



*McCloud River*

(Abbreviated)

## The Facts about Raising Shasta Dam

February 18, 2026



*Shasta Snow Wreath*

Shasta Dam is the fourth highest dam in California<sup>1</sup> and its 4.55-million-acre-foot reservoir is the largest in the state.<sup>2</sup> The dam captures water from three rivers (the upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Pit),<sup>3</sup> blocking migratory fish access, inundated lands formerly used by native Americans, and affecting downstream flows in the process. Constructed and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation since 1945, the Shasta Dam and Reservoir is the cornerstone of the giant Central Valley Project (CVP), which provides irrigation and drinking water for much of California's Central Valley and parts of, and valleys just south of, the San Francisco Bay Area.<sup>4</sup>

McCloud River protected by California law making any further expansion of Shasta Reservoir illegal: In 1989, the California legislature enacted a statute signed by Governor George Deukmejian (R-Long Beach) amending the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (originally signed into law by Governor Ronald Reagan (R-Santa Barbara) to protect much of the remaining McCloud River upstream of Shasta Reservoir.<sup>5</sup>

State/Federal storage studies: In 2000, the CalFed Program identified a Shasta Dam raise for further investigation, studies authorized by the Congress in 2004. Without a state partner, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation or USBR) completed Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation (SLWRI) 2015 final Feasibility Report and 2014 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). It identified a plan with the greatest level of National Economic Development (NED) benefits as one including an 18.5-foot raise of Shasta Dam, expanding the reservoir by 634,000 acre feet, but did not recommend any action (dam) alternative because of serious outstanding considerations.<sup>6</sup> In 2015, the dam raise was estimated to cost nearly \$1.4 billion 2014 dollars,<sup>7</sup> Reclamation's 2019 estimate was \$2 billion in 2019 dollars.<sup>8</sup>

The water supply benefits were small. The average increased deliveries provided by the enlarged reservoir for the preferred alternative are only 51,300 acre-feet<sup>9</sup> (or 0.7% of CVP annual deliveries or a little more than 1/10th of 1% of the state's annual developed water use).<sup>10</sup>

New Reclamation project authorization and funding model: In 2016, the Congress created the 5-year Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN), creating a new model for Reclamation projects requiring upfront non-federal partners. However, likely potential governmental cost-sharing partners are prohibited by the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act from assisting and cooperating with federal agencies in reservoir expansion projects that could adversely affect free-flowing reaches of the McCloud River or wild trout fishery. This should be important since the WIIN requires conformance with environmental law<sup>11</sup> and state and federal law.<sup>12</sup>

In January 2018, the new federal administration prematurely informed the Congress that a WIIN "Secretarial Determination for Commencement of Construction"<sup>13</sup> had been made for an 18.5-foot dam raise<sup>14</sup> According to the document, the necessary cost-sharing partner was expected by the fall of 2019 and construction would begin in late 2019 (early fiscal year 2020). The communication did not inform the Congress that the raise is illegal under state and federal law, that likely non-federal partners were

foreclosed under the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act, nor documented the required conditions making such a determination possible.<sup>15</sup>

Westlands tries to make its move: These legal impediments did not dissuade the Westlands Water District, the largest irrigation district in the country, which in February 2018 again authorized its general manager to “submit a request to the Secretary of the Interior for the enlargement of Shasta Dam and Reservoir, indicating a willingness to potentially share the costs of the enlargement.”<sup>16</sup> On November 30, 2018, the Westlands Water District, as lead agency, issued a Notice of Preparation for an environmental impact report (EIR) for what it calls the “Shasta Dam Raise Project” (SDRP).

