whichever is longer. The hours of operations may be seasonally adjusted with permission from the authorized officer. Extra work hours and/or work days may be authorized when unexpected weather delays or other emergency circumstances occur that will result in construction delays beyond what is planned in the contractor’s contingency schedule.
3	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	This also does not state how the six cabin owners are to be notified if the work hours are to extend into the weekend, when they are most likely going to be using their cabins.	Cabin owners shall be informed about extended construction hours by PG&E a minimum of 48 hours in advance. The notification shall be by telephone call.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
4	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.2 – Some construction parking would be located at the Old Wishon Quarry. This is less than 200 feet from Lot 1’s Cabin. It is one of the many features this project is putting the six cabins in the center of, and exposing/forcing them to be surrounded by unfamiliar chaos and people. The FS and project team have had many years to plan and prepare for this construction. They could have created construction parking away from the six cabins and when construction was complete, could have been used for additional boat trailer parking, eliminating the overflow that always ends up on Road 222. In addition, it has been explained that the workers at the quarry location will be picked up and driven to the quarry site, so why not pick them up at another location, such as the boat ramp parking lot.	Construction parking will no longer be at the Old Wishon Quarry area adjacent to the cabins. The new construction area will be in an area on the west side of County Road 222, opposite the Wishon Quarry Boat Launching Facility. Vehicles, with or without boat trailers, parked in a hazardous manner along County Road 222 shall be cited as applicable under the California state laws.
5	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.3 – 2,300 trees to be removed, this statement is only referring to the trees that are 10 inches in diameter or greater. This does not bring attention to the vegetation that is smaller or emphasize the impact of its removal. This is an excessive amount of forest vegetation being stripped away, leaving the area barren and exposing the six cabins to a multitude of unknown workers and non-workers during and after construction. This loss of vegetation also compromises the security of the six cabins that exist prior to any vegetation removal and will extend for years and hundreds of years for the trees themselves. A barren forest is not what the six cabin owners are paying a lease for.	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3 and 5.
6	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Better design can lessen the impact, lessen the truck trips and shorten the projects timeline. I am all for any government agency obtaining funds from other means other than the taxpayers, but compromising the vegetation of the forest to this extent is extreme, I thought the FS’s job was to protect the forest.	Comment is noted.
7	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.4 – Haul road, too close to Lot 1’s cabin, its proposed location places it approximately 300 feet away. Additionally, this destroys an area that is abundant with forest vegetation as well as providing privacy/security from Road 222 for the six cabins. There is nothing wrong or considered a constraint by using road 222. Utilizing road 222 as part or fully for the haul road protects a portion of the forest, repairs a section of the County road, and the FS is not stuck with a flat area that still looks a haul road. This post construction haul road can be inviting to off-road enthusiasts or a place to park vehicles and/or boat trailers.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 2; and Letter 3, Comments 6 and 10.
8	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.4 – 156 possible truck trips in one day, can occur ten times over the duration of the project. That is about every other month that is just excessive.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 21.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
9	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.6 – Overburden stockpile is an understatement. The location of this direct stockpile will be approximately 100 feet from Lot 6’s cabin to its toe of slope. This is not a buffer but a 30 foot wall of dirt against Lot 6’s cabin, and that is not taking into account that Lot 6 is on the down slope which will only intensify the height of this dirt wall. The FS is more concerned with an unused dilapidated cabin and retaining the area around it than it is for the cabins that are right in the middle of this ongoing construction. This unused cabin has approximately a 600 foot radius away from any construction, a greater distance than any of the six cabins.	The stockpile area has been relocated to provide a wider buffer of vegetation between the Wishon Quarry and the Wishon Tract Cabins. The vegetation buffer is approximately 8.7 acres around the quarry site. The revised stockpile area is shown on Figure 3-2 of the EIR.
10	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	In addition, at the last meeting attended we walked the site with the FS, PG&E, Engineers, and blasting Contractors, all the trees around the unused cabin were tagged to be saved and the ones right next to Lot 6 were tagged to be cut, where is the buffer? Redesign the stockpile area down the hill further away from the cabins, retain a border of trees 20 plus feet deep to screen the stockpile, slightly controlling the dust, noise, and maintaining a safer distance from Lot 6.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 6 ,and Letter 4, Comment 9.
11	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.6 – Bullet item three; there is no mention in this report about the blasting procedures, what is to be expected or how anyone is to be notified. It took one of the cabin owners at the last meeting to ask the question as to what a safe distance is when blasting is to occur. The Blasting Contractor stated a minimum of 500 feet is recommended and it is best that no one be in their cabins for a 30 minute time period when blasting is to take place. These cabins are recreation only, if anyone is at their cabin how are they going to be informed, a flyer on the door? Not all the cabins have phones, none have internet access, cellular connections are not always possible, so how do they let anyone know of the blasting schedule? Who is to be contacted if damages result from the blasting or any of the construction? The cabin owners need a person, not a 1-800 number for contact to solve the problem.	As stated in the Blasting Plan prepared for the Action, the Contractor will post warning signs and guards at all points of access to the blasting area, including trails. The warning signs will comply with the requirements of the jurisdictional authorities and will have lettering a minimum of 4 inches in height on a contrasting background. Signs will be installed at the limits of the blast area noting warning signals and access and radio restrictions. As stated in Section 6.10 (Construction Noise and Vibration) of the EA and Sections 4.10 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) and 4.14 (Noise) of the EIR, Wishon Tract cabin owners will be notified 24 hours in advance of blasting. See response to Letter 3, Comment 14.
12	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.14 – Demobilization; states all construction areas to be restored in accordance with the Wishon Quarry and Reclamation Plan and Vegetation Management Plan. The cabin owners have asked to see these preliminary plans but have not. Concerns are what will the area look like post construction, what are they going to be left with? If it is like the last project, it left the old quarry as a dump, this was under the direction of the FS. I believe it should not be left to the FS alone in finalizing these plans, the six cabin owners should be able to give their approval as well.	The Wishon Quarry and Reclamation Plan is available for public review and comment as Appendix F of the EIR. The Vegetation Management Plan is Appendix G of the EIR.
