

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

- - - - -x  
COMMENTS on the DRAFT :  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT : FERC No. 2105  
STATEMENT for the UPPER :  
NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER :  
PROJECT, CALIFORNIA :  
- - - - -x

Masonic Family Center  
Yorkrite Room  
1110 West East Avenue  
Chico, California 95926

Wednesday, October 20, 2004

The above-entitled matter came on pursuant to notice  
at 1:17 p.m.

1       BEFORE:

2           JOHN MUDRE, Facilitator  
3           Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
4           888 First Street, N.E., Room 51-19  
5           Washington, D. C. 20426

6

7       From The Louis Berger Group, Inc., Contractor:

8           Frankie Green, Senior Environmental Scientist  
9           655 Cherokee Heights Road  
10          Tallassee, Alabama 36078  
11          (334) 857-3595, voice/fax

12          Brian Mattax, Senior Aquatic Scientist  
13          12011 Bellevue-Redmond Road, Suite 200  
14          Bellevue, Washington 98005-2471  
15          (425) 467-6111, ext. 132, voice; 451-7800, fax

16

17

18       From the Applicant, Pacific Gas & Electric Company:

19          Scott Tu, Ph.D.  
20          Hydro Generation Department  
21          Mail Code N11D  
22          P. O. Box 770000  
23          San Francisco, California 94177-0001  
24          (415) 973-9320, voice; 973-5323, fax

25

26

## P R O C E E D I N G S

(1:17 p.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. MUDRE: Okay. I think we're going to go  
4 ahead and get started. We have another good turnout here  
5 today, and that's good to see. My name is John Mudre. I'm  
6 with the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission, on the staff.  
7 And we're here today for public meetings on the Draft  
8 Environmental Impact Statement for the relicensing of the  
9 Upper North Fork Feather River Project.

10 Before we get into taking public comments,  
11 though, I want to just provide some background information  
12 on FERC. And then we're going to give a little, a little  
13 bit of talk and then get to the public comment section.

14 The Federal Regulatory Energy Commission is an  
15 independent agency that regulates electric power, natural  
16 gas, oil pipelines, and the hydroelectric industry. The  
17 Commission is composed of five Commissioners that are  
18 appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. And  
19 the President designates the Chairman.

20 As I mentioned, the Commission administers  
21 nonfederal hydropower projects. We have regulatory  
22 responsibilities over those through the Federal Power Act.  
23 For hydropower FERC is organized into three groups. We have  
24 the one group that issues licenses and relicenses for  
25 hydropower projects.  
26

1                   Then we have the compliance and administration  
2 group. And what they do is they make sure that, once we  
3 issue a license, that the licensee carries out all the terms  
4 and conditions that are in the license. And they're also  
5 the ones that process license amendment applications.

6                   We also have a very active dam safety and  
7 inspections program that ensures public safety at the  
8 licensed projects.

9                   Our main office is in Washington, D.C. We have  
10 five regional offices that are composed mainly of  
11 engineering types. The regional office that has  
12 jurisdiction over the Upper North Fork Feather River Project  
13 is the San Francisco Regional Office.

14                   Can everybody hear me okay?

15                   [SPEAKERS]: Um-hum. Yeah. Okay.

16                   MR. MUDRE: Again, the Commission can issue  
17 licenses for terms ranging from 30 to 50 years. And  
18 licensed projects have to serve the public interest. It's  
19 not just how much generation a licensee can get out of a  
20 project, but we have to consider recreational aspects,  
21 environmental aspects, cultural resources, a whole suite of  
22 resource issues that we need to balance in our licensing  
23 decisions.

24                   I want to give you just a brief overview of the  
25 licensing process. It starts out when the license applicant  
26

1 files his license application. Once we get that in, we look  
2 it over and make sure it has all the components in there  
3 that the laws say that it has to and make sure that it's  
4 adequate. If it's not, we can request additional  
5 information.

6 Once we have all the information we have need, we  
7 then conduct our own independent analysis of the proposed  
8 project. And in most cases for our licenses that involves  
9 the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

10 Then after we do that, the Commission decides  
11 whether and under what conditions to issue a license for the  
12 project. Once we've issued a license, the applicant has to  
13 decide whether they want it or not. And, as I mentioned  
14 before, licenses can be amended once they're issued. So the  
15 license can change over the 30- to 50-year term.

16 I want to mention the Commission is not the only  
17 agency that can affect these hydropower licenses. There are  
18 other agencies, both federal and state, that can impose  
19 mandatory conditions on a license. We have to include these  
20 conditions in a license and we have no discretion to change  
21 them.

22 Examples of this would be 4(E) conditions that  
23 the Forest Service can provide that protect Forest Service  
24 lands.

25 The State Water Resources Control Board has to  
26

1 issue a water quality certificate before we can issue a  
2 license for a project. And we have to include the  
3 conditions of that 401 water quality certificate into the  
4 license.

5 Endangered Species come into play a lot of times.  
6 The Department of Interior or the National Fishery Service  
7 can give us some conditions to protect Endangered Species.  
8 Interior and National Marine Fishery Service can also  
9 prescribe fishways at a project for upstream or downstream  
10 fish passage. And we would have to include those in the  
11 license.

12 Ideally we consider all these recommendations and  
13 conditions in our environmental impact statement, but not  
14 always. Sometimes these don't come in until after we've  
15 completed our environmental impact statement. The water  
16 quality certificate is one example.

17 In many instances the State Water Quality Control  
18 Board has to, because the issuance of a water quality  
19 certificate is a discretionary action on their part, they  
20 have responsibilities under the California Environmental  
21 Quality Act. They have to perform an environmental impact  
22 report a lot of times to support their water quality  
23 conditions. And so sometimes that comes in after our EIS  
24 because they want to see our EIS and maybe use some of that  
25 to satisfy their CEQA responsibilities.

26

1           If we get any big surprises in the water quality  
2 certificate, for example, we may have to do a supplemental  
3 or a supplement to our EIS. We can't change the mandatory  
4 conditions, but oftentimes they could be appealed in other  
5 venues. There are appeal recourses to fishway prescriptions  
6 or water quality certificates that can be pursued if an  
7 applicant or someone else doesn't like the outcome.

8           Okay. There are a lot of people here that are  
9 interested in what's called the thermal curtain. And I want  
10 to just talk about that briefly right now.

11           In the relicensing of the Rock Creek-Cresta  
12 Project, which is downstream of the Upper North Fork Feather  
13 River Project, as I'm sure most of you know, Pacific Gas and  
14 Electric Company agreed to study and to potentially  
15 implement measures to provide cooler water to the Rock Creek  
16 and Cresta reaches of the Feather River. So they executed a  
17 Settlement Agreement with a number of other parties. And  
18 they agreed to do these things.

19           The Commission said in its licensing order:  
20 Well, you can agree to do that, but we can't include some of  
21 that in the Rock Creek-Cresta license, particularly the  
22 portions that pertain to the Upper North Fork Feather River  
23 Project.

24           One of the things they were considering was  
25 making modifications to the Prattville Intake. And the  
26

1 Commission said, 'Well, we're not going to put that in the  
2 Rock Creek-Cresta license because it involves another  
3 project. And, basically if you want to do something up  
4 there, that's going to need to be considered in the context  
5 of the Project 2105 or the Upper North Fork Feather River  
6 Project.'

7 Now that could occur in this relicensing, or it  
8 could occur afterwards as a license amendment. The  
9 important thing to note at this time is that we have  
10 received no proposal from Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
11 to make any modifications to the Prattville Intake. So, to  
12 some extent, you know, a lot of the concerns, at least from  
13 our standpoint, are premature.

14 Now there may be, you know, other agencies that  
15 it's not premature for because they're -- and I'm sure  
16 you'll hear a lot of this, but there are collaborative  
17 groups working to try to come up with solutions to this.  
18 And some of those involve other resource agencies. But at  
19 this time there's nothing before the Federal Energy  
20 Regulatory Commission that involves any changes to the  
21 Prattville Intake.

22 If and when we do receive a proposal to modify  
23 Project 2105 facilities or operation, what we would do is we  
24 would issue public notice and request public comments on the  
25 proposal. Then we'd conduct our own independent  
26

1 environmental analysis of that proposal and ultimately  
2 decide whether or not to approve it.

3 And that's all I'm going to say about that for  
4 now.

5 Let's see. What I want to do next is I've got  
6 with me today Frankie Green from the Louis Berger Group and  
7 Brian Mattox. And they're contractors to the Commission and  
8 helped in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact  
9 Statement.

10 Before we get started with that, though, I want  
11 to mention that the two people over here, they're our court  
12 reporters. They're recording everything that we say here  
13 and they're going to produce transcripts that will be put  
14 into the Commission's official record for this project.

15 So all of the comments that people make here are  
16 going to be recorded and transcribed so that the Commission  
17 can rely on them in their decisionmaking process.

18 So it's important when you get up to speak that  
19 you identify yourself clearly for the record. It may  
20 involve spelling your name. I want to make sure we speak  
21 slowly so, you know, they can make sure they get a good  
22 record of what you want to say. I think that's it as far as  
23 that goes.

24 Transcripts can be obtained from these people  
25 over here, if you want to talk to them after the meeting.

26

1 They'll also be available on the Commission's website in  
2 about two weeks, so you could also obtain them there through  
3 our Public Reference Office. If you need them sooner than  
4 that, you can get them from these people.

5 So at this time I'm going to turn the meeting  
6 over to Frankie Green. And she's just going to briefly  
7 explain how we got here, what we're doing here, and what  
8 happens next.

9 MS. GREEN: Thank you, John.

10 Just briefly, our agenda for today's meeting.  
11 Introductions. I think John's gone over the introductions  
12 for those of us who up here at the front. And if anybody  
13 would like to speak or provide any comments, then you would  
14 need to introduce yourselves for the court reporter.

15 I'll talk a little bit about the purpose of  
16 today's meeting, the history of this proceeding, how we got  
17 to this point with this Draft Environmental Impact  
18 Statement.

19 I'll tell you a little bit about the basis of our  
20 analysis and our conclusions in the Draft Environmental  
21 Impact Statement and let you know what's going to happen  
22 next.

