

Parks, Jeff@Waterboards

From: Allen Green <friendsofpinecrest@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 3:35 PM
To: Parks, Jeff@Waterboards
Cc: Keri Green
Subject: Comment Letter - Pinecrest Conditions Workshop
Attachments: DSC00274 Pan PerpTrans UpPlatform 5 redo.jpg; DSC00280 EasyLeft 4.jpg; DSC00379 PanBottomTrans 6.jpg; DSC00380 EasyLeft 6.jpg; DSC00486 PanUpperADA 5.jpg; DSC00492 EasyLeft 6.jpg

State Water Resources Control Board

Division of Water Rights

Attn: Jeffrey Parks

P.O. Box 2000

Sacramento, CA 95812

RE: Spring Gap – Stanislaus Hydroelectric Project; FERC No. 2130

Pinecrest Lake Level Workshop – Sonora CA – October 4, 2012. Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors Chambers.

Dear Mr. Parks, In addition to the earlier letter sent to you I am making these additional comments based upon items brought up, or not brought up, at the Sonora Workshop.

This was presented in my earlier letter to you and the Board Members, however it did not come up at the Workshop.

A substantial amount of water is being used during the construction of the Highway 108 Bypass - sprayed on the dirt to keep the dust down. These water trucks, are taking water directly from TUD/PG&E's distribution system. They appear to be of the 4,000 gal. size. It has been told to one person that they are using approximately 5 such trucks and that each one makes approximately 10 trips per day dispensing their water.

Obviously if TUD was able to get by this drought summer without needing any more water, as authorized by the SWRCB, even with this very large additional water usage, someone is over estimating TUD's real need.

We again contend that the agreement already in place has demonstrated that it was reasonably constructed and that under drought conditions it worked.

Attached are pages from the Lake Level Report that shows the lake shore at a number of locations and lake levels. It is quite easy to see that at levels below 5606 the lake shore is no longer hospitable and suitable for much recreational use.

The claim that the lake level has been much lower many times may be correct. However it does not prove that the recreational use were not impacted. We now know that the lake level was not very well controlled prior to PG&E refacing the dam in 2002/2003. Water leakage through the dam accounted for the lower lake levels in prior years. You should not use any lake level value prior to 2002 to determine maximum lake levels.

Despite claims that at low lake levels mitigation efforts would compensate for loss of recreational value. We do not agree. The mitigation is not done for the entire shoreline and as such does not have full merit.

Rocks submerged at some lake levels show up at various locations in the lake, many of them are not near the designated beaches, but do present a hazard to boating.

Statements that larger water draws from Pinecrest are needed to maintain crops in the county are specious. We see many locations where new agricultural products are now being grown. We can see that the record breaking almond crop apparently was not hurt by the 'drought of 2012'. Many farmers are beginning to look at alternate crops that require less water. Is anyone able to really project what might happen to local agriculture, or the weather for that matter?

The biggest reason for keeping the current agreement in place is the reluctance of TUD to address the large loss of Pinecrest Lake water. Instead of showing how they are going to reduce these losses, we see projections well into the future years where the losses remain the same in percentage, i.e., approximately 40%, plus an additional 16% of processed water. We cannot allow changes to be made to the original agreement based upon '**what if**' considerations.

How can the SWRCB allow this utility to remain stagnant on this question -- show us what you are going to do to correct this situation?

Thank you for you additional consideration.

Sincerely,

--

Allen Green, PE
Friends of Pinecrest
PO Box 1173
Pinecrest, CA 95364
[209 965-4784](tel:2099654784)
Cell: [916 216-2844](tel:9162162844)