California responds and Westlands has to stand down: In addition to “scoping” comments by the Winnemem Wintu Tribe (the McCloud River is their ancestral homeland) and environmental groups<sup>17</sup>, state agencies told Westlands that “agencies of the state” such as Westlands were prohibited from participating in the planning and construction of this project. The State Water Resources Control Board’s executive officer informed Westlands that EIR lead-agency status is impermissible “planning” for the purposes of this part of the California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.<sup>18</sup>

On May 13, 2019, in separate lawsuits, California Attorney General Xavier Becerra, representing the people of California, and Friends of the River *et al.* (Friends of the River, Golden Gate Salmon Association, Pacific Coast Fishermen’s Association, Institute for Fisheries Resources, Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, and the Natural Resources Defense Council), represented by Earthjustice, filed a complaint in Shasta County Superior Court against the Westlands Water District for violation of the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act.<sup>19</sup>

After a July 29, 2019, hearing on the CA Attorney General’s request for a preliminary injunction, a preliminary injunction was issued barring Westlands from continuing with the EIR and planning and construction of the dam raise project.<sup>20</sup> On September 30, Westlands announced that it was terminating its EIR effort.<sup>21</sup>

Reclamation tries to continue over state and Congressional objections: On February 19, 2020, President Donald Trump promised Bakersfield crowds that he would get them “a lot of water, a lot of dam, a lot of everything.”<sup>22</sup> He then signed an executive order saying: “To help develop and deliver water supplies in the Central Valley of California, I direct those Secretaries to coordinate efforts to: (a) implement the relevant authorities of subtitle J of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (Public Law 114-322), which include provisions focused on (1) developing water storage...”<sup>23</sup>

On February 27, 2020, the Bureau of Reclamation posted the following on Twitter: “President Trump told us to improve #CAwater reliability. Today we’re continuing pre-construction work at Shasta Dam to improve water supplies for farms, family and fish and wildlife. #RaiseShasta, @USBR.”<sup>24</sup>

On August 6, 2020, Reclamation issued a draft supplemental environmental impact statement (DSEIS) for the SLWRI.<sup>25</sup> The purpose of the DSEIS was to provide Reclamation with a federal Clean Water Act 404(r) exemption from certain state water quality permits and to excise some statements in Chapter 25 of its earlier SLWRI FEIS that the dam raise was in conflict with state law.

The draft supplemental EIS drew comments from the State Water Resources Control Board that the state’s wild & scenic rivers act did, indeed, require that state agencies not provide required permits and other approvals for the dam raise project. The California Department of Fish & Game corrected Reclamation’s misunderstandings about the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act and re-emphasized the Department’s conclusion that “[t]he Department finds this project’s impacts are in conflict with California Public

Resources Code section 5093.542.”<sup>26</sup> The California Attorney General’s comments also emphasized this conflict.<sup>27</sup> Environmental groups offered similar and often considerably expanded subject-area comments.<sup>28</sup>

These state objections should have come as no surprise. Governor Brown’s Natural Resources Secretary urged Congressional leaders not to pursue the Shasta Dam raise.<sup>29</sup> In addition to the CA Attorney General’s lawsuit against the Westlands Water District’s attempt to partner with Reclamation in the dam raise, in April 2019, in response to a question about his concerns about Reclamation’s Shasta Dam Raise & Enlargement Project (SDREP) by the Water Education Foundation, Governor Newsom’s California Natural Resources Agency Secretary Wade Crowfoot replied:

Federal officials are pursuing efforts to raise Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River in Northern California, despite state concerns that raising the dam would violate the protection for the McCloud River under California's Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The state’s concerns center on the project’s adverse impacts on the McCloud River, which is specifically protected under state law. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the State Water Resources Control Board restated these concerns in recent comment letters regarding the proposed raise. We hope the Bureau of Reclamation will closely consider our state agencies’ concerns in the coming months.<sup>30</sup>

Reclamation announced the completion of the Final Supplemental EIS on November 19, 2020.<sup>31</sup> The Supplemental FEIS rejected all the state agency or environmental group comments.<sup>32</sup> It did not complete the Record of Decision for the SDREP before reluctantly leaving office.