13	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.15 –As previously stated these cabins are for recreation only, none of these cabin owners live in the area so to get information from a paper that is printed once a week or receive any type of notification to them can be a difficult task. A meeting with the cabin owners needs to be set up and decided by which means the information will best be delivered.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 13 and Letter 4, Comment 3.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
14	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.2.21 – Nothing has been mentioned as to how or where this water pipeline for the quarry dust control is to be installed. How will this affect the road/driveway leading to the six cabins and how much excavation will be needed to install such a line?	The water pipeline is shown on Figure 3-3 of the EIR. As stated in Section 3.3.4 (Reservoir Water Diversion) of the EIR, the pipeline will be 8 inches in diameter and about 2,000 feet in length. The path of the pipeline will extend from the lake to the quarry site. The pipeline will be located adjacent to the haul road and within the haul road right-of-way. The pipeline will be placed in a trench where it crosses Road 222. As stated in Section 4.18 (Traffic and Transportation) of the EIR, pipeline installation and resurfacing of the road over the pipeline would take approximately 8 hours. Removal of the pipeline and resurfacing of the road would also take approximately 8 hours and would require closure of one lane on County Road 222.
15	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Sections 4.2.23 and 4.2.24 – It would be nice to be able to review the Revegetation Management Plan, Wishon Quarry Operation and Reclamation Plan. From past experience on projects that have occurred in the area the old quarry became a dumping ground. The six cabin owners should have some say in how the area around them will be reestablished.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 12.
16	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 4.4 Staff Recommendation 6 -- From the previous Environmental Assessment Report it was going to utilize the dredging material to contribute to the infill of the new quarry, this change is acceptable minus the loophole for possible changes to the location allowing the approval from jurisdictional agencies, i.e., FS. This material is impregnated with pollutants from the lake. It should be stated that it is not to be utilized for the new quarry infill.	As discussed in Section 4.10 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of the EIR, sampling results indicate that replacement of the dredged sediment within the lake would not present significant adverse effects on aquatic habitat. However, the sediments have not been tested for upland disposal, so potential impacts to surface or subsurface water quality through erosion or leaching of stockpiled dredged soils cannot be ruled out. Therefore, upland relocation of the sediment would require additional sampling in compliance with the EPA protocol established in Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods. PG&E will confer with the USFS, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board concerning the sampling results. The sediments will be reused on upland sites only if potential human health risks associated with concentrations of metals or other constituents of concern in the sediment are found to be within acceptable levels. If human health risks are found not acceptable, the applicant will dispose of the sediments at a licensed waste facility.
17	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.3.2 – If there are portable sanitary facilities near the dam then I know there will be some at the new and old quarry site. The parking designated for the quarry workers is located at the old quarry, less than 200 feet from Lot 1's cabin, and the stench from those sanitary facilities is going to reek for two years. As stated previously 4.2.2 there was time to plan for this parking area.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 4. In addition, as discussed in Section 4.19 (Utilities) of the EIR, waste from portable toilets located in the project area would be serviced once or twice a week and the waste disposed of at an appropriate treatment facility.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
18	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.4 through 6.7 Environment – Unequal concern and care have been given to the protection and procedure measures to the surrounding environment, mitigation areas, and wildlife than to the six cabin owner’s security and safety. The surrounding area and wildlife have been given larger buffers to ensure they are not disturbed in their natural habitat, but not the six cabins. These cabins need to be given the same consideration during the design process. Alternate designs do not appear to have been considered.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 3.
19	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.8 – the location of the haul route and the stockpile puts the six cabins up front and personal with the chaos. Apparently boat docks are of more concern than the safety and effects of the six cabins in blasting range. Actually most of the section expresses more concerns for everything else except the six cabins; i.e., boating water levels, across the lake views, picnic and campgrounds.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 3, and Letter 3, Comment 14.
20	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.8.2 – So the Bass Lake Homeowners Association has the opportunity to review a strategy but the six cabin owners get very little time to comment on a 19-acre quarry and all its amenities? PGE is willing to relocate docking facilities and provide dock extensions, how about moving the haul route and stockpile out of site of the six cabins?	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3 and 5; and Letter 3, Comment 7.
21	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.8.2 Campsite and Recreational Cabins – It states that construction would affect the campgrounds in the vicinity and the six cabins; however, it is temporary and should not be sufficient to end the use of the campgrounds. What about cabin use? Two years is not temporary for cabin owners paying a lease, insurance, normal maintenance cost and still having to maintain the area around their cabins. This highly affects the area of the six cabins, haul trucks will be running everyday and blasting once to twice a week. In Section 4.2.4 there can be 156 truck trips in a single day. These are not small trucks, blasting can stop a cabin owner from utilizing there cabin, and following blasting there is the breaking down and pounding of the material to prepare it for the dam’s retrofit. This is not an accurate assessment.	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 2 and 4. Effects of quarry operation, such as noise, would not continue beyond the construction period. Up to 128 truck trips per day for a period of about 10 days would occur on County Road 222 only if it becomes necessary to supply some of the rock from an off-site quarry. The traffic study considered this scenario as the worst case as both rock and concrete trucks would be traveling to the Action site simultaneously. It is anticipated that all rock will come from the Wishon Quarry. Refer to Section 4.18 (Transportation and Traffic) of the EIR for the most recent traffic analysis. See response to Letter 3, Comment 14.
22	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.9.1 Visual Resources – Maybe somebody needs to take a ride on that side of the lake to see what the generations of the six cabin owners have enjoyed. The only roadway that falls under this description is the haul route road in front of Lot 1.	This response assumes that the comment is in reference to the following sentence in Section 6.9.1: “There are no roadways in or near the project area that are designated as scenic, or worthy of protection for maintaining and enhancing scenic viewsheds.” This sentence refers to a federal or state designation. None of the roadways associated with the project have this designation, including County Road 222.