23 So the purpose of our meeting today is to receive  
24 oral and written comments from all of you and also from  
25 agencies or nongovernmental organizations on this Draft  
26

1 Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper North Fork  
2 Feather River Project.

3 Key milestones along the way and how we got to  
4 this Draft EIS, I'll just go over those briefly. On October  
5 23rd, 2002 Pacific Gas and Electric Company filed their  
6 application to relicense the Upper North Fork Feather River  
7 Project.

8 On December 26th of that year the Commission  
9 issued a notice accepting the application and also  
10 soliciting motions to intervene or protest.

11 April 25th of 2003, the Commission issued Scoping  
12 Document 1 to identify issues and alternatives for analysis  
13 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

14 In May of last year, the 21st and the 22nd, we  
15 prepared a -- excuse me -- we held a site visit and scoping  
16 meetings. I think several of you were at those scoping  
17 meetings at that time.

18 After looking at all the information we received  
19 in scoping, as well as what was filed with the license  
20 application, we submitted a -- or, excuse me -- issued an  
21 Additional Information Request in June of last year.

22 And then on August 7th of last year, the  
23 Commission issued the Scoping Document 2, which addressed  
24 the comments we received on our Scoping Document 1. Later  
25 that summer Pacific Gas and Electric Company provided  
26

1 responses to those Additional Information Requests.

2 On August 25th, 2003 the Commission issued its  
3 notice that they were ready to proceed with an environmental  
4 analysis of the Upper North Fork Feather River Project.

5 On March 5th of this year Pacific Gas and  
6 Electric Company filed its Draft Project 2105 Relicensing  
7 Settlement Agreement. There were several collaborative  
8 parties. I'm sure many of you are familiar with the  
9 Settlement Agreement.

10 On April 30th of 2004 Pacific Gas and Electric  
11 Company filed the signed Final Settlement Agreement.

12 September 7th of this year, Pacific Gas and  
13 Electric Company withdrew its 2003 Request for Water Quality  
14 Certification from the State Water Resources Control Board  
15 and then refiled a new application on that same day, which  
16 restarted the one-year clock to take action on the Water  
17 Quality Certificate.

18 September 13th, the Draft Environmental Impact  
19 Statement for this project was issued by the Commission.

20 On September 14th, the Commission requested a  
21 biological opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,  
22 pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. If any  
23 of you have had an opportunity to review the Draft EIS,  
24 you'll know that there are some threatened and endangered  
25 species that are affected by this project.

26

1           On September 15th, the Commission issued public  
2 notice of the Settlement Agreement which had been filed in  
3 April of this year and requested comments on the Settlement  
4 Agreement. Also on that day FERC sent a 10(J) letter to the  
5 U.S. Department of Interior seeking to resolve potential  
6 inconsistencies with that agency with the Federal Power Act.

7           And then now we're here at the public meeting on  
8 the 20th of October.

9           So the basis for our analysis and our conclusions  
10 in the Draft EIS: The National Environmental Policy Act  
11 requires the Commission to conduct an independent analysis  
12 of environmental issues. Our analysis considered: Water  
13 quality, fish and wildlife, recreation, cultural resources,  
14 socioeconomics, as well as electric energy and other  
15 developmental values.

16           We gave strong consideration to the protection,  
17 mitigation, and enhancement measures that were included in  
18 the Project 2105 Relicensing Settlement Agreement. And our  
19 conclusions and recommendations are based on the public  
20 record for this project.

21           There were three alternatives we considered in  
22 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The first one was  
23 the action proposed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company in  
24 its license application, as well as in the Settlement  
25 Agreement that was filed with the Commission.

26

1           We also looked at a staff-recommended  
2 alternative. There were several of the elements of the  
3 proposed action, as well as some additional  
4 staff-recommended measures.

5           And there was also the No-Action Alternative that  
6 was considered. And what that actually means is that the  
7 project would consider as it has operated for the past 50  
8 years. No operations would change. It would stay as it is,  
9 not that the project would go away.

10           If anyone has any interest in what is on the  
11 public record for this project, and that is exactly what the  
12 Draft Environmental Statement was based on, you can access  
13 that information through the FERC website. And it's there  
14 on the screen: [Www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov). And when you go to the FERC  
15 website you use the eLibrary link and select "General  
16 search" and enter the docket number, which for this project  
17 is P-2105, and follow the instructions.

18           However, if you still have trouble getting to the  
19 public record, you can always call that number there. It's  
20 a toll free number.

21           I think most of you are familiar with the  
22 location of this project. There are three reservoirs: Lake  
23 Almanor at the very top, Butt Valley Reservoir, and then  
24 there is a small forebay down at Belden.

25           There are also five powerhouses: The Butt Valley  
26

1       Powerhouse, Caribou Powerhouses 1 and 2, the Oak Flat  
2       Powerhouse, and the Belden Powerhouse.

3               There are also several recreational facilities  
4       associated with this project and other fish passage --  
5       excuse me -- not fish passage, some other elements.

6               So what happens next, now that this Draft  
7       Environmental Impact Statement has been issued? Comments  
8       are due on the Draft EIS on November 1st. Comments on the  
9       Settlement Agreement are also due on November 1st. We're  
10      also expecting to get a response from the Department of  
11      Interior on the 10(J) inconsistencies on November 1st. We  
12      hope to resolve the 10(J) issues by December of this year.

13              The Biological Opinion from the Fish and Wildlife  
14      Service is due January 31st of 2005.

15              If everything comes in as expected and we have no  
16      big surprises, we hope to issue a Final Environmental Impact  
17      Statement for this project in March of next year.

18              We're not exactly sure when the Water Quality  
19      Certificate will be issued from the State Water Resources  
20      Control Board. The final 4(E) conditions should be filed by  
21      the Forest Service in May of 2005.

22              Once the Water Quality Certificate has been  
23      received, only then can the Commission issue a license order  
24      for this project.

25              If you haven't had an opportunity to review the  
26

1 EIS and you'd like to obtain a copy, we do have a few with  
2 us today, or you can contact susan Dupree at the  
3 Commission's Public Reference Division. And her number's  
4 there on the screen. Or you may write her at the Commission  
5 in Washington, D.C. There's no charge to obtain a copy of  
6 the Draft Environmental Statement. You may also contact  
7 John Mudre at the Commission. There's his phone number, or  
8 you may email him at that email address on the screen. And  
9 you can always get that from one of us following the  
10 meeting.

11 Please remember that comments must be submitted  
12 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement no later than  
13 November 1st, 2004. If you do decide to submit written  
14 comments, make sure at the top of the first page of your  
15 filing you include the name of the project, the Upper North  
16 Fork Feather River Hydroelectric Project, and the number,  
17 the project number, FERC Number 2105-089. And you need to  
18 submit all of those comments to the Secretary of the  
19 Commission in Washington, D.C.

20 So that's it. I just want to remind everybody of  
21 the project location, if anybody had any specific comments.

22 MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much, Frankie.

23 Let me mention all those phone numbers and  
24 addresses that just flashed by on the screen, they're also  
25 provided in our Public Notices and everything. So you  
26

1 should be able to get those or, if you need to get them, see  
2 us after the meeting and we can give them to you.

3 I think what I want to do now is, since there is  
4 a lot of interest in the thermal curtain, I'm going to have  
5 Scott Tu from Pacific Gas and Electric Company just give  
6 everyone an update on some of the analyses that they've been  
7 doing pursuant to that Rock Creek-Cresta Settlement  
8 Agreement, what types of alternatives they've been looking  
9 at, just basically an update on where they are with that and  
10 maybe some sort of schedule as to when they might be  
11 wrapping up those analyses and coming up with some  
12 recommendations.

13 So at this point I'm going to turn the meeting  
14 over to Scott Tu.

15 DR. TU: Hi. My name is Scott Tu, T-, as in Tom,  
16 -u.

17 Tom Jereb, who is the Project Manager, couldn't  
18 be here today because of a family emergency matter. So I'm  
19 here today to give this presentation. It'll take about five  
20 minutes to go through.

21 Now I'm just going to give you what's gone on in  
22 the past several years, what study we have conducted to  
23 study the feasibility of cold water on Lake Almanor. And  
24 then here's a quick general background about the study.

25 The study includes three projects: The Upper  
26

1 North Fork Feather River, 2105; and also downstream would be  
2 Rock Creek-Cresta Project, 1962; as well as at the very low  
3 end of the Feather River, North Fork Feather River, the  
4 whole project.

5 Now the current North Fork Feather River water  
6 temperatures aren't affected by the project operations in  
7 2105. These water temperatures are a major concern of the  
8 resource agencies. Next slide.

9 So the involvement with the majority of the  
10 resource agencies involved include the California State  
11 Water Resource Control Board, California Department of Fish  
12 and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest  
13 Service, the Park Service, and the National Marine Fishery.

14 Now the principal regulatory driver of this issue  
15 relies on the Rock Creek-Cresta license issued by the FERC  
16 in late 2001. And also in late 2000 we also had a  
17 Settlement Agreement for the Rock Creek-Cresta license.  
18 These are the primary regulatory drivers. And these,  
19 according to these regulatory drivers, the license condition  
20 number 4 specifically reads: In order to reasonably protect  
21 cold fresh water habitat, licensee shall maintain daily  
22 water temperatures of 20 degrees Celsius or less in the Rock  
23 Creek and Cresta reaches, to the extent the licensee can  
24 reasonably control such temperatures.

25 The Settlement Agreement, as was signed in late  
26

1 2000, it requires the creation of a Prattville Intake, water  
2 temperature control unit. Now the determination to  
3 ultimately control the Prattville Intake water temperature  
4 control measure is currently being discussed among the  
5 resource agencies and interested parties. So there's no  
6 proposal yet.

7 I'll give you a quick background about Lake  
8 Almanor and the Prattville Intake. Here's an old topo map  
9 that was obtained back in 1910. It shows the Big Meadow  
10 area. Basically Lake Almanor now as we found it, as you can  
11 see, consists of two arms. The western arm is called  
12 Chester arm; it's generally very shallow. And the Eastern  
13 arm, or Hamilton arm, is much deeper. Most of the cold  
14 water is stored in this arm.

15 Now to give you an orientation, here is the  
16 Prattville Intake that our water is currently taking out for  
17 primary power generations. Here's the Canyon Dam which will  
18 release the water, put it down through the canyon, North  
19 Fork Feather River Canyon.

