

PB  
FERC 2105

STATE WATER RESOURCES  
CONTROL BOARD

2015 MAR 20 AM 11:39

DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
SACRAMENTO

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

[Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov)

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

Dear Mr. Barnes,

Attached please find the text of the letter drafted by our management team here at the Lake Almanor Country Club. I feel our management has done an excellent job of succinctly summarizing the major concerns that all of us who call Lake Almanor home have over the possibility of a thermal curtain (or any other control system which would divert the cold water pool from our lake). While I wholeheartedly endorse their letter, I have a few other points I would like to add to their summary:

I think we can all agree, given the length of time we have been discussing this certification process, that the wheels of our regulatory system turn very slowly indeed. If either of these Alternatives are implemented, I doubt very much, once it is determined that the loss of cold water is having a negative impact on the fisheries and/or the health of the lake, that we would be able to react quickly enough to be to change course before irreparable harm is done to the environment. I am afraid that, once we reach the "tipping point" where the fish are dying off and the algae is taking over the lake, it will be too late to easily reverse course.

I also think the point needs to be made that there is a distinct possibility of indirectly and adversely impacting the habitat of the many animals, which call this area home. As an example, Lake Almanor is an important nesting ground for a large population of Grebes. We also have good sized populations of Osprey and Bald Eagles. All of these birds (and many others) directly depend on a healthy fish population to thrive. If the possible damage to the lives and livelihood of all the residents of and visitors to Lake Almanor isn't enough to justify abandoning these Alternatives, perhaps concern over the risk to our native wildlife populations would cause the decision makers to think twice.

Lastly, I would much rather see the significant sums of money required to implement these Alternatives, which we, the rate payers for PG&E, will have to bear (adding insult to injury), spent on projects which would more directly and decisively have a positive impact on the environment. Let's face it, mankind does not have a stellar record of anticipating the long term consequences of our actions, when we mess with Mother Nature. I can't help but feel that this project is progressing, not because anyone thinks it is an excellent idea, but rather because we feel we "have to do something". Undertaking a project, which carries with it potential serious environmental consequences, for the mere *possibility* that it *might* have a minor positive impact many miles downstream, seems especially foolhardy.

Thank you for the time you are taking to assure that all our concerns are integrated into the decision making process surrounding this certification process.

Best Regards,



Mark Johnson  
937 Lassen View Drive,  
Lake Almanor, CA 96137  
530-259-4664

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

[Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Peter.Barnes@waterboards.ca.gov)

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

Dear Mr. Barnes,

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

My main issue with the Draft EIR is that I find very little in the report regarding the impacts this project, and the proposed Alternatives, will have on the quality of my life. I strongly disagree with the statement that increasing the water temperatures of Lake Almanor will not have a "substantial impact". I live here and my personal experience has been contrary to your findings. With several years of drought I have seen firsthand the negative effects that an increase in water temperature has on the lake. We are experiencing more algae than in the past, which in turn reduces the clarity of the lake. I fear that any activity that further reduces cold water in the lake will greatly reduce the cold water fisheries that have made Lake Almanor one of the best fishing destinations in the State of California. My observations are supported by data in the final draft of the Lake Almanor Water Quality Report, 2015.

Increased water temperatures, increased algae, and reduced fisheries will have a devastating negative impact on the local economy, which is dependent upon tourism and already suffering. When I consider all of the negative impacts this project will have on the local economy and environment, I wonder what the impact will be on my quality of life and property value. Will more local businesses close? Will I lose needed services, such as our hospital, as a result of a worsening local economy? Will we lose the one thing that has brought us all here – the enjoyment of Lake Almanor?

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