23	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.9.1 – The Marina View Heights community can close their curtains if they don’t want to see the construction. The six cabins have no escape from the noise, dust, blasting, trucks, loss of security and the visual enjoyment that the FS is allowing to be removed. They seem to be mentioned quite a bit in this report, I guess seeing the work is different from being in the middle of it.	See response to Letter 1, Comments 4 and 5.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
24	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.9.1 Long Term Effects – This is the only area that comes close to describe the post construction effects in this area. The grading of the new quarry in the report sounds good but at the last meeting it was described by the civil engineer that a 2:1 slope is how the area will be graded and at certain intervals a bench will be created to break the runoff that will be produced during the wet season. The benches will make the area look manmade where as less of a slope will provide a look that would be more natural.	Comment is noted.
25	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.10.2 Ground Vibration – The project has placed its distance limits just at the edge of the six cabins, with the exception of the impact pile drivers. This would be acceptable if alternate options were not possible. In this case alternate options do exist; using Road 222 would direct the major equipment further from the six cabins, lessening the damage to the cabins. These cabins are not occupied as a normal residence, if something were to happen, pipe burst, window breakage, gas leak, from the up close construction the damage might not be found until weeks later, intensifying the damage and increasing the cost for repairs. Who is going to be responsible for this, and who are the six cabin owners to contact to fix the damage, a 1-800 number is not the solution a contact person who will respond immediately is.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 3, and Letter 3, Comment 13.
26	LETTER 4 Joan Zierott April 19, 2010	Section 6.10-2 Airblast – The first bullet item, not only should be listed agencies be notified 48 hours in advance but the six cabin owners as well, not the 24 hours noted in the second bullet.	PG&E shall provide blasting schedules to cabin owners by telephone call. Preferably, notification will be provided a minimum of one week in advance. Notification should include identifying the day or days of the week when blasting will occur, number of production blasts per day, and other pertinent information. In addition, cabin owners shall be contacted 48-hours in advance of blasting by telephone.
1	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	As was suggested at the April 21 st meeting we would like the final decision to be that which you are heavily leaning towards regarding the haul road that it does not change the entrance on either side of the front of the Wishon Tract, they will be using Road 222 now for their Retrofit project which includes no expansion or use of the “ponding basin” in front of our home.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 2, and Letter 3, Comment 3.
2	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We suggest a detour for through traffic on to Goat Mt. Road to stop traffic from coming through the project area, it seems like this would save money by cutting down on the pay for someone to stand there (more like 3 or more people) to wave flags at people for a couple of years. The public wouldn't have to wait for trucks and chance getting a rock in your windshield or tire of course the homeowners will be allowed through.	Comment is noted.
3	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We were so happy to hear at the April 21, 2010 meeting that Ranger Dave said he did not think phone/email messages were too much to ask for blasting notice. Since we would be asked at those times to leave our cabins because of possible danger to us we are requesting both phone message and emails to us.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 26

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
4	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	At the same meeting it was told to us that PG&E was discussing having an inspector look at our homes before and after but there was no detail as to who the inspector would be employed by or what they would do if there was damage found after or during the project. We would like to see detail on this inspector and the end result of what will happen if there is damage to any part of our house inside or out and what a speedy recovery for damages will take place. If it is deemed necessary to wrap or take any kind of proactive measures to assure our home be in the pre-blasting condition, we would like the Forest Service to direct PG&E to have this completed. We need to get a value on the inside of the homes as well as the outside in case our cabin is not fixable after this blasting or needs any repair, our home has been owned by my family for close to 100 years and the inside is in fabulous condition.	Comment is noted. See response to Letter 3, Comment 13. The Forest Service is aware of the commitment the proponent has made to the permit holders. To our knowledge specific details about the inspections have not been agreed upon yet. This is a private property issue between the proponent and the owners of improvements on NFS lands. The Forest Service will aid discussions by availing the conference room at the Bass Lake District office for meetings between the proponent and the permit holders.
5	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	At the April meeting it was stated that they are thinking of installing a Security (pull type) Gate for the Wishon Tract we request this to be the case and also request that the gate be left there after the project is finished for our use.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 12.
6	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We request the parking lot be moved out of the front yard of the Manselian's cabin and away from our Wishon tract of homes. I went by the area yesterday and see no reason why the parking cannot be moved to across from the Boat Dock Parking area on the land side off Road 222, there is plenty of area with no trees and NO cabins. If for some reason this isn't done, which I sincerely hope it will be since we have homes which we use for our summer vacation homes then we ask for Security (a continual monitoring of our homes day and night throughout the entire project to include after-hours patrol) to make sure we are protected. We also ask that our driveway be repaved after the project people are finished and any signs of a parking lot are removed and the area is brought back to its original pre-project state.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 4, 10 and 16. See response to Letter 3, Comment 12.
7	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We urge the Forest Service to preserve as much of the forest as possible and hold PG&E and Parsons (or whoever the contract is with) to take out as few trees as possible and stick to the new improved boundary (that include cutting of less trees) for the work area of the quarry.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 3, and Letter 3, Comment 6.
8	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We would as homeowners like to add that we have lease relief for five years to help compensate our loss of use to our home. We are of retirement age and that means we are able to use our cabin during times when many people have to work, this project of course needs to be done and we want that a hundred percent but we would like you to imagine yourselves in our shoes and help make the loss of our wonderful vacation/retirement retreat a bit more tolerable.	Prior to the implementation of the 2008 Recreation Residence Appraisals, the Regional Review Appraiser and/or Contract Appraiser shall make a site visit to the Tract to determine whether project activities have affected market value of the lots. If the Appraiser(s) determine market values have decreased because of construction activities or construction related changes in the vicinity of the Tract, the appraised value of the lots shall be adjusted downward. The site visit shall occur in October 2011. Permit holder/cabin owners shall be invited to be present during the Appraiser's site visit.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
9	LETTER 5 Martin & Chris Krikorian May 3, 2010	We would also add that you secure a plan that would assist us for any damages we may incur while this project is taking place, be that from blasting or vandal. We will be enduring the inconvenience of construction activities be it from loss of use of our home or time it takes to get to our home or even having to leave our home during blasting and again we ask that you do whatever you can to help assist us with these burdens.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 7, Letter 3, Comment 13, and Letter 5, Comment 4..
1	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	As we suggested at the April 21 st meeting we would like the final decision to be that which you are heavily leaning towards regarding the haul road that it does not change the entrance on either side of the front of the Wishon Tract, they will be using Road 222 now for their Retrofit project which includes no expansion or use of the "ponding basin" in front of our home.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 2, and Letter 3, Comment 3.