Congress continues to prohibit Shasta Dam construction: Title IX<sup>33</sup> (Western Water Infrastructure) of the 2021 bipartisan infrastructure bill (the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, HR 3684,) created a WIIN-like storage subsidy program authorizing \$1.150 billion for water storage, groundwater storage, and conveyance. The IJA requires that reimbursable and non-reimbursable federal funding to federal projects comply with Reclamation law.<sup>34</sup> The IJA does not allow for Shasta Dam raise construction funding.<sup>35</sup> Authorization of IJA Title IX appropriations expires at the end of the 2026 federal fiscal year (§40901).<sup>36</sup>

On January 9, 2023, in the opening days of the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress, Representative David Valadao (R-Hanford) introduced H.R. 215, the Working to Advance Tangible and Effective Reforms (WATER) for California Act (the WATER for California Act).<sup>37</sup> H.R. 215 §305(b) purported to override (for CVP contractors) the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act provisions (CA PRC §5093.542(c)) that prevent public agencies of California (agencies of the state and many of the state’s political subdivisions) from assisting Reclamation in the planning and construction of the SDREP.<sup>38</sup>

H.R. 215 drew considerable opposition.<sup>39</sup> H.R. 215 was passed (marked up) by the House Natural Resources Committee on April 28, 2023.<sup>40</sup> In June, 2023, the House Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee added H.R. 215 (Valadao) to its markup of the Energy & Water Appropriations bill, (page 64, Title V “Water for California” Sec. 501)<sup>41</sup> loosening the restrictions on Shasta Reservoir expansion construction funding<sup>42</sup> and purporting to preempt a portion of the McCloud River protections in the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act.<sup>43</sup> On October 3, the Administration threatened to veto the House Energy & Water Appropriations bill,<sup>44</sup> noting its opposition to ending the IJA prohibition on construction funding for the Shasta Dam & Reservoir Expansion Project.<sup>45</sup> On October 26, the U.S. House of Representative passed H.R. 4394, the “Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2024.” H.R. 4394 included H.R. 215.<sup>46</sup> This language, however, was not included in any subsequent Continuing Resolutions. On March 8, 2024, the second session of the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2024.<sup>47</sup> This “minibus,”

contained six appropriations bills, including an Energy & Water appropriations package that did not include McCloud River CAWSRA preemption provisions of H.R. 4394 or H.R. 215<sup>48</sup> or their other provisions.

2025 Presidential executive orders: On Inauguration Day, January 20, 2005, President Trump signed a Presidential Memorandum “Putting People over Fish: Stopping Radical Environmentalism to Provide Water to Southern California” “to route more water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to other parts of the state for use by the people there who desperately need a reliable water supply.”<sup>49</sup> Four days later, President Trump signed an executive order directing “[t]he Secretary of the Interior...[to] utilize his discretion to operate the CVP to deliver more water and produce additional hydropower, including by increasing storage and conveyance...to high-need communities, notwithstanding any contrary State or local law.... He also directed the Secretaries of the Interior & Commerce that...“[w]ithin 30 days from the date of this order, each designated official shall identify any regulatory hurdles that unduly burden each respective water project, identify any recent changes in state or Federal law that may impact such projects from a regulatory perspective...and shall develop a proposed plan, for review by the Secretaries, to appropriately suspend, revise, or rescind any regulations or procedures that unduly burden such projects and are not necessary to protect the public interest or otherwise comply with the law.”<sup>50</sup>

The Secretaries are expected to recommend signing the Record of Decision for Reclamation’s Shasta Dam and Reservoir Expansion Project (SDREP) supplemental EIS, recommending that construction funding be included in the federal appropriations bills, and recommending that federal statutes attempting to preempt the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act be introduced and enacted.

However, on January 24, in an example of confused messaging, President Trump visited the Los Angeles area and repeated his idea that the recent L.A. fires stemmed from lack of water deliveries to Southern California. He added this surreal description of where California’s water comes from:

“But we have a lotta water that is available...You’re talking about unlimited water coming up from the Pacific Northwest, even coming up from parts of Canada. And it pours down naturally, it has for a million years, for a million years, it pours down, you’ll never run out, you’ll never have shortages... You know you don’t even need reservoirs with the water coming down. You don’t need the reservoir. You have so much water, you don’t need it. You only have the reservoirs because you tried to hold the water. But you have natural water coming down, along the coast. It’s, for a million years it’s been coming. You know that, right?”<sup>51</sup>