20 Some of the temperature there that we got, and  
21 how this is to be driven at. It just gives you some idea  
22 about how the temperatures varies with space. That is, to  
23 look at the temperature from top to bottom as well as from  
24 one location to another.

25 Now PG&E has been monitoring the temperature  
26

1 monthly since 2000 in the summertime. Here are eight  
2 locations we've been monitoring monthly. Here are two  
3 central profiles that we obtained in the year 2000. To the  
4 left is June 22nd of 2000. To the right is July 20th. And  
5 these eight profiles, as you can see, pretty much collapse  
6 into one curve. Particularly, you're moving into summer.  
7 So in July, mid-July, it's all pretty much just one profile  
8 that can be used to depict the entire data on a temperature  
9 profile. So the Lake Almanor profile really varies with  
10 depth. It doesn't matter where you are in space.

11 And also notice in the summertime, the top water,  
12 say, the top 30 feet of water is where there's warm water.  
13 The temperature is about 21 degrees and as high as 25  
14 degrees.

15 This warm water stays on top of the cold water,  
16 which is around 9 to 10 degrees, 9 to 11 degrees. And in  
17 between is a very rapid change in temperature which is  
18 called "thermocline." This is area is very important for  
19 cold-water habitat.

20 So here is also -- you look at the temperature in  
21 space. Now we also want to show how the temperatures change  
22 with time. Now the stratification develops probably in  
23 early June. And this stratification becomes fully developed  
24 in July and August. At this time this upper arm develops  
25 stratification in June and July on the bottom, bottom  
26

1       portion of the lake.

2                   By about October they will turn over, and it  
3       becomes eventually complete isothermal, isothermal, a  
4       completely uniform temperature for the entire lake in  
5       November and December. And this is very typical of a larger  
6       lake. And it happens each and every year. And we have data  
7       from DWR for the past ten years.

8                   Now here PG&E has formed a group of consulting  
9       firms to study the concept. This includes PG&E's staff, and  
10      Bechtel for an extra study that studies the temperature in  
11      the reservoir. We also asked the University of Iowa to help  
12      us to study this hydraulic model, which I want to talk about  
13      later on.

14                  And then Black and Veatch helped us to put this  
15      construction cost per unit, engineering and construction  
16      costs, which was evaluated by the University of Iowa. We  
17      have Jones and Stokes which studied the lake, the cold-water  
18      habitat in Lake Almanor associated with the Feather River.

19                  And, finally, we have Tom Payne and Associates,  
20      which traced the water from the lake all the way through the  
21      entire Feather River downstream to give you a perspective of  
22      how the temperature of the water varies.

23                  So these are the teams we put together to study  
24      this concept. Now the alternatives we studied include this  
25      floating curtain. It's about 50 feet in depth of different  
26

1 size and different locations. We have studied the submerged  
2 short-hooded pipe, as well as some dragging material to  
3 enhance the cold water into the Prattville Intake.

4 So here is a map showing the temperature  
5 formation of the lake. As you can see, the dark color is  
6 where it gets deeper. So most of the cold water is in the  
7 Hamilton Branch arm compared to the Chester arm. And you  
8 see the area right here, that's about two miles by three  
9 miles. That's where we studied this hydraulic model. And  
10 the reason we wanted to study the hydraulic model is to  
11 study how to modify the Prattville Intake to take the map  
12 there and pull water out from this modification.

13 These are just some of the pictures showing the  
14 construction of the model, hydraulic model, at the  
15 University of Iowa, the flooring. The skill model is laid  
16 out to get accurate temperature information. And also  
17 notice this cold-water channel.

18 This cold-water channel was dug out back in the  
19 1920s, at which time PG&E was trying to increase the  
20 capacity of the Prattville Intake by tapping into an  
21 Hamilton Branch arm. So this cold-water channel has been  
22 built in the model.

23 And you also can see some of the coil being built  
24 in the middle of the hydraulic model, because we want to  
25 control the heat conductions. And also this is just another  
26

1 way, another picture showing the cold-water channel is in  
2 the process of being built. So it's a very sophisticated  
3 plumbing system.

4 Here's the finished product of the hydraulic  
5 model. Roughly it's about 80 feet long, about 50 feet wide,  
6 about three feet in depth. Here's the Prattville Intake.  
7 Here is our cold, incised cold-water channel leading to the  
8 Hamilton Branch arm on the bottom, far off to the left.  
9 Here's the peninsula, and along the peninsula here is the  
10 Chester arm.

11 Now the floating curtain. Now this concept is  
12 not the first of its kind. The U.S. Bureau has studied this  
13 way back and built it in 1973 in California. Where? In the  
14 Whiskytown Reservoir. This curtain, this is the same as  
15 PG&E's proposed -- not proposed, but to study. It's about a  
16 block about 2500 feet long or 30 meters long. But this  
17 curtain is about 30 meters deep.

18 So it basically consists of several flotation  
19 tanks with buoys to stabilize it. And the curtain would be  
20 just expanded to meet this floating chamber up to about 30  
21 feet, and at which this basically blocks the warm water from  
22 the top, allowing the cold water from the bottom of the  
23 curtain.

24 Here is another view. Now in the hydraulic  
25 model, we studied a different size of curtain. In the end,  
26

1 the University of Iowa recommends the number 4 as the most  
2 promising curtain in terms of the size and location to  
3 produce the cold water for the Prattville Intake.

4 In the study it also recommends -- there are some  
5 levees on top of this cold-water channel. This cold-water  
6 channel was dug out back in the 1920s. At that time the  
7 channel was simply dug out and they just extracted the  
8 materials. They laid them on the bank of the riverbank  
9 forming up small levees.

10 Now this levee is roughly about three to five  
11 feet in height. The channel itself is about 50 feet, and  
12 it's about five feet in depth. So these levees actually act  
13 as a barrier to permit some of the cold water entering the  
14 Prattville Intake. So Iowa has recommended removal of some  
15 of these levees as part of the enhancement.

16 Here's a diverse view high on the proposed  
17 curtain, showing the pink color in there. Okay. To give  
18 you an idea about the size of it, fully north of this is the  
19 resort, just a little north of this proposed site. And this  
20 yellow line is just showing the curtain in the low-speed  
21 zone. And this will be a new speed zone just imposed in  
22 front of the other curtains.

23 Again, this shows the entire lake. That is where  
24 the curtain is going to be.

25 MR. PROTSMAN: Proposed.

26

1 MS. [SPEAKER]: Proposed.

2 DR. TU: Pardon me?

3 MR. PROTSMAN: Proposed curtain, please.

4 MR. [SPEAKER]: Scott, I think you want to  
5 clarify that PG&E has not submitted this to FERC yet.

6 DR. TU: Yes. We have not submitted this to  
7 FERC. This is proposed by the University of Iowa.

8 MR. [SPEAKER]: Why not the University of  
9 California?

10 DR. TU: The -- well, let me go on.

11 The result of modeling. This is a result of the  
12 study from the hydraulic model under August conditions.  
13 August is probably the most critical conditions in terms of  
14 providing cold water for downstream, simply because August  
15 the water surfaces are lower in the summer. And under the  
16 existing conditions, the temperature going through is not  
17 very high. It's going to be about 21.2 degrees.

18 With the curtains and partial removal of the  
19 levees, the temperature is not very high. There are 16  
20 groups. And the other alternative was a long or  
21 short-hooded pipe with only channel modification. If you  
22 look at this number, the second options produce the most  
23 promising in potential benefit.

24 Now this is a study done by Jones and Stoke,  
25 where they studied, we all know, Lake Almanor when you take

26

1 the cold water out, it's going to impact the cold-water  
2 habitat. So we want to know how much water is being  
3 impacted. So this is a study where we considered both the  
4 dissolved oxygen, as well as the temperature with and  
5 without the Prattville Intake curtain, how this is going to  
6 be changed.

7 This figure shows under the existing conditions,  
8 without the curtains. The picture to the left is a  
9 dissolved oxygen profile. To the right is the temperature.  
10 Under the existing conditions shown at the dashed line with  
11 the Prattville curtain that's shown by the solid line. So  
12 generally you can see, with the curtain in place, the  
13 thermocline, which is a layer between the warm water and  
14 bottom water, it's going to pull it down by zero to ten  
15 feet.

16 Now this study gives the final result. Under the  
17 existing conditions we know, based on the data we've been  
18 monitoring for years, that annual stratification,  
19 antistratification occurs each and every year.

20 During the summertime in the reservoir the  
21 cold-water habitat is confined in a narrow bandwidth near the  
22 thermocline by two parameters: Dissolved oxygen and  
23 temperature. By this study where we could find the physical  
24 habitat or the cold-water habitat is by these numbers, the  
25 dissolved oxygen has to be greater than five milligram per  
26

1 liter; the temperatures are less than 22 degrees. That  
2 parameter is where you find the bandwidth.

3 By the summertime, under existing conditions, the  
4 water capacity will be reduced to roughly about a  
5 hundred-thousand-acre feet. And the model is able to  
6 capture the significant trend of this behavior. With this  
7 model then we went one step further, to study what would  
8 happen with the curtain.

9 So honestly with the curtain in place we found  
10 the water-surface area, there will be no change because  
11 we're simply pulling the same amount of water from the lake  
12 except from different strata of the lake. And the  
13 thermocline, I have already shown you, when we pour, we  
14 lower like zero to ten feet. And the surface-water  
15 temperature was increased by zero to 25 degrees Celsius.

16 Now the change of thermocline and surface-water  
17 temperature will be the natural variation. What I called  
18 "natural variation" is what we actually studied over 33  
19 years of operations and defined under the existing  
20 Prattville Intake conditions how this thermocline changed  
21 from one year to another for the entire 33 years. That is  
22 why we called it "natural variations."

23 Then we define, with the curtain in place, how  
24 this views changes to the existing conditions.

25 Now we found that it produced insignificant  
26

1 change for the cold-water feasible habitat, compared to over  
2 or natural seasonal reductions. We wanted to define this  
3 insignificant change through the collaborative process with  
4 2105 for the Rock Creek-Cresta.