2	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	We suggest a detour for through traffic on to Goat Mt. Road to stop traffic from coming through the project area, it seems like this would save money by cutting down on the pay for someone to stand there (more like 3 or more people) to wave flags at people for a couple of years. The public wouldn't have to wait for trucks and chance getting a rock in your windshield or tire of course the homeowners will be allowed through.	Comment is noted. A Traffic Control Plan was prepared by Madera County and PG&E for this project (Appendix Z in the EIR). The Plan does not call for closing Rd 222 for through traffic during the construction project.
3	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	We were so happy to hear at the April 21, 2010, meeting that Ranger Dave said he did not think phone/email messages were too much to ask for blasting notice. Since we would be asked at those times to leave our cabins because of possible danger to us we are requesting both phone message and emails to us.	See letter 4, Comment 26.
4	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	At the same meeting it was told to us that PG&E was discussing having an inspector look at our homes before and after but there was no detail as to who the inspector would be employed by or what they would do if there was damage found after or during the project. We would like to see detail on this inspector and the end result of what will happen if there is damage to any part of our house inside or out and what a speedy recovery for damages will take place. If it is deemed necessary to wrap or take any kind of proactive measures to assure our home be in the pre-blasting condition, we would like the Forest Service to direct PG&E to have this completed. We need to get a value on the inside of the homes as well as the outside in case our cabin is not fixable after this blasting or needs any repair, our home has been owned by my family for close to 100 years and the inside is in fabulous condition.	See responses to Letter 3, Comment 13, and Letter 5, Comment 4.
5	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	At the April meeting it was stated that they are thinking of installing a Security (pull type) Gate for the Wishon Tract we request this to be the case and also request that the gate be left there after the project is finished for our use.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 12.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
6	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	We request the parking lot be moved out of the front yard of the Manselian's cabin and away from our Wishon tract of homes. I went by the area yesterday and see no reason why the parking cannot be moved to across from the Boat Dock Parking area on the land side offroad 222, there is plenty of area with no trees and NO cabins. If for some reason this isn't done, which I sincerely hope it will be since we have homes which we use for our summer vacation homes then we ask for Security (a continual monitoring of our homes day and night throughout the entire project to include after-hours patrol) to make sure we are protected. We also ask that our driveway be repaved after the project people are finished and any signs of a parking lot are removed and the area is brought back to its original pre-project state.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 16.
7	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	We urge the Forest Service to preserve as much of the forest as possible and hold PG&E and Parsons (or whoever the contract is with) to take out as few trees as possible and stick to the new improved boundary (that include cutting of less trees) for the work area of the quarry.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 3.
8	LETTER 6 Carrie Krikorian Zulewski May 3, 2010	I am requesting that the U.S. Forest Service take these concerns into consideration when making a decision regarding the Crane Valley Dam Retrofit Project. I also request that the Forest Service negotiate with PG&E to request fair compensation for the financial impact on us. I understand the necessity of the project and look forward to continually working collaboratively with the Forest Service and PG&E to expedite the successful completion of the project.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 7; Letter 3, Comment 10, and Letter 5, Comment 8.
1	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	I request the forest service – as the landowner of the forest – to demand that construction plans be modified to protect the forest. Make the construction footprint smaller. Require immediate forest replanting. Adhere to the verbal comments made April 21.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 16.
2	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Other than verbal considerations, these past months of discussions have yet to secure the safety and security of the cabins and its residents.	See response to Letter 3, Comment 10.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
3	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	The EA does indicate areas much further away from the construction site – Wishon Point Campground and Marina View Heights – would be affected by the retrofit process. The recommendation that campers use another campground (6.8.1: Campsites and recreational cabins) or that Marina View Heights view of construction equipment is only short term, vibration and blasting. Additionally, Marina View Heights' short-term view of construction equipment is minimal when considering the fact the 100-ft plus trees and vegetation surrounding my forest enjoyment will be gone for several lifetimes as well as the constant disruption of 13,000 one-way trips of trucks hauling rock across the Wishon Tract road entrance. Other troublesome issues include vacating my cabin during blasting, noise and vibration of rock crushing, loss of privacy created by employee parking lot and elimination of Wishon Tract's seclusion. None of these issues are addressed in the EA.	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3 and 5.
4	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	I request the forest service – as my landowner – to demand protection of my private property. Guarantee restitution of both my personal and structural property due to damage generated by construction; make the process fast tracked and simple – no voice mail calls or long claim forms.	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 1; Letter 3, comment 10,
5	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Repair and repave the Wishon Tract road. Provide daily security surveillance during the entire construction and revegetation period. Install a permanent, automated security gate.	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3 and 5; Letter 3, Comment 16.
6	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Communicate construction and blasting schedules through both telephone and electronic email processes.	See responses to Letter 3, Comments 13, and 14.
7	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Move the haul road to Road 222. Relocate the employee parking lot from the Wishon Tract area.	See responses to Letter 3, Comment 16.
8	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Restrict construction activity to a standard weekday, eight-hour work schedule.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 2.
9	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	Create a detour of Road 222 using Road 221 to remove as much public access from the construction area.	As stated in Section 6.11 (Traffic and Transportation) of the EA and Section 4.18 (Traffic and Transportation) of the EIR, the Traffic Control Plan (Appendix Z of the EIR) would be implemented to reduce safety hazards on County Road 222. In addition, construction areas will be fenced and signed with no public access permitted.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
10	LETTER 7 Wishon Tract Lot 1 May 5, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Manselian • Annette Paxton 	For this reason, I again request additional consideration be made to compensate for this disruption. It is unfair to ask the Wishon Tract to encumber the financial costs of the special use permit and cabin ownership expenses as other Bass Lake residents when our usage is disrupted. I request the forest service/PG&E to provide lease and utility relief for a minimum of five years; additionally, cover the costs of attorney fees throughout this legal burden.	See response to Letter 5, Comment 8.