The Congress moves to put the federal taxpayers on the hook: On May 22, 2025, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 1, the GOP “Reconciliation” package, 215–214–1.<sup>52</sup> The House bill would have appropriated up to \$2 billion for expansions of federal water storage facilities and another \$500 million for federal canal reconstruction for use by the Secretary of the Interior until 2034.<sup>53</sup> The storage provision amount equals Reclamation’s 2019 cost estimate for the proposed Shasta Dam raise,<sup>54</sup> and some insiders speculated that the Shasta Dam raise was on the minds of some key Reconciliation bill insiders.<sup>55</sup>

On July 2, the U.S. Senate voted 51–50 in favor of their GOP “Reconciliation” package.<sup>56</sup> The Senate bill appropriates \$1 billion for expansion of federal water storage and conveyance facilities for use at the Secretary’s discretion until 2034. Perhaps noteworthy, Reclamation’s 2015 SLWRI Feasibility Report sets up another billion federal taxpayer dollars that need not be eventually paid off by the beneficiaries (non-reimbursable).

On July 3, the House acceded to the Senate by a vote of 218–214. On July 4, President Donald J. Trump signed the Senate’s Reconciliation “one big, beautiful bill.”<sup>57</sup>

In a breathtaking departure from more than a century of Reclamation law,<sup>58</sup> this money would be a gift from the nation's taxpayers to the beneficiaries of these funds allocated by the Secretary (and perhaps largely to irrigation districts in the Central Valley). Gone would be any cost-sharing requirements. Gone would be any reimbursement to the taxpayers from the benefiting irrigation districts over time. The bill could also set up a confrontation between traditional state control over its waterways (the Shasta Dam raise is illegal under state law) against a rising and assertive imperial federal government.

The lobbying resumes: On February 9, 2026, a collection of powerful water and agricultural leaders from the Central Valley penned a letter<sup>59</sup> to President Donald Trump requesting that he (1) sign the record of decision for Reclamation's supplemental FEIS for the dam raise and reservoir construction and (2) begin construction of the dam raise using the \$1 billion in the "one, big, beautiful bill" passed and signed the previous year.

The letter did not reveal that construction of the dam raise is illegal under §5093.542(b) and required state permits unavailable under §5093.542(c) of the California Public Resources Code (the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act). The letter did not confront the funding shortfall in the "one, big, beautiful bill's" \$1 billion versus the 2019 \$2 billion<sup>60</sup> estimated project cost or provide a 2026 estimate. Nor does it restate Reclamation's view that their preferred dam-raise alternative would only increase CVP deliveries by 0.7%.<sup>61</sup>

*This abbreviated memo is based on a recent update of the more comprehensive memo by Steve Evans when he was conservation director at Friends of the River. Ronald Stork took it from there to include the event history from 2016 to the present and considerably enriching the endnotes. For current fact sheets and more resources see: <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/our-work/rivers-under-threat/sacramento-threat-shasta/> For additional information concerning this project, please contact Ronald Stork, Friends of the River, (916) 442-3155 x 220, [rstork@friendsoftheriver.org](mailto:rstork@friendsoftheriver.org) or Steve Evans, CalWild's Wild Rivers Director, (916) 708-3155, [sevans@calwild.org](mailto:sevans@calwild.org).*

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_the\\_tallest\\_dams\\_in\\_United\\_States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_the_tallest_dams_in_United_States).

<sup>2</sup> The California Water Atlas, prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning & Research in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources, 1978 & 1979, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> "The four major tributaries to Shasta Lake are the Sacramento River, McCloud River, Pit River, and Yét Atwam Creek (formerly Squaw Valley Creek), in addition to numerous minor tributary creeks and streams." USBR Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation (SLWRI) Final Feasibility Report, July 2015, p. 1-12. The entire Final Feasibility Report can be found on Reclamation's website: <https://www.usbr.gov/mp/ncao/slwri/docs/feasability/slwri-final-fr-full.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> USBR SLWRI Final Feasibility Report, pp. 1-9, 1-12 figure 1-5.

