

Barnes, Peter@Waterboards

From: Bob Sloan <bobsloan1@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 5:18 PM
To: Barnes, Peter@Waterboards
Cc: Robert Sloan
Subject: Upper North Fork Feather River Project

Dear Mr Barnes,

The following letter is a copy that I'm sure you have seen before. It reflects my sentiments as to the feather river project. My wife and I have resided in Lake Almanor West outside of the Chester area for the past thirteen years. We have used the lake and it's amenities for the entire time. We value the lake for it's fishing, swimming and boating. During the past years of drought, we have seen the effect of a lower water flow into the lake. the water is not as clear, swimming is not as good with lower lake levels and wildlife seems to have be negatively impacted. Your plan for thermal curtains and pulling colder water out of the lake can only make the lake worse. It will adversely affect water quality, the fishing and boating activity, as well as the economic health of the area.

I recommend you continue to search for other solutions.

Robert Sloan
300 Manzanita Drive
Chester Ca

Peter Barnes
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 2000
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000
E-Mail: Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov

Re: Upper North Fork Feather River Hydroelectric Project Draft EIR

To Whom it May Concern:

I am a resident of Plumas County, writing to express my concerns regarding the State Water Resources Control Board's Upper North Fork Feather River Hydroelectric Project Draft Environmental Impact Report ("EIR").

In general, I find the EIR confusing and unclear. Lake Almanor has been operated for the last 50-some years as a hydroproject. The environment and community has adjusted to this. Now significant changes are being proposed. As I understand it, PG&E, the county, and other stakeholders held extensive negotiations and developed a settlement agreement in 2004. That settlement provided more cold water flows down the river while maintaining enough cold water and suitable lake levels at Lake Almanor so that its recreational benefits would be preserved. For some reason the EIR includes two project "alternatives" that involve thermal curtains and even more water releases that would significantly impact Lake Almanor. Why are *any* alternatives necessary when the proposal to operate per the settlement already provides beneficial changes that will cool the river downstream?

Those that live in and visit Plumas County value the natural resources of Lake Almanor. The EIR's thermal curtain and increased cold water outflow alternatives will significantly impact the fisheries and visual beauty of Lake Almanor. The EIR admits that these alternatives will significantly impact Lake Almanor's fisheries and potentially cause a massive fish kill. Why would the State Water Board consider alternatives that will harm Lake Almanor's

beneficial uses by draining the lake of its cold water? I thought CEQA prevented public agencies from harming the environment. This is bad policy.

The EIR also fails to evaluate the recreational economy that is tied to the Lake Almanor fisheries – an important economic driver in this region. Harm to the fish means harm to the community because fewer people will visit and fish the lake. This will probably result in closed and abandoned businesses and homes, and declining funds for public services. The EIR should not ignore this issue.

I request that you reject the thermal curtain / increased release alternatives and ensure protection of Lake Almanor and the surrounding community.