1	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	The EA appears to classify the Residences as nightly cabin rentals. Because of this omission, the impacts to the Cabin Owners were not analyzed. Without this analysis, the EA does not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether an EIS should be prepared. Therefore, the USFS should prepare a supplemental EA to include analysis of the impacts to the Residences and the Cabin Owners from the proposed Project or prepare an EIS for the proposed Project.	The six recreational cabins are identified in Section 6.8 (Recreation and Other Land and Water Uses) of the EA. These cabins are considered in the analysis presented in the EA. Further detailed analysis of impacts to the cabins is presented in Chapter 4 (Environmental Setting, Consequences, & Mitigation) of the EIR.
2	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	According to the EA, work on the proposed Project will take place 5 to 7 days per week, 10 to 12 hours a day for 24 months.	See response to Letter 4, Comment 2., and Letter 7, Comment 8.
3	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>In sum, the EA does not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether the proposed Project significantly affects the quality of the human environment.</p> <p>The Cabin Owners request that the USFS take a good look at the impacts that the proposed Project will have on the Cabin Owners. While the Cabin Owners acknowledge that the proposed repairs are necessary, alternatives to the design of the Project must be considered to minimize the impacts to the Cabin Owners and mitigation measures must be adopted to address those remaining significant impacts following modification of the Project.</p>	<p>The EA includes a full written description of the Action. Figure 2 of the EA presents a detailed to-scale project site plan on a recent aerial base. The proposed haul road, equipment storage sites and staging areas are specifically delineated and identified on the site plan. Extensive analyses of environmental impacts were conducted and reported in the EA as listed in Section 10 (Literature Cited or Used).</p> <p>The EA assessed the impacts of two alternatives to the proposed action: dam removal and permanent reduction in the lake level. A number of haul road and stockpile alternatives were developed and tested in the project design process, and were rejected for reasons of feasibility or because they would result in adverse impacts to the environment. The EA identified temporary impacts on recreational uses, including the recreational residences (cabins). Project design elements were incorporated to avoid or minimize permanent environmental impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality.</p> <p>Further analyses were conducted and reported in Chapter 4 of the DWR EIR. Chapter 5 (Alternatives Analysis) of the EIR provides more analysis of alternatives, including using off-site quarries to supply rock instead of the Wishon Quarry and an alternative that would improve the strength of the dam with cement deep soil mixing.</p> <p>Cabin owner concerns were taken into consideration, resulting in changes to the location of the haul route, stockpile and parking areas, and preservation of an 8.7-acre buffer of vegetation around the cabins.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
4	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The EA is conceptual in nature. While Figure 2 of the EA provides a general site plan, no specific information as to the exact location and dimensions of the haul road, equipment storage sites and staging areas are provided. Figure 2 also fails to identify the location of the Residences, and the distance between the various components of the proposed Project and the Residences. Because the EA does not evaluate a definite plan, the EA's superficial analysis of the proposed Project's impact to the human environment is meaningless.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 8, Comment 3. Details of project elements are displayed on Figure 3.3 of the EIR. Road dimensions are provided on Figure 3-5 and Table 3-2 in Chapter 3 (Description of Project and Alternatives) of the EIR. Section 4.14 (Noise) and Section 4.17 (Recreation) of the EIR state distances of construction activities from residences.</p>
5	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Unless the EA is based on a concrete proposal for action, it is impossible to determine the environmental impacts that might occur once a proposed action is fully defined. For instance, we cannot determine exactly how far the proposed activities will be from the Residences because various distances have been mentioned in different communications from the Project proponent and others. Therefore, all the distances mentioned in this letter are approximate but it is clear that the proposed quarry site, haul roads and staging and parking areas are closely adjacent to the Residences.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 8, Comments 3 and 4.</p>
6	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Here, the exact location of the haul roads and equipment storage areas, as well as the boundaries of the proposed quarry, and their relation to the Residences is required to determine the extent of the environmental impacts. Precise location of the components of the Project is necessary to evaluate exactly how many trees must be cut, and how much grading will take place, among other things. Without a precise proposal, the USFS cannot determine whether the proposed Project has the potential to cause significant environmental effects. The USFS must obtain precise Project proposal from the applicant and prepare a supplemental EA that addresses that precise proposal, feasible alternatives and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 8, Comment 4.</p>
7	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The EA does not analyze any feasible alternative that achieves the Project objective of repairing the dam while also lessening the impacts that significantly affect the quality of the environment. Alternatives to the use of the Wishon Quarry as the source of material for repair of the dam should have been considered.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 8, Comment 3.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
8	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Additionally, alternatives that would relocate the haul route and construction parking areas away from the Residences should be examined. NEPA compliance requires alternatives to be evaluated that would allow the proposed action to move forward in a less environmentally damaging manner. The EA for the proposed Project should be revised to provide alternatives that would lessen impacts to the Cabin Owners.</p> <p>If the USFS does not develop an additional or supplemental EA to address these issues, the statement of decision should include a full written consideration of alternatives and the basis for selection so that the public may review and comment upon the basis for the decision.</p> <p>The EA must describe the probable environmental impacts of both the proposed action and its alternatives. The EA relied on by the USFS for its approval of the proposed Project fails to provide sufficient evidence to fully analyze the proposed Project or to determine whether an EIS must be prepared.</p>	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 2, 3, and 4; Letter 3, Comment 16; and Letter 8, Comment 3.
9	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	The EA incorrectly characterizes the surrounding land uses.	Section 6.8 (Recreation and Other Land and Water Uses) of the EA accurately characterizes the surrounding land uses as "a mix of private lands on the northeast side and FS-managed lands on the southwest side."
10	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	The EA wrongly concludes that the Marina View Heights community is the only community in view of the project area. In fact, some Cabin Owners are located less than 200 feet from the location of the proposed overburden stock pile location and approximately 100 feet from the proposed construction staging parking area.	Section 6.8 (Recreation and Other Land and Water Uses) of the EA states that "During project construction, the quarry would affect users of the Wishon Point Campground and the recreational residences (cabins) near Old Wishon Quarry." See responses to Letter 1, Comments 5 and 6.