5 And also with the curtain we are able to bring  
6 the lower temperature from the intake and put it in the Butt  
7 Reservoir. At the same time the dissolved oxygen is also  
8 much lower than it used to be. By the model, under the  
9 existing conditions, temperature, this is dissolved oxygen  
10 entering Butt Reservoir through the Butt Lake Powerhouse.

11 Under the existing conditions in the summertime  
12 around June through July, September, the flow is roughly  
13 about six to seven times a year.

14 Now the same thing for this stipulates to be able  
15 to maintain seven, eight times a year. With the proper  
16 curtain, it will not only bring the colder water, but also  
17 lower the DO content. So the DO is going to be bring down  
18 some of that, too.

19 Then we take this water for the Rock Creek-Cresta  
20 and pull it downstream. They are very interested. They  
21 say, well, what benefit will be downstream? So we route  
22 this water all the way from Lake Almanor, Butt Valley, send  
23 it all the way through the entire Feather River. So zero  
24 mile defines the Canyon Dam and mile 50 is where the North  
25 Fork of the river is just above this.

26

1                   So these are the temperature profiles along the  
2 Feather River under the various structures. And I will show  
3 you.

4                   Now here we have shown under the August  
5 conditions, no more August, no more meteorological  
6 conditions. We have four profiles here. The top line  
7 represents, again, the existing condition without any change  
8 in the Prattville Intake. Just pick up where you can still  
9 look at Rock Creek. Rock Creek ends right over here. Okay.  
10 Here is the Butt Creek Powerhouse.

11                   So under the Prattville Intake the temperature in  
12 normal hours, August, is roughly about 21 degrees, slightly  
13 less than 21 degrees. As was shown here, the dashed line,  
14 which is at 20 degrees, as stipulated in the Rock  
15 Creek-Cresta Settlement Agreement, with the curtain, Butt  
16 Lake and Lake Almanor, which is shown by this triangle where  
17 it would bring down less than 20 degrees. Then also we look  
18 at the other curtain intakes, two curtain and three curtain.  
19 Each has different incremental benefit.

20                   So, generally speaking, with the curtain in Lake  
21 Almanor where it would meet the Rock Creek, below 20  
22 degrees, that's under normal conditions. But under the  
23 extreme, August, which is under dry water years or warmer  
24 with temperature under existing Prattville conditions is  
25 hovering around about 22 degrees.

26

1                   With curtains in Prattville Intake it will bring  
2 down. It's going to still be about 20 degrees, but it's  
3 going to be between 20 and 21 degrees. And that's the rest  
4 of it.

5                   So this information is still in progress. So our  
6 next step is to condense this information and continue to  
7 work with the 2105 Collaborative Group, as well as with the  
8 Rock Creek-Cresta Ecological Resource Committee, and the Poe  
9 Relicensing Collaborative Group. So it's still a  
10 work-in-progress. And as soon as we get the final revision,  
11 we'll supply it to FERC.

12                   MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Scott, for providing us  
13 some of the results of some of the analyses that you've been  
14 doing on different alternatives that might be able to be  
15 implemented to remove cold water from Lake Almanor and  
16 provide it to some of the downstream reaches.

17                   We asked Tom Jereb at last night's meeting that  
18 -- you know, I was interested in the schedule that the group  
19 may have for reaching some conclusions, finishing up their  
20 analyses, and maybe being in the position to make some sort  
21 of recommendation one way or the other. And I think he  
22 indicated it would be one to two more months before any  
23 sorts of decisions could be made on how they want to proceed  
24 with this.

25                   He also indicated that they're looking at other  
26

1 potential ways of providing cold water to downstream  
2 reaches, which includes things like increasing shading along  
3 the east branch of the Feather River, and there are some  
4 other measures that he's looking at. You can look at the  
5 transcripts, I think, from last night's meeting, you know,  
6 to get a better listing of those, because I want to go ahead  
7 and get along to the public comment section before we take  
8 up too much of your time with this.

9 But thank you again, Scott.

10 And I think at this point we want to go ahead and  
11 get started. I think we have a question in the back --  
12 excuse me. Here's what we're going to need to do.

13 If you're going to speak and ask questions,  
14 you're going to need to come up to the microphones in the  
15 front. I don't know if you have a procedural question or  
16 what, but why don't you come up and ask your question, and  
17 then we'll get back to -- yes.

18 MS. DETWEILER: My name is Theresa Detweiler.  
19 And my question is actually about the study. It said that  
20 it had an insignificant impact on the cold-water habitat.  
21 And I'd just like to clarify if that is the cold-water  
22 habitat within the deep part of the lake and what impact is  
23 it going to have on the upper, warm layer of the lake?

24 MR. MUDRE: Okay. Well, I can answer that.

25 MS. DETWEILER: Okay, thank you.

26

1                   MR. MUDRE: And the answer to that is that we're  
2 not here to discuss or interpret what some of these studies  
3 have said or not said. We're going to go ahead and get  
4 people's comments. This -- you know, people can even -- I'm  
5 sure even -- see, the FERC hasn't been privy to any of these  
6 studies and collaborative groups because we have ex parte  
7 regulations that basically say that anything that we do in a  
8 contested proceeding has to be in a public meeting, or  
9 something like that. And these collaborative groups have  
10 been meeting separately. So we don't know what they've been  
11 up to. And that was part of the reason we wanted to bring  
12 them on to the agenda for a last item tonight, so we can get  
13 some of this information into our public record.

14                   But I don't think it serves the purpose of  
15 everyone here to debate some of these modeling studies and  
16 what they mean at this point.

17                   MR. BABER: John, I think -- my name is William  
18 Hugh Baber, III. Bill Baber. And I have just a question of  
19 -- Scott actually made at the end of his little proposal. I  
20 understand that when you're finished with all of your work,  
21 your graphs and your determinations, Scott, you'll be making  
22 a proposal on behalf of PG&E to FERC as to whether or not to  
23 do the thermal curtain alternative. Is that correct?

24                   MR. MUDRE: Well, I could probably answer that,  
25 too.

26

1 MR. BABER: Okay.

2 MR. MUDRE: Maybe a little more to people's  
3 liking than the last one I answered, but --

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. MUDRE: -- if they want to make any changes  
6 to what they're doing, to the structures or operations of  
7 the Project 2105, they have to get our approval to do it.  
8 So if they decide that they want to do something and that's  
9 not a given, they will have to come to us with their  
10 proposal.

11 And, as I outlined earlier, you know, we need to  
12 give it a hard look and decide whether or not it's in the  
13 public interest. And we'll take all these people's concerns  
14 into account at that time.

15 MR. BABER: So our comments today on the thermal  
16 curtain are relevant and necessary for your bench rule  
17 decision as to whether or not --

18 MR. MUDRE: Well, --

19 MR. BABER: -- they're going to accept PG&E's  
20 proposal, if they make it?

21 MR. MUDRE: To some extent, you know, at this  
22 point they're premature because there is no proposal,  
23 specific proposal, that we can look at. That being said, we  
24 understand that it is an important issue for a lot of people  
25 and, you know, we're willing to hear comments on it. I mean

26

1       they will inform us to some degree.  It's good information  
2       for us to have and, at the same time, though it is a little  
3       premature since we do not have anything and we may not have  
4       anything in front of us.

5               MR. BABER:  I understand that, John.  But PG&E  
6       has done a lot of work already with their graphs, analyzing  
7       this thermal curtain, and it's out in the public now.  So  
8       it's a possibility.

9               Is that right, Scott, for PG&E?

10              MR. MUDRE:  It's a possibility.  There's no  
11       question about that, but it's not -- it's not something  
12       that's, you know, ripe for us to look at.  So at this point  
13       let's get on with the meeting, and the comments, and things  
14       from like that.  And you can come up again and say, but  
15       there are a few things I need to do first.

16              MR. BABER:  Okay.  Fine.  Thank you.

17              MR. MUDRE:  Can that wait a couple of minutes,  
18       sir?

19              MR. [SPEAKER]:  I beg your pardon?

20              MR. MUDRE:  Can that wait a couple of minutes?

21              MR. [SPEAKER]:  Yes, it can.

22              MR. MUDRE:  What I want to do at this point is we  
23       have some representatives of Congressman Doolittle and  
24       Herger and State Senator Aanestad here.  And we wanted to  
25       give them the opportunity to make their comments first.  And  
26

1 then we will move on to the comments of everyone else.

2 So whichever one of you guys wants to go ahead  
3 and lead off.

4 MR. OEHLER: Alex Oehler from Congressman  
5 Herger's office.

6 MR. [SPEAKER]: Do you have a PA system, to turn  
7 it on? We can't hear back here.

8 MR. [SPEAKER]: No, that won't do it.

9 MR. OEHLER: Did you get my name? Oehler,  
10 O-e-h-l-e-r.

11 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

12 MR. [SPEAKER]: Does that work for people?

13 [SPEAKERS]: Yes. Turn around.

14 MR. OEHLER: Well, I'm kind of addressing FERC,  
15 but I'll just be quick because I understand that you guys  
16 want to make some comments. And, frankly, I think it's more  
17 important to hear what you guys have to say than necessarily  
18 what we have to say, because really what we're going to do  
19 is just reflect everything that we are hearing from the  
20 public.

21 And something -- you know, first of all, I thank  
22 you very much for coming and holding the meeting here. It's  
23 incredibly important that -- you know, based on what we have  
24 heard around our congressional district, I almost think that  
25 you should hold one in every single county that we  
26

1 represent, because we have been hearing -- we represent, for  
2 those of you who don't know, all the way from Yolo County  
3 all the way to the Oregon border. I don't think that  
4 there's been a place that Congressman Herger has been where  
5 he hasn't heard about this.

6 And you think about all the things that are in  
7 the news, the war in Iraq and, you know, what's going on  
8 with the presidential election, it seems like that single  
9 most important issue that we're hearing from people is that  
10 we are opposed to this thermal curtain.

11 And so, you know, I appreciate that you guys have  
12 a process that you go by, and I understand that. But I  
13 think it's profoundly important the things that these people  
14 have to say about this thermal curtain are certainly  
15 expressed and recorded. Obviously we're here to do that  
16 today.