<sup>5</sup> The California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act prohibits new dam and reservoir construction that would increase reservoir levels above the McCloud River Bridge (California Public Resources Code §5093.542 (b)). The bridge is a bit more than a mile (5,440 feet) downstream of the current reservoir gross (full) pool and approximately one and two thirds of a mile (5,440 feet plus 3550 feet, the latter above current gross pool) downstream of the gross (full) pool that would be formed in the 18.5-foot dam raise alternatives (USBR SLWRI FEIS, pp. 25-4-5, 25-36-40). The SLWRI FEIS map

---

(Figure 25-2, p. 25-5) depicts both of the preceding reaches (McCloud River Bridge up to current gross pool elevation of 1070', and from the current gross pool elevation of 1070' to 1090', the approximate gross pool elevation of the 20.5-ft preferred-alternative reservoir elevation increase). It also depicts some of the potential river-bed area subject to yearly high-pool reservoir inundation, treated as elevation 1020 feet (upper limit of "lake" in critical dry year) to elevation 1070 feet (present gross pool). According to the SLWRI FEIS (pp. 25-4-5), this reach is treated by the USFS Shasta-Trinity National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan in 1994 as part of the reservoir. This reach is called the transition reach in the SLWRI FEIS (pp. 25-3-4) since the reservoir yearly high pool is usually within this reach. Referring to the lineal distance from reservoir elevation 1020 ft. to expanded reservoir elevation 1090 ft., the 20.5-ft. reservoir raise is described as increasing the length of this new "transition" reach to 12,550 lineal feet or 2.38 miles (SLWRI FEIS, p. 25-37). It may also be relevant that under the lowest of the dam-raise alternatives (the 6.5-ft. CP1 dam raise), the reservoir gross pool would rise to 1,078 feet, inundating 1470 lineal feet of the McCloud River upstream of the current Shasta Reservoir gross pool (SLWRI FEIS p. 25-27). The SLWRI FEIS wild & scenic rivers chapter can be found here:

<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/SLWRI-FEIS-Chapter-25-ws.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> SLWRI Final Feasibility Report p. 9-1. Although no plan is recommended, a plan (CP4A) is identified as the preferred plan. Table 6-15 from page 45, Chapter 6, "Timeline and Status of Feasibility Study," states: "This Final Feasibility Report evaluates and compares comprehensive plans and identifies the NED Plan. The Final EIS includes responses to public comments and identifies the Preferred Alternative." However, identification of a preferred but not recommended alternative in the Final Feasibility Report that is released to Congress was inconsistent with the 2004 federal statute authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to, in consultation with the Governor of California, submit the feasibility report of this and other named federal projects to the Congress once the Secretary determines that it should be constructed using in whole or in part federal funds. HR 2828, 108th Congress. The "Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act." MP-15-122 Reclamation Transmits to Congress Final Report on Proposed Shasta Dam Raise, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid Pacific Region News Release, July 29, 2015.

<http://www.usbr.gov/newsroom/newsrelease/detail.cfm?RecordID=49890>.

<sup>7</sup> For the NED project, the estimated construction cost is \$1.265 billion plus \$105 million for interest on construction, making the total capital cost \$1.371 billion. Construction costs for all of the alternatives range from \$990 million to \$1.283 billion. Capital costs range from \$1.073 to \$1.291 billion (SLWRI Feasibility Report, p. 4-47 table 4-7). For the latest cost estimate, \$1.4 billion at this writing, see: <https://www.usbr.gov/mp/ncso/docs/sdrep-facts.pdf>. As noted, in March of 2019, Reclamation's construction engineer Richard Welsh told the SLDMWA executive director the estimated cost of the project was now \$2 billion.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2019-3-22-SDREP-cost-estimate-from-USBR-manager-Richard-Welsh.pdf>. (Obtained from and Earthjustice Public Records Act request.)

<sup>9</sup> SLWRI Feasibility Report, p. 5-4 table 5-2.

<sup>10</sup> SLWRI Feasibility Report, pp. 1-9, 1-20.

<sup>11</sup> WIIN §4007(b)(4) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS. — In participating in a federally owned storage project under this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall comply with all applicable environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)

<sup>12</sup> WIIN §4007(j) "Consistency with State Law: Nothing in this section preempts or modifies any obligation of the United States to act in conformance with applicable State law." §WIIN §4012 Savings Language. Subtitle J, California, can be summarized as follows: the WIIN should not be interpreted or implemented in a manner that preempts state law, affects obligations of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, changes the Endangered Species Act (ESA), would cause additional adverse effects on listed fish species, and affects obligations of the Pacific Fishery Management Council under the ESA or Magnuson Stevens Act to manage California to Washington coastal fisheries.