11	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	The only mitigation the EA suggests for impacts to the surrounding land uses, including the Residences, is that six other campgrounds exist around Bass Lake which are "sufficiently distant from the quarry to preclude adverse effects of project construction noise." The use of a nearby campsite is not feasible or adequate mitigation for impacts to permanent vacation homes owned by the Cabin Owners on land leased from USFS will endure if the proposed Project is approved as designed.	Section 6.8 (Recreation and Other Land and Water Uses) of the EA states that "Six other campgrounds around Bass Lake area ... exists to accommodate those recreation users choosing to avoid Wishon Point Campground during project construction." It is not anticipated that the Wishon Tract Cabin owners would use campgrounds around the lake.
12	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	Those impacts will be especially severe because a number of the Cabin Owners are retired and they utilize the Residences frequently during the work week throughout the year.	See response to Letter 1, Comment 4.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
13	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The EA does not mention the Cabin Owners in its discussion of the visual resources. In analyzing the affected environment, the EA notes that approximately 300,000 cubic yards of rock material would be generating from the proposed Wishon quarry. As the proposed quarry area, as well as the haul roads, staging sites, and construction parking areas are currently all heavily vegetated with mixed conifers and Manzanita and ceanothos understory, aesthetic impacts from the removal of this vegetation will be significant.</p> <p>Again, the EA only looks at the aesthetic impacts to the Marina View Heights community, and completely ignores the existence of the Cabin Owners. The EA notes that the Marina View Heights community will be highly sensitive to the visual changes that result from the Project. In the analysis of the short-term effects of the proposed Project. The EA provides that temporary visual changes would exist for the quarry site, haul roads, parking areas and stockpile areas. These temporary changes would include construction activities utilizing heavy equipment, as well as large areas of cleared vegetation and exposed soil. The EA notes that visual impacts to the Marina View Heights community would be minor due to the distance of the residences from the Project, the tree coverage surrounding Marina View Heights and the tall forest canopy surrounding the quarry area.</p> <p>By contrast, none of these mitigating factors will be present for the Cabin Owners who will not have the benefit of the tall forest canopy surrounding the project or any distance and a significant amount of the tree coverage currently screening the Residences will be removed by the Project. The Residences are directly adjacent to and at roughly the same elevation as the quarry, and very slightly above the construction staging parking area and haul road. Therefore, the Cabin Owners will experience all of the impacts to aesthetics from the proposed Project, not just minor impacts as depicted in the EA.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 3 and 5.</p> <p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 6.</p>
14	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Similarly, the long-term effect portion of the analysis of aesthetic impacts also fails to address affects to Cabin Owners. The EA states that as many as 2,300 trees in the area will be removed resulting in significant and far reaching impacts on the Cabin Owners.</p>	<p>See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3, 5, and 6.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
15	<p>LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Krista Ostoich 	<p>This section of the EA appears to look at the impacts of the construction noise to the Residences, described as Bass Lake Annex Residences. The analysis utilizes Madera County's noise standards for heavy industrial noise sources as a base line measurement to look at noise impacts. As the Residences are located in a rural, forested area, the use of industrial noise standards is not proper. Instead, the EA should use Madera County noise standards for rural, residential areas.</p> <p>The noise study indicates, however, that even the industrial noise standards would be exceeded at the Residences during all phases of construction. The industrial standards are 60 dBA during daytime hours and 55 dBA during nighttime hours. According to the EA, the Residences will be subject to levels of 68 to 72 dBA during site preparation, 77 dBA during vegetation clearing, 71 to 81 dBA during quarry production and rock buttressing and 68 to 72 dBA during demobilization. Not only will the industrial noise standard be exceeded, it will be exceeded by 21 dBA at times.</p> <p>The mitigation provided for these noise impacts will not effectively reduce the noise impacts to the Cabin Owners because the mitigation measures will only be implemented to "the extent feasible" or "as practicable." The USFS must make these mitigation measures mandatory so they will be implemented although, as proposed, they will not be effective in fully mitigating the impacts to the industrial standards.</p>	<p>Construction noise and vibration impacts are described in detail in the Noise Technical Report, dated December 2009, supporting the EA. The findings of the technical report are summarized in the EA. The noise standard used in the analysis is for the exposure of residential uses to industrial noise sources, as shown on Table 10 of the Noise Technical Report. Thus, a residential noise standard is used in analysis. This is restated in Section 4.14 (Noise) of the EIR, which presents further analysis of noise impacts at the Wishon Tract Cabins. The EA identifies a temporary construction related noise impact, which would be reduced by the measures identified in the EA in addition to the relocation of the haul road and greater buffer between the quarry and nearest residence.</p>
16	<p>LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Krista Ostoich 	<p>Because the impacts from noise during construction phase is above the industrial standards set forth by Madera County, the proposed Project will have a significant affect on the quality of the human environment and a supplemental EA that contains meaningful mitigation or an EIS should be prepared.</p>	<p>Recent project design changes have rerouted the haul route and relocated the proposed parking area away from the cabins, as requested by the cabin owners, addressing their other noise-related concerns in this area. These changes include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quarry stockpile area has been relocated further away from the cabins, which will reduce noise impacts of activity at the stockpile area during the construction and operation of the quarry. An 8.7 acre buffer of mature trees and vegetation between the Wishon tract and the stockpile areas and quarry site will help filter noise and dust. Construction parking and staging will no longer be at the Old Wishon Quarry area adjacent to the cabins. The new construction parking area is at the Martin cabin site west of County Road 222 across from the Wishon Boat Launch facility. Noise associated with construction workers coming to and from the Project site and arriving and leaving for the day will be reduced at the cabins. The quarry haul road will no longer be adjacent to the cabins. The new alignment will follow Route 222, and be further away from the cabins reducing noise impacts associated with project generated traffic. See Figure 3-5 of the EIR.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
17	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Again, the mitigation proposed would not effectively mitigate these impacts to a level below significant. The mitigation measures include notifying various agencies prior to blasting activities, giving 24-hour notice to nearby landowners, and ensuring that no member of the public is within the area during blasting. Some of the Residences are within 200 feet of the proposed quarry overburden area and within 500 feet of the quarry itself. Therefore, the Cabin Owners will be prevented from using their Residences every time there is blasting, and will only be notified 24 hours in advance. As these are vacation Residences, the Cabin Owners will be unable to make plans to visit their Residences without the possibility of being informed at the last minute that they will not be able to enter the area.</p>	See response to Letter 1, Comment 1, and Letter 3, Comment 14.
