

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] *Cindy Nease*  
[Address] *2369 Ashley Ave. Prattville, CA*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name] Mike Simmons  
[Address] P.O. Box 1879, Chester, CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] Peter P Candler  
[Address] P O BOX 361  
Westwood • Ca • 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] Virginia Melanson

[Address] P.O. Box 577

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

TINA KANGERGA

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

6 WOODSTONE LN  
CHICO CA 95928

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,



[Name] Cathy Simmers  
[Address] P.O. Box 1879, Chester CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name] JEFFREY E. LESEUR  
[Address] 460 4th AVE CHESTER, CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, *Gail Andersson*  
[Name] *366 meadow Brook Loop # 5*  
[Address] *Chester Calif 96020*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

  
Wildwood

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2/05

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] Kelvin Cambai  
[Address] Wildwood

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]   
[Address] Wildwood apt 14 st

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name] Kathleen Harrington

[Address] 366 - Dilleysbrook Loop  
Chico, Ca. 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

*Florence Blankenship*  
*Wild Wood*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:16

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

*Steven Veitch*

[Name]

*STEVEN VEITCH*

[Address]

*366 Meadow Brook Loop Apt I*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

  
8170 DEER BROOK CT. RENO NV 89523

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,



[Name]

Noah Berry

[Address]

~~176~~ 189 Lake Almanor west, L.A.W. Ca.

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

*Elaine V. Lee*

[Name]

[Address]

*6681 Dyer Dr  
Lake Almanor, Ca. 96020*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
*4616 KATHLEEN DENISE LANE, Reno, NV 89503*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfrf\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfrf_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, *W. Stegall*

[Name]

[Address] 3581 PARK-HILL DR LAKE ALMANOR CA

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:17

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,   
[Name] 209 LASSEN DR  
[Address] POB 1195 WESTWOOD CAL 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:18

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

 346 OSPREY LOOP CHESTER, CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:18

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

Robert Johnson  
6830 Almanor Lake Est. Dr  
Lake Almanor, CA

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name] Dick Mankey  
[Address] 240 Lake Almanor West, Chester, CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] John & Alisa Tower  
[Address] 3214 Woodlake Lake Almanor 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

Josh Rapoport  
720 2nd Ave  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, *E. Joan Tunquist*  
346 Meadowbrook Loop  
Chester, CA 96020

[Name]  
[Address]

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

*K Dennis McEvans*  
*214 Creeksaver Dr*  
*Lake Almanor CA*  
*96137*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name] Sherry JOHNSTON  
[Address] P.O. BOX 479, CHESTER, CA 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

*Monna Lancia*

[Name]

[Address]

*P.O. Box 1310 Chester, Ca*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, 

[Name]

[Address]

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,



[Name]

[Address]

MIKE DOMINISSIE 492 BAILEY CREEK DR,  
LAKE ALMANOR, CA 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,   
[Name] P.O. Box 361  
[Address] Chester Ca - 96020

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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

**Re: Upper North Fork Feather River Hydroelectric Project Draft EIR**

Dear Mr. Barnes:

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 (DEIR). It is my understanding that the Water Board's function is to help protect the environment, and that an EIR is intended to ensure that environmental damage is avoided. However, what I find in this particular document seems to be contrary to that fundamental direction.

I object to increased cold water removal from Lake Almanor. Whether it would reduce river temperatures to the desired level many miles downstream is an unproven theory, but it would absolutely damage the cold water fishery in the lake. Spoiling one part of the environment for a potential improvement in another part does not seem like a rational action for a State agency.

I believe that it would be irresponsible for the State Water Resources Control Board to require either of the two alternatives found in the DEIR. They both ignore the true upstream environmental impact, as well as the social and financial impacts. In my opinion, the State review process has failed to address the key issues in a reasonable manner. The DEIR should be rejected.

Sincerely,

*Wanda Brummer*  
*134 Lake Almanor W.D.R.*  
*Chester, CA 96020*

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely, *Wanda Crumme*  
[Name] *134 Lake Almanor W. Dr.*  
[Address] *Chester CA 96020*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

  
[Name] Robert C Eberhardt  
[Address] 3254 Dayton Rd Chico 95928

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,



[Name]  
[Address]

1802 Palm Ave  
Chico Ca  
95926

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

*Robert C Eberhardt*  
*3254 Dayton Rd Chico Ca 95928*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] *Nicholas Canella*  
[Address] *229 Maywood Chester*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
PERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

*Sandra Thompson* 1101 Hidden Beach Rd  
Lake Almanor, Ca. 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] Syndi Bright  
[Address] 410 Cedar Westwood

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] *Justin Lawler*  
[Address] *410 Cedar St*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]  
[Address]

*Dei Ragan*

*3027 Evergreen Crk  
Lake Almanor CA  
96137*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unfrf\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unfrf_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,


[Name]

[Address]

*Debbie Petersen*  
*205 Lakeview Dr. Lake Almanor Ca 96137*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]



<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] RANDY MARTIN  
[Address] 220 FIRST STREET CHESTAR CA 96020  
Randy Martin

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,



[Name]

Dan Rickert

[Address]

462-755 Clear Creek Dr Clear Creek 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] CURTISS J HOAG  
[Address] 3671 ILLINOIS AVE  
CORNING, CA 96021

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

  
<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)



PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:19

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name] *Geoff Foss*  
[Address] *PO Box 178 Chester, CA*

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC 2/05

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:20

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,

[Name]  
[Address]  


Brenda Edwards  
3693 Parkhill Drive  
Lake Almanor, CA 96137

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)

PB  
FERC  
2105

March 26, 2015

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 26 AM 11:20

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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").<sup>1</sup> 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.

Sincerely,  RANDY ARBOGAST  
[Name] 702 CLIFFORD DRIVE  
[Address]

<sup>1</sup> The EIR is available online at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/water\\_quality\\_cert/unffr\\_ferc2105\\_eir.shtml](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/unffr_ferc2105_eir.shtml)