<sup>13</sup> This determination is supposed to be contingent on several matters. WIIN § 4007(b) (3) COMMENCEMENT. — The construction of a federally owned storage project that is the subject of an agreement under this subsection shall not commence until the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) determines that the proposed federally owned storage project is feasible in accordance with the reclamation laws; (B) secures an agreement providing upfront funding as is necessary to pay the non-Federal share of the capital costs; and

---

(C) determines that, in return for the Federal cost-share investment in the federally owned storage project, at least a proportionate share of the project benefits are Federal benefits, including water supplies dedicated to specific purposes such as environmental enhancement and wildlife refuges.

We are not aware of any meaningful explanation of how the determination was reached.

<sup>14</sup> “Report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Distribution of Fiscal Year 2017 Funding for Water Conservation and Delivery- Pub. L. 114-322 (Section 4007), Water and Related Resources, Bureau of Reclamation and Discussion of Criteria and Recommendations.” (WIIN Funding Report)

<http://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Adm-rprt-on-2018-CA-reservoir-enlargement-approps-request-ocr.pdf>. See pp. 3 and 4 for the “Secretarial Determination for Commencement of Construction for the dam raise.”

<sup>15</sup> “WIIN Funding Report.” <http://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Adm-rprt-on-2018-CA-reservoir-enlargement-approps-request-ocr.pdf>. See pp. 1, 3, 6. WIIN § 4007(b) (3) COMMENCEMENT. — The construction of a federally owned storage project that is the subject of an agreement under this subsection shall not commence until the Secretary of the Interior — ...(B) secures an agreement providing upfront funding as is necessary to pay the non-Federal share of the capital costs...

<sup>16</sup> Minutes of the February 20, 2018, meeting of the Board of Directors of the Westlands Water District, p. 12.

<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/WWD-February-2018-board-minutes-ocr.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/FOR-et-al-scoping-comments-SDRP-rev2.pdf>.

<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/CalWild-Shasta-Dam-Raise-Scoping-Comments.pdf>.

[https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Scoping-Comments-on-WWD-CEQA\\_A1b.pdf](https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Scoping-Comments-on-WWD-CEQA_A1b.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> See Comments on Westlands Water District’s Initial Study/notice of Preparation for the Shasta Dam Raise Project, Shasta County, from Eileen Sobek, Executive Director, State Water Resources Control Board, November 14, 2018, pp. 1–3.

[https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/WQC\\_NFisch.JKSahota.-Comments-on-Shasta-Dam-Raise-Project.pdf](https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/WQC_NFisch.JKSahota.-Comments-on-Shasta-Dam-Raise-Project.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> For Friends of the River *et al.* complaint, see <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/2019-0513-FOR-et-al-Shasta-Dam-Complaint-ocr.pdf>. For FOR *et al.* joint press release, see [https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Joint-Press-Release\\_Shasta\\_Final.pdf](https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Joint-Press-Release_Shasta_Final.pdf). For Friends of the Rivers’ press release, see <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Press-Release-Suit-Filed-to-Stop-Shasta-Dam-Raise.pdf>. For Earthjustice’s press release, see <https://earthjustice.org/news/press/2019/fishing-and-conservation-groups-sue-country-s-largest-agricultural-water-district-over-illegal-plot-to-raise>. For the CA Attorney General’s press release, see <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-becerra-sues-westlands-water-district-block-unlawful-shasta-dam>. For the CA Attorney General’s complaint, see <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/people-v-westlands-complaint-declaratory-injunctive-relief-shasta-dam-ocr.pdf>.

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/2019-07-28-Tentative-Ruling-on-PI.pdf>.

<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/2019-0731-Order-Granting-PI.pdf>.

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Westlands-terminates-Shasta-Dam-raise-EIR-Mavens-Sept-30-2019.pdf>.

<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Westlands-terminates-Shasta-Dam-raise-EIR-Mavens-Sept-30-2019.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Trump-delivers-not-so-says-Newsom-Fresno-Bee-Nov-19-2020.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Trump-February-2020-memo.docx>.