17 If I could just share with you what I have  
18 experienced, I don't know if you have seen the kind of broad  
19 and deep opposition to a proposed project like we're seeing  
20 here. And I understand this is not a part of the project  
21 currently, that it's just being considered. I'm just  
22 wondering how productive it is to continue to consider  
23 something that is receiving such overwhelming opposition.  
24 And I wanted to --

25 (Applause.)

26

1                   MR. OEHLER: I just wanted to offer Congressman  
2 Herger's office and I know that the elected officials from  
3 the State Senate, the Assembly, Congressman Doolittle's  
4 office, who -- actually Lake Almanor is in his district.  
5 It's my understanding that Senator Feinstein is sending a  
6 representative or is planning on making comments in this  
7 regard, that she is hearing from the public, but I really  
8 can't speak on her behalf.

9                   But, like I said, we have just been literally  
10 blown away by the amount of opposition that there is to this  
11 project. So I wanted to offer us, and I'm sure I can speak  
12 for the other elected officials in this regard that if  
13 there's anything that we can do to help work through this,  
14 we certainly want to do that because the amount of  
15 opposition to this thermal curtain that we are seeing is  
16 just really remarkable.

17                   And I did want to clarify something. In the  
18 slides that you presented you mentioned that there is sort  
19 of mandates that the other agencies, including the State,  
20 can put on FERC to issue a license. And so the mandate is  
21 reducing water temperature that's coming from the State; is  
22 that correct? The State is not mandating this thermal  
23 curtain and it's up to FERC whether or not we would proceed  
24 on something like this; is that right?

25                   MR. MUDRE: Well, I hesitate to speak for the  
26

1 Water Board. The Water Board has their basin plan. And  
2 their basin plan has classified the Upper North Fork of the  
3 Feather River as a cold-water habitat. And so they would  
4 like to see colder, cooler water in that stretch of the  
5 river.

6 MR. OEHLER: Okay.

7 MR. MUDRE: I don't know -- I don't think any  
8 group is wedded to any particular mechanism for providing  
9 that cold water. You really need to --

10 MR. OEHLER: Okay. Let me just -- let me just  
11 interject if I can, because I think that, from my  
12 perception, the public is solidly wedded against this  
13 thermal curtain.

14 MR. MUDRE: Right.

15 MR. OEHLER: So if we're trying to reduce water  
16 temperatures and if the public is an important player in  
17 this process, which I believe profoundly that they are, then  
18 I think what we need to do is put our heads together. And I  
19 can't imagine that we can't come up with another way to meet  
20 these State mandates, because certainly the opposition to  
21 this thermal curtain is something that we've seen from Yolo  
22 County all the way up to the border, like I said, because  
23 people in this area treasure Lake Almanor, the facility.  
24 It's a really special place. And, you know, I think that  
25 when there's this kind of opposition, solid opposition to  
26

1 something, I think it should hit us all and we should take a  
2 second look at doing perhaps something else.

3 MR. MUDRE: Right. That makes a lot of sense.  
4 And, as I mentioned before, it's a little premature before  
5 FERC because we don't typically get involved in things until  
6 something lands on our plate.

7 MR. OEHLER: Right.

8 MR. MUDRE: However, as I said, there are  
9 agencies working and collaborating with groups.

10 MR. OEHLER: Right.

11 MR. MUDRE: And I'm sure that, you know, they  
12 would be the ones to contact at this point in time.

13 MR. OEHLER: And I respect that you guys have a  
14 policy. Elected officials, we don't have the luxury of  
15 saying, well, this is just simply something that we can't  
16 address, when virtually everyone is sending us letters,  
17 calling us, emailing us, faxing us, knocking on our door  
18 saying: This is something that we're opposed to. And this  
19 is something that's not even in our district. But so many  
20 of our constituents own property up there and recreate up  
21 there, that it's something that's important to us. So thank  
22 you very much. Appreciate it.

23 MR. MUDRE: You're very welcome.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. JENSEN: My name is Brian Jensen,  
26

1 J-e-n-s-e-n, with Congressman John Doolittle. And I want to  
2 just echo some of the things that Alex mentioned because  
3 we've experienced very much the same thing. And that is I  
4 don't know of another issue in recent memory that has  
5 resonated with the folks in and around Lake Almanor and the  
6 people that use Lake Almanor in the way that the  
7 not-proposal-yet idea of a thermal curtain has done. And  
8 really it's generated a degree of opposition that I have not  
9 see mirrored in other examples.

10 So I think it is important that, despite the fact  
11 that I acknowledge that, and this is not a formal proposal  
12 from PG&E to FERC, and it's not necessarily the point in the  
13 process where FERC would make a decision on this. But I  
14 think, as Alex said, that it is important that perhaps in  
15 the interests of saving a lot of money and time in  
16 researching a solution to what is a need to have cooler  
17 water in the river downstream, that perhaps we invest our  
18 efforts and resources in other ways of achieving that.

19 And so I just want to mention that Congressman  
20 Doolittle, like Congressman Herger, simply could not support  
21 something that has the possibility of degrading a place like  
22 Lake Almanor or Butt Valley Reservoir in a way that is going  
23 to be damaging to the environment, to the fisheries  
24 upstream, as well as to the socioeconomic conditions in and  
25 around that area.

26

1           And so, again, echoing what Congressman Herger is  
2           experiencing here, this is something that has widespread,  
3           very deep opposition, as is going to be evidenced here very  
4           shortly, I imagine.

5           But I think it's in the best interests of FERC  
6           ahead of time, so to speak, to be aware of these concerns,  
7           and for PG&E as well. And by no means does Congressman  
8           Doolittle fault PG&E for exploring these various proposals  
9           for meeting a need that is there. However, I think it's in  
10          everyone's interest that the same kind of effort and  
11          resources are invested in to pursuing some of the  
12          alternatives to this problem.

13          And, frankly, if you're looking to spend \$53  
14          million on some water infrastructure, we have a few  
15          suggestions for you.

16          (Laughter. Applause.)

17          MS. DAVIS: My name is Kim Davis, and I'm  
18          District Representative for Senator Sam Aanestad. Thank you  
19          for allowing us to be here today to speak.

20          The Senator met with Art Baggett about a week and  
21          a half ago about this very issue and expressed the concerns  
22          that you heard yesterday and you're going to hear today.  
23          And we will continually be in contact with the State  
24          Resources Control Board on this issue. And we are here for  
25          the constituents.

26

1           I do want to echo that this is probably one of  
2 the most -- well, it's one of the most opposed issues that  
3 we have faced here in California. And the only other thing  
4 I can see relevance to is the Klamath Basin. And we all  
5 know what happened with that issue, and that was in Oregon.  
6 And we were closely tied and a lot of people in our state  
7 went up to Oregon to help support those people.

8           So the senator is looking for some real science.  
9 He wants to make sure that either the thermal curtain or any  
10 other alternative does not decimate one environment to help  
11 another. In absence of any real science, we do not feel  
12 that this alternative should be pushed.

13           I don't know if it's proposed or not proposed.  
14 You said it's not proposed, but the license there said it  
15 was proposed, so I'm not really sure what the correct  
16 language for that should be.

17           The thermal curtain does not also appear to be  
18 fiscally responsible, especially in light of the fact that  
19 there are some preliminary results out from the Iowa State  
20 University [sic] study showing that lowering the temperature  
21 in Rock and Cresta River reaches in the manner of the  
22 thermal curtain is questionable. It just doesn't seem that  
23 the cost-benefit ratios are balancing out.

24           There's also responsibility to the community that  
25 is just now recovering from the environmental hit that the  
26

1 timber industry took. This very industry, the timber  
2 industry, supported the region for many years. And damage  
3 done to any of the lakes up there would be environmentally  
4 irresponsible and would have severe socioeconomic impacts.

5 There is a growing number of opposition. The  
6 responsible action would be to work with the local  
7 governments and the communities, and taking into serious  
8 consideration some of the other alternatives.

9 In conclusion, in yesterday -- in today's paper,  
10 yesterday a Forest Service member employee stated that, yes,  
11 the thermal curtain, is an alternative and can't be  
12 dismissed because it's unpopular. This statement appears to  
13 diminish the very serious environmental concerns being  
14 brought forward, the type of mindset is disturbing. And it  
15 is our hopes that the government agencies we will be working  
16 with will have more of an open mind in seeking the best  
17 environmental solution possible.

18 Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MS. PETERSEN: I am Kristen Petersen from  
21 Assemblyman Rick Keene's office. And I echo everyone who is  
22 sitting here today. We have received so many letters, and  
23 so many signatures on petitions, and things like that.

24 I have been attending the 2105 Collaborative  
25 meetings and I have met with many of you. We have met with  
26

1 the State Water Resources Control Board and are working with  
2 them. We've also met with PG&E representatives in trying to  
3 come up with another solution, because we are not supportive  
4 of the idea of the thermal curtain. And I just want to take  
5 this opportunity to say that in this public forum.

6 Please continue to contact us if you have  
7 questions and to continue to have a dialogue with FERC and  
8 PG&E and the other interested parties.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. LaMALFA: Good afternoon. I'm Assemblyman  
12 Doug LaMalfa from the Second District. And I thank you  
13 folks for holding this meeting here today in the Valley, so  
14 it's accessible to a lot more people down here.

15 I'm going to deviate from my prepared statement  
16 here because it'll just be more echoes. I think that --  
17 well, first of all, it's a personal issue for me and my  
18 family. We've been landowners there since 1957 in the Lake  
19 Almanor area. But beyond the personal, it's extremely  
20 important that whatever the result is of this process, that  
21 it's fair to everybody and that it produces a viable result,  
22 a good result.

23 And, as we've heard many times, that there's very  
24 dubious science involved with any process here that attempts  
25 to lower the water temperature one degree in order to cause  
26

1 less stress on fish. And the other side of the coin being  
2 opening up ten different cans of worms on other  
3 environmental effects to other species, possibly causing  
4 algae and other growth in the lake. It's just I don't think  
5 well thought out, even though this proposal is really -- not  
6 really a proposal. It's some kind of...some kind of ghost  
7 proposal here, anyway.

8 But I know it's a process we have to go through,  
9 and I respect FERC. You have a job to do. PG&E has a job  
10 to do. They're in the business of generating electricity,  
11 not necessarily trying to figure out what's best for  
12 lowering the water temperature one degree, or causing kids  
13 to go to camp, or building parks in the urban areas, as they  
14 have been tasked by PUC and others to do.