18	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The blasting and vibration from operation of the quarry will have a significant effect on the human environment, as the Cabin Owners will be prevented from entering their property during blasting. Due to the intensive nature of this impact, a supplement EA should be prepared which provides effective mitigation for these impacts. Alternatively, an EIS should be prepared to fully analyze this proposed activity. In addition, there is a significant risk that the blasting can damage the structure of the Residences themselves.</p>	See response to Letter 1, Comment 1, and Letter 3, Comment 14.
19	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The EA concludes that traffic impacts will be minor, while noting that the new haul road will handle 78 one-way trips from the quarry to the dam for approximately 310 days. This haul road is proposed for directly in front of the Residences. The Cabin Owners environment will drastically change from its current state as a forested, residential area. The mitigation measures provided in the EA will not reduce the impacts from the haul road traffic to a level below significant. Therefore, a supplemental EA that contains meaningful mitigation or an EIS should be prepared.</p>	See response to Letter 1, Comment 2.
20	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>This road alignment will result in long-term impacts to the cabin Owners. Significant adverse impacts will result from the removal of large numbers of mature trees in front of the Residences to allow the construction of the haul road, as well as construction of the road itself. This area will take decades to reforest. In the meantime, the Cabin Owners will have lost the shading and aesthetic values they currently enjoy. Additionally, the forested area serves as a buffer between the Residences and Road 222. Without this buffer, the Residences will be subject to increased traffic noise and air pollution from Road 222. Additionally, the Residences will be visible from Road 222. As the Residences are vacation Residences, and not permanent homes, this exposure may result in break-ins or other criminal activity when the Residences are vacant.</p>	See responses to Letter 1, Comments 3, 5, and 6.

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
21	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The current location of the haul road will also expose the Cabin Owners to increased noise and pollution from the use of the haul road itself. The trucks used by the applicant to haul rock from the quarry to the dam are large and disruptive in nature. The operation of the trucks so close to the Residences will result in a safety hazard for the occupants of the Residences and completely change the environment the Cabin Owners now enjoy.</p> <p>To lessen the impacts to the Cabin Owners, the USFS should require a different route for the haul road. Specifically, the USFS should require the applicant to build a one-way haul road that connects and utilizes Road 222. This alternative would better protect the Residences from impacts of the proposed Project, including eliminating the traffic impacts directly in front of the Residences from the use of trucks between the quarry site and the dam and dramatically reducing the number of trees that need to be removed. The Cabin Owners will still be impacted, but with a realignment of the haul road, the long and short term nature of these impacts will be reduced.</p>	See responses to Letter 1, Comment 2, Letter 6, Comment 2..
22	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Additionally, the Cabin Owners' request that the USFS require the applicant to construct a mechanical security gate across the entrance road leading to the Cabin Owners' Residences. This will assist in protecting the Residences from criminal activity that may result from the increased human presence in the area due to the proposed Project and preserve the Cabin Owners' privacy.</p>	See response to Letter 6, Comment 2

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
23	<p>LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Krista Ostoich 	<p>The current plan for the proposed Project shows a construction parking area located on top of the old quarry adjacent to the Cabin Owners' Residences. This parking area will impact the Residences in many ways. First, construction workers arriving and leaving the parking area before and after construction work begins and ends will impact the Cabin Owners. Their arrival will result in light pollution from their vehicles, as well as noise from both the vehicles and the workers themselves. As is human nature, workers will likely arrive and prepare for the work day by listening to their radios and conversing with their colleagues. This will result in additional impacts to the Cabin Owners beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the proposed Project. Not only will the Cabin Owners experience noise, dust, and traffic from the operation of the proposed Project, with the current parking area location, they will be impacted for additional periods of time each day beyond the established hours for operation of the quarry.</p> <p>Also, due to the long hours these workers will be on the job and the long commute distance to the job site for many workers, it is likely that some workers may even spend some nights in their vehicles at the parking area. This will further impact the Cabin Owners because increased noise and light may exist during all hours of the day.</p> <p>To mitigate these impacts, the construction parking area should be relocated. There is a site on the land side of Road 222 across from the boat docks which could be transformed into a parking area. In fact, this area is already utilized by boat trailers avoiding paying fees for parking at other locations. The relocation of the parking area would lessen the overall impacts of the proposed Project on the Cabin Owners.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 17.</p> <p>No employees of the proponent or their contractors will be authorized to reside overnight in any portion of the construction area.</p> <p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 16.</p>
24	<p>LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Krista Ostoich 	<p>Additionally, as mitigation for the impacts that will result to the Cabin Owners from the proposed project, the USFS should require that the old quarry area be restored and revegetated to blend into the surrounding forest, in the same manner that is required for the proposed Wishon Quarry.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 16.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
25	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>To mitigate the impacts to the Cabin Owners from the significant loss of forested areas from the proposed Project, the USFS should require that the applicant only cut the minimum number of trees necessary to achieve the Project objectives. Additionally, the USFS should examine and approve each tree that will be removed. The USFS should take special precaution to remove as few trees as necessary in the overburden area so that a buffer exists between the Residences and the overburden and quarry area. Additionally, the USFS should require that all soil removed from the quarry site be preserved and used for quarry restoration. All disturbed Project areas should be replanted with viable, large, irrigated trees so as to ensure that the reforestation of the area happens as quickly as possible.</p>	<p>Restoration of the quarry area is discussed in detail in the Wishon Quarry Operation and Reclamation Plan prepared for the Action. This plan is available for review as Appendix F of the EIR and available at www.cranevalleydam.com. As stated in the plan, the project activities will remove existing trees that have been targeted as necessary for project safety and access as approved by the USDA-FS. An approximate 8.7-acre vegetation buffer surrounding the quarry operation will be preserved for noise and dust suppression and visual screening purposes. Also, as stated in the plan, all quarried rock and overburden remaining after construction is complete, is planned to be used in the Wishon Quarry reclamation process.</p> <p>Planting with locally native species from stock originating within 2 miles of the project area will be accomplished using bare-root stock or containerized seedlings/saplings at a density of specified by a professional native plant revegetation contractor, and approved by the USDA-FS. Depending on the species used and the time of planting, temporary irrigation may be necessary for the establishment of seedlings and saplings during the first summer of growth. The necessity of an irrigation plan will be assessed and if required, developed and issued as an addendum to the plan after final contouring of the site has occurred.</p>
