

June 16, 2006

Steven W. Anderson, Field Manager
U. S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Redding Field Office
355 Hemsted Drive
Redding, CA 96002

**Subject: Salmon Creek Resources Land Exchange
Case File Number CA 43098
Appraisal Report
Environmental Assessment, EA Number CA-360-RE-2004-15**

Dear Mr. Anderson:

This letter represents the Shasta Community Services District (District) response to items relating to the District in the Appraisal Report and Environmental Assessment prepared for the exchange of a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) parcel located within District boundaries.

U.S. Dept. of the Interior's Appraisal Report for a Governmental Parcel located near the end of Victoria Dr. in Shasta, California. (Also known as Area 51):

Statements relating to Shasta Community Services District (District) are found on pages 2 & 3 under the Summary section and on page 22 under the Subject Property Description section, as follows:

pp. 2 -3:

"The property is located outside of the City of Redding and is not in the General Plan area. Consequently, there are no services provided through the City. However, the subject is within the Shasta Community Service District, which does provide water. There is no public sewer available. In a recent conversation with Walter Kaufman, Jr., Manager of the Shasta Community Service District, in which the subject property is located, he stated that there is no water available through their district. However, water could be obtained from another district and the pipe on Victoria Drive and running through the subject property probably would not be adequate size for development of the property with multiple home sites. The water provided from the other water district would be an additional service fee and major costs could be involved in enlarging the water line on Victoria Drive, which is reported by Mr. Kaufman that the expense of developing it is at the developer's expense."

p. 22:

“Since the property is located outside of the City of Redding, there is no public sewer available. The subject is located within the Shasta Community Service District, which is a water district, located on Highway 299. There is an 8” water main, which stops at the northern border of the subject, on Victoria Drive. According to Walter Kaufman, Jr., who is the manager of the water district, he stated that the time of the pre-application process there was no water available. Mr. Kaufman previously stated that the 8” line was not adequate for service to the subject property. Mr. Kaufman now states, after the pre-application process, the board has approved acquisition of water from another water district, which would make water available to the subject, but there would be additional cost of development for the subject property for a new water line along Victoria Drive. Mr. Kaufman did not know what the cost would be as it was based on several variables. The additional water from the other water district would also incur some minor additional hookup fees.”

Response:

Both of these discussions misrepresent the availability of water for the subject property. Although the District has obtained additional water for the use of existing and future single-parcel connections, it does not have water for the potential development that could occur on the subject property. Per District ordinance, all new developments (defined as more than two lots) must provide water to the district in sufficient quantity and of suitable quality to serve the new development. The cost of this additional water must be borne by the developer, as must the cost of all new infrastructure or improvements to existing infrastructure needed to deliver water to the new development.

Specifically, in August 2005, the Board of Directors of the District approved Ordinance 1-05 which states, in part, that the property owner/developer who wishes to divide an existing parcel into three or more separate lots is responsible for locating, purchasing, and transferring a specified amount of water to the District to supply each proposed lot or residence for a period of not less than 40 years.

District requirements also state that any necessary improvements or construction of new facilities needed to supply future development will be the financial responsibility of the property owner/developer. The exact costs and specific improvements that may be required for a project cannot be determined until sufficient information and a project map is provided to the District that would allow for a management and engineering review of the proposed project.

U.S. Dept. of the Interior's April 2006 Environmental Assessment, Case File # CA 43098 report:

In the April 2006 Environmental Assessment report it was stated that at least one meeting was held with District staff in March 2005. This meeting did not occur.

Numerous concerned citizens and local groups petitioned the District Board to request a meeting with the Bureau of Land Management to gather specific information to provide the Directors with sufficient information to make a well-informed decision regarding the amount of benefit the property in question could provide to the community of Shasta.

A committee of the District Board and the General Manger was appointed, and several attempts were made by the District to establish a meeting with BLM representative Steve Anderson. Much of the correspondence that was sent and messages that were left for Mr. Anderson requesting further information went unanswered, and no meeting between the District committee and BLM was ever held.

Thank your for providing an opportunity to respond to these reports.

Sincerely,

Bonnie E. Lampley
SCSD Board President

BEL/jac