15 So I'm bothered by the process that when there's  
16 a license due, that everybody seems to be able to jump into  
17 the game and get their piece out of it before we can get the  
18 license redone.

19 And, you know, again, I know you folks have to go  
20 through a process and deal with folks at the State level  
21 here. And so that's -- our job as State legislators is to  
22 get the Water Quality Control Board to rethink what the  
23 process is, perhaps redoing this as a warm-water basin  
24 instead of a cold-water basin, looking at the science  
25 involved here, that if -- can these goals be achieve, even  
26

1       -- no matter what the process we come up with, what fix of  
2       lowering water temperature, and is it truly justified.  
3       Because I think the root core of this thing is that because  
4       there's a dam there, everybody thinks that we've caused some  
5       kind of activity to change the nature of the waterflow.

6                 Well, it has caused change, but what if the dam  
7       wasn't there. We wouldn't even have the possibility of  
8       regulating flow, causing things to happen. That could  
9       outweigh the positive things that happen that outweigh the  
10      negative at the existence of the dam and the generation  
11      facilities. So that needs to be taken into account in the  
12      science of this whole process, something that is very sorely  
13      lacking.

14                So I believe there should be no more time or  
15      resources wasted on the thermal curtain ghost proposal. Any  
16      such continuation on this particular proposal is  
17      counterproductive. And the focus must be moved to  
18      alternative solutions that exist. But, first of all, that  
19      the science, that the need is there, even before we chase  
20      more alternatives, in my view.

21                As Vice Chairman of the Natural Resources  
22      Committee in the State Assembly I have had the opportunity  
23      to witness many proposals intended to help the environment  
24      but without solid science to back them up. We ought not  
25      make the same mistakes here.

26

1           Everything I've read and learned about the  
2           proposed curtains, I believe the justification for the  
3           project is not sound. The arguments made on its behalf are  
4           entirely unconvincing based on the documentation.

5           I urge this panel to reject the thermal curtain  
6           as a proposed solution for the water temp issue that is  
7           under discussion. As stated, I am fully aware that the  
8           curtain has not been recommended as the remedy to the  
9           proposed water-temp issue at Rock Creek-Cresta regions.

10           However, it's important for you to know that the  
11           FERC Number 2105 DEIS has perpetuated a proposal that I  
12           cannot support and I will vigorously oppose the thermal  
13           curtain should it be advanced to a formal proposal.

14           Thank you.

15           (Applause.)

16           MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much. And, you know,  
17           some of this I think may be due to semantics. A lot of  
18           times when scientists are doing work, they have proposed  
19           alternatives. And I think those -- that is the lexicon that  
20           Dr. Tu was speaking from, as opposed to a proposal from PG&E  
21           to us to actually do something. So I don't know what  
22           purpose will be served by arguing whether this is a proposal  
23           or it isn't a proposal.

24           So let's go on with getting some comments in.  
25           Let me mention that if you do have a prepared statement,  
26

1 after you speak if you could give it to the court reporters,  
2 that will help them when they do their transcription to make  
3 sure that everything gets in there accurately.

4 Now at this point do we have any other elected  
5 officials, representatives of elected officials, or  
6 representatives of Tribal governments here? Bill Dennison.

7 Anyone else?

8 Okay, Bill.

9 MR. DENNISON: Thank you. Thank you very much,  
10 Scott. I am William N. Dennison, Plumas County Supervisor,  
11 District 3, which encompasses the Lake Almanor area; also  
12 the Chairman of the Plumas County Appointed 2105 Committee  
13 that's been working on this for too long. Over two and a  
14 half years, as a matter of fact.

15 I want to voice what we've heard from Congressman  
16 Doolittle, Congressman Herger, Senator Aanestad, Assemblyman  
17 LaMalfa, and Assemblyman Keene. Couldn't have said it any  
18 better. Couldn't have said it any more forceful. So you  
19 have Plumas County's me-too on that one.

20 You need to know that Plumas County initiated the  
21 2105 Licensing Group. We were involved. We're the ones  
22 that said, 'Let's be collaborative.' And we came to an  
23 agreement on April 23rd of this year with this  
24 Collaborative. We were very pleased to do that.

25 And you have taken that Settlement Agreement into  
26

1 your consideration, and we appreciate that very much as  
2 well. Never did we think that the license would be delayed  
3 as much as it was. We might have taken longer with our  
4 Settlement Agreement had we known. But that bothers us,  
5 that this might go on for an indeterminate time to help the  
6 waters down below. But it's a process. We understand that.

7 Today I would like to provide you with copies of  
8 two documents I will give you in a moment. One, I guess I  
9 need to say the same thing as the others have said, though,  
10 that we recognize that this is not anything but a ghost  
11 submission at this time. But nonetheless it's so important  
12 because it's been shown for so long that we cannot help but  
13 -- not debate it, but talk about it, that have been  
14 considered by one group or another since 1996 on whether or  
15 not there should be a thermal curtain.

16 And it's noted a dozen times or more in the DEIS,  
17 so we know that we need to take it seriously. Because of  
18 the potential devastation to the ecology, the fisheries of  
19 Lake Almanor and Butt Lake Reservoir, Plumas County has  
20 taken this very seriously and our comments are directly  
21 related to the Draft Environmental Statement.

22 Now today I'd like to provide you two copies, as  
23 I said. One is called, "Biological Issues Associated with  
24 the Contemplated Lake Almanor Water Temperature Curtain at  
25 the Prattville." That's a scientific document by Mr. Vogel.

26

1 And Dave Vogel is a senior scientist, natural resource  
2 scientist in North California.

3 And I'll give you also "The Plumas County  
4 Resolution 04-0776" that was passed by the Plumas County  
5 Board of Supervisors by a five-to-zero vote on October 12th.

6 Mr. Vogel has noted that this same thermal  
7 curtain proposal was brought to FERC in the early 1990s.  
8 And, most important, November 1st of 1996, the Draft  
9 Environmental Impact Assessment for the Rock Creek-Cresta  
10 relicensing, PG&E and the Department of Fish and Game said  
11 separately, they concluded that equal or greater protection  
12 and enhancement of the North Fork of the Feather River  
13 Fishery resources would result if PG&E provides funding,  
14 funding for fishery-enhancing projects than if PG&E fulfills  
15 the agreement.

16 They go on to say, "Therefore, California  
17 Department of Fish and Game and PG&E have agreed to amend  
18 the agreement by deleting the requirement to modify the  
19 Prattville Intake structure." 1996.

20 After millions of dollars of further modeling,  
21 the end results to us recently indicate that there is still  
22 only the potential of lowering the water temperature by  
23 about one to one and a half degrees 40 miles downstream.

24 Now the only difference between then and now is  
25 that we -- today and what it was in 1996, is that we now

26

1 recognize that the two pristine trophy lakes will be  
2 sacrificed at the cost to the PG&E ratepayers. Not PG&E,  
3 not the government, ratepayers.

4 And the price has increased since 1996 from \$5  
5 million to \$53 million. That's the reason, folks, that we  
6 have to continue with this. We have to be on top of this  
7 issue, because a thermal curtain, whether it's called a  
8 ghost or real, it's still a serious issue for Plumas County  
9 and better be for the State of California.

10 Mr. Vogel's report includes the following  
11 statements. Quote: Based on documents reviewed, I conclude  
12 that the potential benefits from the thermal curtain that  
13 may result in the Rock Creek-Cresta reach are vague and  
14 speculative. Most importantly, none of the documents  
15 provide any clear description of the fishery resource  
16 tradeoffs between presumed increased trout growth during  
17 late summer for an unknown number of fish in the North Fork  
18 Feather River, bypass reaches, versus the adverse effect  
19 that impacts this substantial trout fishery in upstream  
20 reservoirs.

21 He said that prospective analysis had never been  
22 made.

23 This circumstance is most attributable to a lack  
24 of detail on modeling assumptions, limitations, and the  
25 absence of a comprehensible integration of modeling  
26

1 scenarios for various alternatives under consideration for  
2 temperature control.

3 Now those tradeoffs, the benefits to the Rock  
4 Creek-Cresta fisheries versus a devastation of Lake Almanor  
5 and Butt Reservoir should have been evaluated, should have  
6 been evaluated before we went to all the cost of having the  
7 Iowa State [sic] bathtub modeling that was done in Iowa  
8 State University.

9 Now I'll give you the written notice. I won't go  
10 through the whole thing.

11 Next I want to just briefly review the Plumas  
12 County Resolution that was done with great forethought. And  
13 what they've done in the Resolution -- I see John looking at  
14 his watch. This is important, John -- that the Resolution  
15 says in part: One, the Board is being kept informed on all  
16 the activities of the 2105 LG that we helped start. They're  
17 greatly appreciative of the progress made on the Settlement  
18 Agreement.

19 It states a concern that too much time and money  
20 has been focused on the thermal curtain and very little on  
21 alternatives to the water-temperature issue, just as these  
22 folks have said. They're concerned that the march toward  
23 the thermal curtain never ceases, even though there's a  
24 tremendous amount of professional data and statements of  
25 deterrents, including the Thomas Payne Report that said up  
26

1 the 40 percent of lake's salmonoids' habitat will be  
2 destroyed.

3 A statement by Joe Odgaard, who is one of the  
4 researchers, who was quoted in the Iowa State Newsletter as  
5 saying, quote: A continuous withdrawal of cold water would  
6 delete -- could delete the lake's the cold-water supply,  
7 resulting in damage to lake habitat.

8 There were statements given once again to you  
9 last night by noted Department of Fish and Game fish  
10 biologist retired, who has worked on the lake for 20 years.  
11 And he knows the lake. And he stated that the reasons, the  
12 many reasons that the thermal curtain feasibility study  
13 should be stopped, as was suggested by Assemblyman LaMalfa.  
14 There are two pages of details, and I'll give you at the end  
15 of the presentation.

16 But the important part that the Supervisors said,  
17 they're asking that whoever is behind the ghost cease and  
18 desist any further consideration, because it just is not  
19 going to work. And we don't want to see the money spent on  
20 it and don't want to see PG&E spend any more money.