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/USBR-we-obey-tweet.png>,

<https://twitter.com/usbr/status/1232804668952195073>,

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/USBR-Shasta-Dam-raise-dEIS-press-release-Aug-6-2020.pdf>. <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/SLWRI-Draft-Supplemental-EIS.pdf>.

<sup>26</sup> [https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Shasta\\_Dam\\_Raise\\_Supplemental\\_DEIS\\_ltr\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Shasta_Dam_Raise_Supplemental_DEIS_ltr_FINAL.pdf).

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020-10-05-FINAL-comment-letter-on-Shasta-Dam-SEIS-letterhead.pdf>.

- 
- <sup>28</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/FOR-et-al-SLWRI-DSEIS-comments.pdf>.  
<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/NRDC-et-al-comments-on-Shasta-Dam-enlargement-DSEIS-10-5-20.pdf>.  
<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020-10-5-Center-for-Biological-Diversity-et-al-Comments-on-SLWRI-DSEIS.pdf>.
- <sup>29</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Shasta-Dam-letter-3.13.18-LLM.pdf>.
- <sup>30</sup> <https://www.watereducation.org/western-water/californias-new-natural-resources-secretary-takes-challenge-implementing-gov-newsoms>.
- <sup>31</sup> <https://www.usbr.gov/newsroom/newsrelease/detail.cfm?RecordID=73146>.  
<https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/2020-11-19-Trump-administration-finalizes-Shasta-Dam-raise-EIS-USBR.pdf>.
- <sup>32</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/SLWRI-Final-Supplemental-EIS-to-EPA.pdf.pdf>.
- <sup>33</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021-BIB-IIJA-Title-IX.pdf>.
- <sup>34</sup> IIA §40902(b) provides for that with the following language: (2) FEDERAL BENEFITS.—Before funding a project under this section, the Secretary shall determine that, in return for the Federal investment in the project, at least a proportionate share of the benefits are Federal benefits. (3) REIMBURSABILITY.—The reimbursability of Federal funding of projects under this section shall be in accordance with the reclamation laws. The federal benefits associated with these federal projects may not support more than 50% funding, thus limiting federal project subsidies.
- <sup>35</sup> Under IIA §40902(a)(1)(A)(i) and §40902(a)(1)(A)(ii), §40902(1) feasibility studies are authorized for this project on the basis of prior study authorization (PL 96-375 §2). Under IIA §40902(2)(A) (Congressional authorization required) and §40902(2)(B)(i) (Congressional failure to approve Secretarial construction recommendation) and the similar §40902(2)(C)(i), construction appropriations for the Shasta Dam raise are not authorized by the IIA.
- <sup>36</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021-BIB-IIJA-Title-IX-sec-40901.pdf>.
- <sup>37</sup> <https://valadao.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=495>.
- <sup>38</sup> CLARIFICATION.—No provision of State law shall preclude or otherwise prevent any public water agency, including a public agency of the State, that contracts for the delivery of CVP water from assisting or cooperating with, whether by loan, grant, license, or otherwise, the planning and construction of any project undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation to enlarge Shasta Dam. (WATER for California §305(b)) (See CA Public Resources Code § 5093.542(c).) <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2023-1-9-HR-215-Valdao-sec-305-Shasta-Dam.pdf>.
- <sup>39</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Opposition-Letter-to-H.R.-215-042423.pdf>.
- <sup>40</sup> <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/215/all-actions>.
- <sup>41</sup> <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/AP/AP10/20230615/116119/BILLS-118--AP--EnergyWater-FY24EnergyWaterSubcommitteeMark.pdf>. See page 64, Title V “Water for California” Sec. 501.
- <sup>42</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2023-10-26-Section-531-House-Energy-Water-Approps-bill.pdf>.
- <sup>43</sup> §535 of the House Energy & Water Appropriations bill (H.R. 4943) seeks to preempt California Public Resources Code §5093.542(c). <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2023-10-26-Section-535-House-Energy-Water-Approps-bill.pdf>.
- <sup>44</sup> <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/H.R.-4394-Energy-and-Water-Development-and-Related-Agencies-Appropriations-Act-2024.pdf>.
- <sup>45</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/2023-10-3-Energy-Water-Approps-SAP-veto-excerpt.docx>.
- <sup>46</sup> <https://valadao.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=908>.
- <sup>47</sup> <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/4366>. (This 2024 appropriations bill did not contain provisions preempting the McCloud River protection provisions of the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act.)
- <sup>48</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2023-1-9-HR-215-Valdao-sections-301-305-Shasta-Dam.pdf>. <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2023-10-26-Section-531-535-House-Energy-Water-Approps-bill.pdf>.

