

Barnes, Peter@Waterboards

From: Leslie Larson <leslie@larsonbennett.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 10:43 AM
To: Barnes, Peter@Waterboards
Subject: Draft EIR, PG&E Certification UNFFR Project NO 2105

Mr. Peter Barnes, Engineering Geologist
State Water Board Resource Control Board, Division of Water Rights
Water Quality Certification Program
P.O. Box 2000
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov

RE: Draft EIR, PG&E Certification UNFFR Project NO 2105

Dear Mr. Barnes,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the above mentioned project. My concern is that Alternatives 1 and 2 will have a devastating negative impact on my community, the surrounding communities, the local economy, and the environment.

The Draft EIR contains very little with regard to the impacts of this project. Yet, the proposed Alternatives will have a dramatic impact on the lake which currently supports thriving plant & animal communities as well as a significant portion of Plumas County's population. I strongly disagree with the statement that increasing the water temperatures of Lake Almanor will not have a "substantial impact".

I live here and my personal experience has been contrary to your findings. With several years of drought (and no one is claiming that the drought or climate change is over) I have seen firsthand the negative effects that an increase in water temperature has on the lake. We are experiencing more algae than in the past, which in turn reduces the clarity of the lake. Any activity that further reduces cold water in the lake will greatly reduce the cold water fisheries here. In turn, this will affect the food chain that relies on these fisheries. It seems we are sacrificing one ecosystem for a minimal, at best, positive effect on the downstream ecosystem. Why does this make sense? My observations are supported by data in the final draft of the Lake Almanor Water Quality Report, 2015.

Further, increased water temperatures, increased algae, and reduced fisheries will have a devastating negative impact on the local economy, which is dependent upon tourism and already suffering. It's about more than the fishermen! Algae has already resulted in warnings of swimmers itch, making the lake downright unusable for the other half -- people who boat, water ski and swim. Since it's impossible to predict when "swimmer's itch will happen, tourism will simply dry up. The consequences of this on the local economy and on real estate values -- *and tax revenues for Plumas county* -- are enormous and resoundingly negative.

When I consider all of the negative impacts this project will have on the local economy, Plumas county and the environment, I wonder what the impact will be on my quality of life and property value. Will more local businesses close? Will I lose needed services, such as our hospital, as a result of a worsening local economy? Will we lose the one thing that has brought us all here -- the enjoyment of Lake Almanor? **Would you do this to Lake Tahoe?**

In conclusion, I am OPPOSED to Alternatives 1 & 2, as described in the Draft EIR, and I believe that pursuing these Alternatives is unreasonable and reckless. I urge the State Water Board to only consider the PG&E project, as submitted and approved in the Settlement Agreement of April 22, 2004, without the additional release of cold water from Lake Almanor.

Sincerely,

Leslie Larson & Mike Bennett

1117 Lassen View Drive

Lake Almanor Peninsula, CA 96137