

## **Barnes, Peter@Waterboards**

---

**From:** Douglas Ghiselin <ghiselin@vom.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 24, 2015 11:58 AM  
**To:** Barnes, Peter@Waterboards  
**Cc:** Supervisor Thrall; Aaron Seandel; Dennis Mason; LACC Office; Douglas Ghiselin  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft EIS

Mr. Barnes:

I am writing you with regards to the proposal to remove cold water from Lake Almanor in an effort to reduce the downstream water temperature of the North Fork of the Feather River. **I am opposed to alternatives 1 and 2 as described in the draft EIR.** I urge the State Water Board to consider the UNFFR project as submitted and not require additional release of cold water from Lake Almanor.

However, when reading the draft EIR, one does not need to read very deeply to conclude that the recommendation will be to remove cold water from Lake Almanor to reduce water temperature several miles downstream from Canyon dam. I believe this recommendation has significant potential for adverse impact on the quality of water in Lake Almanor, and thus will have significant impact on the beneficial uses of Lake Almanor which are set forth in table 2-1 of the draft EIR. The draft EIR states that the State Water Board must ensure that UNFFR Project operations, including any water quality measures designed to benefit the North Fork Feather River, will not unreasonably affect water quality in Lake Almanor.

The draft EIR sets forth significant scientific discussion relative to the water quality in Lake Almanor and concludes that the proposed alternatives 1 and 2 will not have a substantial impact on water quality in Lake Almanor. Scientific studies, such as the draft EIR, result in conclusions based on the opinions of researchers who have technical expertise in the particular field of science being studied. Such scientific studies are followed by tests that either confirm or deny the study's conclusion. I see no such requirement in the draft EIR. The draft EIR contains much technical data relative to Lake Almanor water quality that can be used as a baseline. I ask that, if the final EIR endorses removal of cold water from Lake Almanor, it also require in depth simultaneous testing to confirm/deny the conclusion that removal of cold water from Lake Almanor does not have an adverse impact on the beneficial uses of Lake Almanor. Please note that a significant beneficial use of Lake Almanor as set forth in table 2-1 is its fishery. I propose that, for the first several years, such testing require the gathering and evaluation of data every two weeks when cold water is removed from Lake Almanor. The results should be published quarterly and made available for public review with an annual presentation to the public in Chester, California.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments.

Sincerely,

Douglas R. Ghiselin  
1045 Peninsula Drive  
Lake Almanor Peninsula, CA  
[ghiselin@vom.com](mailto:ghiselin@vom.com)

mailing address:  
300 Moon Mountain Road  
Sonoma, CA 95476