- 
- <sup>49</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/2025-1-20-Putting-People-over-Fish-presidential-memorandum.pdf>. (“Putting People over Fish: Stopping Radical Environmentalism to Provide Water to Southern California” Presidential Memorandum)
- <sup>50</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/2025-1-24-CA-water-fire-presidential-EO.pdf>. (“Emergency Measures to Provide Water Resources in California and Improve Disaster Response in Certain Areas” Presidential Executive Order)
- <sup>51</sup> <https://www.headwatersonline.org/the-river-advocate/trump-declares-war-on-california-water>, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FujkhVISVb0>. [43:30 – 44:45]
- <sup>52</sup> <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/house-passes-trump-s-reconciliation-bill-after-shoving-in-larger-medicaid-cuts-at-last-minute/ar-AA1FhX07>.
- <sup>53</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025-5-2-Reconciliation-bill-storage-and-canals-funding-authorizations.pdf>.
- <sup>54</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2019-3-22-SDREP-cost-estimate-from-USBR-manager-Richard-Welsh.pdf>.
- <sup>55</sup> <https://calmatters.org/environment/water/2025/05/shasta-dam-california-water-farmers-trump/>, [https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025-5-19-Opp-Letter-to-Shasta-Dam-Raise-Funding\\_BudgetReconciliation.pdf](https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025-5-19-Opp-Letter-to-Shasta-Dam-Raise-Funding_BudgetReconciliation.pdf).
- <sup>56</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/2025-6-27-the-one-big-beautiful-bill-act-Sec-50501-Water.pdf>. (U.S. Senate “Reconciliation bill”)
- <sup>57</sup> H.R. 1, the 2025 Reconciliation bill; the one big, beautiful bill. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1/all-actions>.
- <sup>58</sup> <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46303>. See especially Table 2 for the percentage of Reclamation’s upfront funding that is recoverable (reimbursable) in rates charged by Reclamation.
- <sup>59</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/central-valley-farmer-ltr-re-obbb-shasta-funds-final.pdf>. There were two press accounts on the preceding letter. <https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article314634086.html>. <https://sjvsun.com/ag/valley-farmers-push-for-trump-to-fund-shasta-dam-enlargement-project/>. This latter press account of the letter drew an addendum from Friends of the River:

The assertion that the “delivery capacity” of Shasta Dam was reduced 40% in the early 1990s is unsourced. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California began construction of its \$1.9 billion, 800,000-acre-foot Diamond Valley Reservoir in 1995 and completed filling in 2003. A number of groundwater storage projects for State Water Project customers have also been implemented in the last “half a century.” Reclamation’s 2020 “environmental impact report” was, in fact, a supplemental environmental impact statement. Environmental impact reports that are prepared by California agencies, California water districts of varying sorts, and non-federal governments for the Shasta Reservoir expansion project are precluded by provisions of the California Wild & Scenic Rivers Act protecting the McCloud River. Its construction is also prohibited. Reclamation’s Central Valley Project delivers around 7,000,000 acre-feet in a typical year. Reclamation’s Shasta Dam raise NED alternative (typically the federally preferred project) is modeled to result in an average 51,300 acre-feet per year of new deliveries. Reclamation provides CVP water service/repayment contractors a supplemental supply that fluctuates as supply availability and demand by other contractors influence delivery possibilities.

<sup>60</sup> <https://www.friendsoftheriver.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2019-3-22-SDREP-cost-estimate-from-USBR-manager-Richard-Welsh.pdf>. (Obtained from and Earthjustice Public Records Act request)

<sup>61</sup> *SLWRI Feasibility Report*, pp. 1-9, 1-20, p. 5-4 table 5-2.