26	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>While recognizing the necessity of using the quarry, additional mitigation should be required in order to minimize the noise, vibration and aesthetic impacts on the Residences discussed above. The current proposal for the quarry shows that tree removal will occur within approximately 200 feet of one of the Residences to allow for sufficient stockpile area around the quarry. To minimize impacts to the Cabin Owners, the boundary of the overburden stockpile area should be moved to allow for at least 300 feet between the stockpile area and the nearest residence. This can be accomplished by increasing the height of the overburden pile. This will minimize impacts by increasing the distance between the two uses, as well as leaving additional trees standing which will serve as a buffer between the Residences and the quarry area.</p>	<p>The stockpile area has been relocated to provide a wider buffer of vegetation between the Wishon Quarry and the Wishon Tract Cabins. As stated in Section 4.1 (Aesthetics) of the EIR, between the northern quarry site boundary and the Wishon Tract Cabins, the existing forest canopy and understory will be maintained to provide a minimum 250-foot buffer.</p>
27	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The mitigation for the blasting in the quarry contained in the EA is insufficient to reduce impacts to the Cabin Owners. Additional mitigation measures should be required. This mitigation should include a maximum of one day per week for conducting blasting. The blasting should be scheduled to occur in the same block of time on the same day each week and it should only occur during the workweek, not on weekends or holidays. The Cabin Owners should be notified at least one week prior to any change in the blasting schedule. Notification should occur through telephone calls to each of the Cabin Owners, as well as through electronic mail and/or fax. The applicant should be required to contact each Cabin Owner to obtain written instructions of the notice addresses and the most effective type of notice for each owner.</p>	<p>See responses to Letter 3, Comments 13 and 14, and Letter 4, Comment 11.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
28	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>To protect against structural damage from blasting the USFS should require that the applicant pay for an independent inspector chosen by, or approved by, the Cabin Owners, to inspect all of the Cabin Owners' Residences prior to blasting, and each month during blasting. Any recommended measures to protect the Residences from the effects of blasting should be completed by the applicant, at its sole expense, prior to commencement of blasting. In addition, the applicant shall pay for all necessary repair work to the Residences resulting from the blasting activities, vibration from the haul road or other Project related causes.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 7. See responses to Letter 3, Comment 13, and Letter 5, Comment 4.</p>
29	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>If, at anytime, damage to the Residences is detected, the specific Cabin Owner should be notified by telephone call and electronic mail immediately and, if possible, the damage should be repaired or stabilized at the applicant's expense prior to the next blast. If damage is noted during the middle of the night, notification should be given the following day.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 3, Comment 13</p>
30	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Finally, as discussed above, the noise and vibration levels from the construction of the quarry and its various components will exceed all applicable standards. To assist in mitigating the noise and vibration impacts, the following mitigation measures should be required:</p> <p>The Applicant shall require by contract specifications that the following construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hours of construction shall be limited to daylight hours on weekdays from Memorial Day to Labor Day and to daylight hours Monday through Saturday during the remainder of the year. • Ensure that all construction and mining equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards. • Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from Cabin Owners' Residences. • Implement noise attenuation measures, including a noise barrier or noise blanket in between the quarry and the Cabin Owners' Residences. • The Applicant shall require by contract specifications that construction staging areas, along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the proposed Project, would be located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible, such as the Cabin Owners' Residences. 	<p>Noise mitigation in the EA includes locating construction equipment as far as practical from noise-sensitive areas and requiring sound-control devices on gasoline and diesel engines. Section 4.14 (Noise) of the EIR further requires noise-reducing enclosures around stationary noise-generating equipment and the construction of barriers or use of existing barrier features between noise sources and noise-sensitive land uses.</p> <p>See also responses to Letter 8, Comments 4 and 15; Letter 3, Comment 14; Letter 4, Comment 11; and Letter 7, Comment 8.</p>

Comment Number	Author and Date of Correspondence	Comment	Response
31	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>Despite all feasible mitigation, the Project will have profound and long lasting adverse impacts on the Cabin Owners' quiet enjoyment of their Residences. To mitigate these adverse impacts, the USFS should limit all work performed on the proposed Project to daylight hours, and work performed between Memorial Day and Labor Day should be restricted to Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.</p>	<p>Construction hours have been adjusted to restrict work hours, to the extent feasible and practical, to daylight hours. See response to Letter 7, Comment 8. See response to Letter</p>
32	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>The USFS should require that the applicant compensate the Cabin Owners for their loss of use of their Residences due to all of the Project operations, long term loss of trees and the other impacts described above. Specifically, Cabin Owners should be compensated in an amount equal to their lease payments to the USFS for five years from the date the Project commences. In addition, because the Cabin Owners have been required to engage attorneys to address the inadequate nature of the project description and the EA, the applicant should be required to reimburse the Cabin Owners for their reasonable attorney's fees to assist the Cabin Owners in correcting the deficiencies in the Federal process.</p>	<p>See response to Letter 1, Comment 7.</p>
33	LETTER 8 Baker Manock & Jensen May 6, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Krista Ostoich 	<p>If the USFS is not inclined to prepare a supplemental EA, we request that all of the mitigation measures suggested in this letter be required in the District Ranger's Decisional Document as conditions on the permit for the proposed Project.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
1	LETTER 9 PG&E May 7, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Bragagnolo 	<p>We understand the construction will have some temporary effects on the surrounding community; however, public safety is the top priority. Delays in the start of construction could have a negative impact on the scheduled completion date, and increase the risk that repairs will not be made before the occurrence of a large earthquake on the San Andreas fault. Timely completion of this project will protect public safety and ensure that both the community and visitors will continue to enjoy Bass Lake for many years to come.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
25	Cosma Plastering, Inc. March 17, 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dino Cosma 	<p>Just step on the gas a little. The lake level is costing the home owners dearly.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>