21 And we are going to do everything we can  
22 possibly, whether State Legislators or federal Congressman,  
23 Senator Feinstein, and agency representatives to make sure  
24 that it doesn't go through, because it just isn't the right  
25 thing to do.

26

1                   So I want to end, though, not just on a negative.  
2                   The positive side is we're going to work with the coalition.  
3                   It's a worthwhile coalition. We've done well. We'll  
4                   continue to work with all those in that. And we will come  
5                   up with an alternative that will not degrade Lake Almanor  
6                   nor Butt Reservoir.

7                   Thank you very much.

8                   (Applause.)

9                   MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Bill.

10                  At this point we're going to move on to comments  
11                  from the general public. I think in order to make sure that  
12                  we can hear from everyone who wants to speak, let's try to  
13                  limit your comments to about three or four minutes each.  
14                  And also let me just say that we would not object to hearing  
15                  some comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
16                  also.

17                  (Laughter.)

18                  MR. MUDRE: Let me get to this gentleman first,  
19                  because he's been having his hand up for a long time now.

20                  MR. JORGENSEN: My name is Kent Jorgensen, and I  
21                  live at Lake Almanor and I live in Chico. Last summer my  
22                  grandson and I were fishing in Lake Almanor. And I pulled a  
23                  fish out of the water and little Andrew said, "Poppa, what  
24                  are those little sore spots on those fish?"

25                  And I said, "Well, that came from the State of  
26

1 California Fisheries Department putting in some fish into  
2 this lake about five or six years ago and introduced these  
3 little mites into this lake. And every summer for about two  
4 months those little mites start growing on those fish. But  
5 when it starts getting cold, when the water starts getting  
6 colder, they drop off and they're not on those fish."

7 Well, what you're talking about right now is  
8 reducing the temperature of that lake, and you're going to  
9 have these little mites on these fish all year long. That's  
10 going to increase tremendously, plus as the other folks have  
11 been already saying about the Clear -- so-called Clear Lake,  
12 with the blooms they have over there.

13 Anyway, I'm retired from United Airlines. And I  
14 was in the engineering department. And I know for a fact on  
15 airplanes you have what you call an air-conditioning system  
16 that converts the outside air through a compressor and then  
17 releases that air, and it's called an "air-cycle machine."  
18 And the expansion of this air then cools the air.

19 Well, why can't we take the water from Lake  
20 Almanor, run it through one of your existing pipes, have  
21 this water span over a waterfall-type system, and you'll  
22 drop the water temperature five to six degrees immediately,  
23 or even more. This will work. And it does work because of  
24 your cooling systems that you have in a lot of your  
25 buildings today. They have a waterfall. And it drops that  
26

1 temperature when it falls on top of these buildings through  
2 the radiation. It drops that temperature down and decreases  
3 it many, many degrees. I can't give you exact temperatures.  
4 But this actually works. And you don't need a water  
5 curtain. All you need to do is do a little engineering.

6 That's all I have to say other than: Save our  
7 lake, please.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. MUDRE: After you, what we're going to do  
10 we'll go to the order the people signed in on.

11 MR. LUGER: My name is Marty Luger. And I know  
12 everybody here will have a chance to speak. So I would just  
13 like to, for the record: Is there anybody here who's in  
14 favor of the thermal curtain? Raise your hand.

15 (No hands raised.)

16 MR. LUGER: I thought so. Let the record reflect  
17 that nobody in the room raised their hand.

18 I spent quite a bit of time at Whiskytown Lake  
19 over the years. And that thermal curtain is not a pretty  
20 sight that you want to build in Lake Almanor.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MUDRE: All right. Thank you very much.

23 I want to apologize in advance if I get anyone's  
24 name wrong and if we've already heard from someone.

25 I have a William Hugh --

26

1                   MR. BABER: Baber.

2                   MR. MUDRE: Okay. There we go.

3                   MR. BABER: John, thank you. And I first want to  
4 thank you for coming and holding this meeting. I know it's  
5 required by law, and you're going to make every attempt to  
6 comply with the federal laws on these CEQA issues.

7                   Almost everything that I -- and I had a little  
8 speech that I wrote out of about -- I had six points that I  
9 wanted to bring up to you for objecting to this proposed  
10 thermal curtain.

11                   First, I guess -- and I've said this before -- my  
12 name is William Hugh Baber, III. I am Bill Baber, an owner,  
13 resident, and user of -- in the Lake Almanor Basin for the  
14 last 24 years.

15                   I support the 2105 PG&E relicensing process  
16 without the water-temperature requirement of this thermal  
17 curtain. Since almost all of my six points -- and I have a  
18 seventh, which is a conclusion that I want to get to -- have  
19 been accented by the state and federal legislators here  
20 through the various representatives, and I particular want  
21 to support the Assemblyman Doug LaMalfa's comments, which  
22 were excellent. And he came here personally and talked to  
23 all of you.

24                   My business is I'm a businessman; I'm a farmer.  
25 I'm a lawyer, retired, for 32 years accessing water and  
26

1 agricultural real estate. I've appeared before a number of  
2 State Water Resources Control Board issues, meetings, lots  
3 of trials over endangered species, environmental concerns.

4 This, it seems like, should be nipped in the bud.  
5 And since PG&E has not proposed it, it is hoped that as a  
6 result of this hearing today and other hearings I know that  
7 -- and I, of course, accept all of Plumas County Supervisor  
8 Dennison's remarks and support them -- that this proposed  
9 curtain, which I know PG&E have done a lot of study on, as  
10 referenced by Scott here earlier, would be just killed and  
11 they would move on to put that proposed -- and I'll just  
12 comment on a few of my thoughts -- the 55 million or 53  
13 million, I think Bill commented on, which is for this  
14 particular project and another two million a year  
15 maintenance costs for the one thermal curtain at Prattville  
16 and the two at Butt Valley, would seem to be better spent by  
17 PG&E and, I guess, approved by FERC and the various  
18 agencies, including Fish and Game; NMFS, National Marine  
19 Fishery Service; and the other fishery agencies, by coming  
20 up with other fishery-enhancement projects which could be  
21 really helped, for instance, salmon and trout.

22 I mean, we know Butt Lake and Lake Almanor are  
23 prized trout fisheries. And any possible damage to those  
24 ecosystems with this thermal curtain would just be crazy,  
25 just... I can't even believe it would happen, so...

26

1           And, anyway, my conclusory statement was that it  
2           appears that what is being proposed for this thermal curtain  
3           is actually using, using Lake Almanor and Butt Lake as an  
4           environmental experiment. There's really no science that  
5           pinpoints exact benefits that will occur as a result of  
6           creating and installing this thermal curtain.

7           And I guess, finally, what's going to happen if a  
8           thermal curtain is proposed by PG&E and FERC accepts it, and  
9           then it doesn't work? I mean who takes it out. PG&E  
10          doesn't take it out because they're not charged to take it  
11          out by the licensing of 2105.

12          Who's going to take it out? The State Board?  
13          They're not going to take it out. They don't care. They're  
14          a regulatory agency.

15          NMFS, the Fishery Service? No, they're not going  
16          to take it out.

17          Fish and Game, they're not going to take it out.  
18          No one is charged with taking the crazy thing out.

19          And then what happens to the existing habitat,  
20          environmental habitat; the retail businesses in Chester  
21          which have suffered the degradation by this thermal curtain,  
22          what happens to them? I mean who restores them? It's  
23          crazy.

24          So, anyway, those are my thoughts. Thank you  
25          very much.

26

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MUDRE: Thank you.

3 Our next speaker will be Christi Goodman.

4 MS. GOODMAN: I was asked to speak last by  
5 Supervisor Dennison.

6 I'm Christi Goodman, Plumas County Flood Control  
7 and Conservation District, directed by Tom Hunter.

8 Plumas County supports the watershed approach to  
9 licensing and hopes that the term of the license, the 2105,  
10 will be reflected when it's issued.

11 Plumas County acknowledges that the designated  
12 beneficial uses of Lake Almanor and the North Fork Feather  
13 River is a natural resource to all people of California.  
14 Hydropower generation, water supply, warm- and cold-water  
15 fisheries' habitat, and recreation are important statewide.

16 Plumas County's comments on the Draft EIS for  
17 Project 2105 are mostly positive. And we are pleased that  
18 the components of the Settlement Agreement have a potential  
19 for full ratification in the final license.

20 We propose expanded water-quality monitoring  
21 sites and timeframes, a revised Shoreline Management Plan, a  
22 Temperature Management Plan, and an alternative to the  
23 Prattville curtain, a reoperation scenario.

24 What we request from FERC for inclusion in the  
25 Final Environmental Impact Statement is an analysis of how

26

1 much water in CFS from Canyon Dam's lower gate would be  
2 required to offset heating in Rock Creek, Cresta, and Poe  
3 with and without Caribou 1 and 2 or Caribou 1 or 2 offline  
4 for the month of August.

5 We acknowledge the potential problems that were  
6 resolved in the Settlement Agreement, which would include  
7 potential losses to generation, possible conflicts with USFS  
8 mandates and hydrogen sulfide, that we believe that the use  
9 of current infrastructure and the benefits to Butt Lake and  
10 Lake Almanor fisheries would be worth the investments.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Christi.

13 George Protsman.

14 MR. PROTSMAN: My name is George Protsman.

15 And I just want to say, because this room was  
16 full before, I'm very proud to be the Chairman of the Save  
17 Lake Almanor Committee.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. PROTSMAN: I want to thank all the people  
20 that have been here, that have come today from Chico and  
21 from the Valley.

22 I also want to thank the panel, John, and the  
23 recorders -- I hope you can hear us now -- for the exemplary  
24 democratic process that you displayed last night in Chico --  
25 I mean in Chester when we had 250 people come out during a

26

1 winter storm warning. That gives you some idea about the  
2 intensity of feeling in the hearts and minds of the people  
3 that love Lake Almanor.

4 I also want to thank all the political  
5 representatives, elected representatives, that are here  
6 today and representing their boss. I'm really amazed that  
7 the word has gone out so strongly and so quickly.

8 We've really just been focusing on the Almanor  
9 Basin, and its relation to the EIR. Our main job is to get  
10 the information out to the public in what they consider to  
11 be a good sign in a fair and balanced way.

12 But I must say, even though our focus has been on  
13 the Lake Almanor Basin, we are coming to Chico. So I hope  
14 that we will have the same level of support that we've had  
15 in the Almanor Basin on this issue.

16 I would be remiss if I did not tell you, in terms  
17 of responding to the EIR, that we have a free information  
18 source, SaveLakeAlmanor.org, SaveLakeAlmanor.org, which is  
19 continually updated on a daily and weekly basis to provide  
20 information. I'm sure you'll find many of the addresses  
21 that were shown in the slide, if you're on that website,  
22 that you can refer to.

23 Every person in this room and the ten friends you  
24 have that were not here can play an important continuing  
25 part in writing your thoughts and sharing your thoughts with  
26

1 FERC, the Department of Fish and Game, and the State Water  
2 Board and, of course, we want to keep informing our elected  
3 representatives of our feelings about this issue.

4 I don't want to go into what is proposed as the  
5 difference between what is considered to be a thoughtful  
6 process that goes on, but I am very nervous when a bankrupt,  
7 giant corporation spends \$1.4 million to have a  
8 consideration of something.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. PROTSMAN: So, again, I want to thank the  
11 FERC staff and people, including the stenographers, that  
12 have been listening to us in becoming part of the public  
13 record.

14 I want to encourage you all to become part of the  
15 process, to get information, to be informed, but most  
16 importantly to act, act by writing, continuing to write to  
17 your elected representatives. There's a download on the  
18 website that you can use, a canary pad and a pencil, put in  
19 an envelope is just as good. What's important is that you  
20 express your thoughts, because you can see that it is making  
21 a difference. You are making a difference. And that's  
22 important that we continue to make a difference so that we  
23 can stop the thermal curtain and we can save Lake Almanor.

24 I just wanted to ask if part of the public record  
25 was information that was provided at the last 2105 meeting  
26

1       that I attended, it was Tom here and Scott went through the  
2       alternatives. All the alternatives that were proposed were  
3       rejected as not being feasible, yet in the relicensing is  
4       key criteria to implementing any kind of thermal curtain is  
5       the test of reasonableness.

6                 Now I'm not a lawyer, and I don't like to use too  
7       many lawyers, but I can say I would question whether or not  
8       this proposal would pass the legal test of being reasonable.

9                 Again, thank you all for being here and working  
10       to save Lake Almanor. Thank you.

11                (Applause.)

12                MR. MUDRE: Thank you, George.

13                It looks like the next speaker is Gary Markee, I  
14       think, or Mangin.

15                MR. MANGIN: Mangin.

16                MR. MUDRE: Mangin.

17                MR. MANGIN: Hi. My name is Gary Mangin, and  
18       I've been a resident of the Lake Almanor area since 1973. I  
19       started fishing Lake Almanor in 1955 as a little guy. And  
20       let me give you a real working knowledge of the lake.

21                Aquatic weed at that time -- that was the  
22       original level of Lake Almanor. It was a lower level, and  
23       the water heated up very well by June. And the aquatic weed  
24       grew all the way across the quarter-upper end of the warm  
25       water section of Lake Almanor, which includes the boat ramp

26

1 at Almanor West all the way over to Bailey Creek. You could  
2 not get a boat up in that area. If you'd go about ten feet,  
3 you had to take the aquatic weed out of your prop, and it  
4 was just a useless area.

5 Now since the lake was raised, the aquatic weed  
6 disappeared. The blue-green algae has become very, very  
7 light. Only at the late end of the year do you get  
8 blue-green algae.

9 The proposal to take 50 percent or around that of  
10 cold water out of Lake Almanor, the aquatic weed will  
11 probably start up in that area around June. The people in  
12 Almanor West will not have docks; they will not be able  
13 launch boats, or PG&E will have a great expense removing  
14 aquatic weed.

15 The blue-green algae is detrimental to fish life.  
16 It takes the oxygen out of the water. And in the old days  
17 when the blue-green algae grew in Lake Almanor, the fish  
18 moved to springs to survive. And now there's more water and  
19 the fish are all over lake. And if you take this water out,  
20 what are the fish going to do? They're going to go  
21 belly-up.

22 And Mr. Tu's representation of the Iowa State  
23 University [sic], if you want to go on the internet, pull up  
24 their report. After \$900,000 spent on this report, the last  
25 paragraph says it's detrimental to the habitat of Lake  
26

1 Almanor.

2 So thank you very much.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. MUDRE: Thank you.

5 The next speaker, Linda Pohler.

6 MS. POHLER: Hi. I'm Linda Pohler, P-o-h-l-e-r.

7 I'm a Realtor and a small-business owner in Lake Almanor. I  
8 am a Director for the Plumas Association of Realtors and  
9 California Association of Realtors Bank Director. I also do  
10 a lot of summer vacation rentals. The Lake Almanor Basin  
11 alone generates almost \$420,000 in the summer, mainly from  
12 June to August. The County itself generates \$1,887,746.06,  
13 to be exact. And most of these -- this is transient  
14 occupancy tax, which is a real estate tax. So this is  
15 basically from summer aspects only.

16 So any change to Lake Almanor will definitely  
17 help tourism -- or hurt tourism -- ew, big faux pas -- hurt  
18 tourism, which is the economic base of Plumas County.

19 From a Realtor's standpoint I have had already  
20 from buyers negative comments about the potential or  
21 proposed thermal curtain. They're very concerned that  
22 should they invest in a second home or a property in Lake  
23 Almanor that their investment will not be well served,  
24 should the lake change.

25 Even though it's not really something that we can  
26

1 discuss at length with our buyers, it's becoming a stigma.  
2 So the fear that it may happen is already affecting Realtors  
3 and property sales.

4 The Plumas Association of Realtors strongly is  
5 opposed to any more effort towards the thermal curtain.  
6 Thanks.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Linda.

9 The next speaker, Don, maybe Springer.

10 MR. SPRING: Spring. Hi. I'm Don Spring, a  
11 resident of Chico. I've had a cabin at Almanor for about 35  
12 years. I don't have the benefit of a million-dollar study,  
13 but I do have 60 years' fishing experience.

14 About 30 years ago when the lake was lower, the  
15 water temperature exiting the lake was probably as high or  
16 higher as it is today. Is that right? Probably higher  
17 because it was a warmer lake.

18 Anyway -- you weren't there.

19 (Laughter.)

20 The fishery from the Caribou Powerhouse down to  
21 Belden was one of the best fisheries in Northern California.  
22 The water temperature then was higher; the water flow was  
23 much higher.

24 What was the final death blow to that area was  
25 the dam below Caribou Powerhouse and funneling the water to  
26

1 the Belden Powerhouse. That ruined about 12 to 14 miles of  
2 prime trout stream.

3 Now the water temperature alone is not going to  
4 bring that back. You need water flow. About the same time  
5 PG&E cut the water flow back on the Pit River, Pit 5 and Pit  
6 6 area, that was the other good fishery. The Barth brothers  
7 used to go up there and catch five-, six-pound trout. They  
8 displayed them in their store.

9 When you cut the water flow back there, it turned  
10 to moss and the trout died and the pike took over. Water  
11 flow is just as important as water temperature. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

14 Frank Solarity?

15 MR. SOLINSKY: I flunked penmanship as a kid.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. SOLINKSY: Frank Solinsky. I live on Lake  
18 Almanor West. I have businesses in Chico and --  
19 S-o-l-i-n-s-k-y -- I have businesses in Chico and  
20 Susanville.

21 I've used the term "elitist" to describe what we  
22 are doing. We are asking the people and businesses of  
23 California to increase the electrical rates to pay for a \$53  
24 million project to benefit a few elitist fly fishermen on  
25 the Feather River. This project is only a benefit to a few

26

1 people, but the masses pay for it.

2 I also want to add that I've been involved with  
3 Lake Almanor West lakefront property for over 30 years. I  
4 watched how very little temperature increase drastically  
5 increases the algae found on piers, boats, and the lake  
6 bottom.

7 Two years ago during the very hot weather, the  
8 lake had too much algae to even swim for a short period of  
9 time. As the lake cooled down just a little bit -- and  
10 they're talking about a half a degree here -- that algae  
11 started to disappear. The divers in the area who put the  
12 docks down along the piers, they'll tell you the same thing.  
13 I mean it's very little. It doesn't take much.

14 Three years ago warm water and waterfowl  
15 droppings caused mites to be in the water so that you could  
16 not safely swim without being bitten. There have been no  
17 studies made on the algae and pollution increases and  
18 long-term damage that could occur by taking cold water from  
19 the lake. Cold-water removal could destroy the lake.

20 Fifty-three million dollars to lower water  
21 temperature one to two degrees does not make economic sense.  
22 This entire thought process is ridiculous. Please inject  
23 common sense into the equation of California resources. We  
24 are truly committing changes that will have to be borne by  
25 future generations in California. Thank you.

26

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

3 John D. Arlo?

4 MR. DANDL: Dandl, D-a-n-d-l?

5 MR. MUDRE: That's it.

6 (Laughter.) I do apologize.

7 MR. DANDL: Thank you folks for coming. I've  
8 been to all these meetings. And I basically for 25 years  
9 ran a manufacturing company and did all the engineering  
10 myself.

11 And I've noticed kind of a real glaring flaw in  
12 this whole process of the curtain. And that is this: 70  
13 percent of the cold water in the lake sits over in the  
14 Hamilton Branch area, Hamilton Branch arm, let's say.

15 And years ago -- they alluded to it at different  
16 times here -- that they dug a small canal to get the water  
17 from Hamilton Branch over to the Prattville Inlet. Now  
18 there's some real mathematics here that don't work out.

19 First of all, they say this little canal carries  
20 about 200 cubic feet per second. The intake at Prattville  
21 has the ability to go up to 2,000 cubic feet per second but  
22 generally they run it around 12- to 1300 cubic feet per  
23 second. And once they put this cold-water curtain in and  
24 they start drawing down water at the rate of 1200 to 1300  
25 cubic feet, they're going to object, one, just suck all the  
26

1 cold water out of the Chester arm; two, they're going to  
2 suck a lot of mud in because this little canal that they're  
3 counting on getting the water from Hamilton Branch over to  
4 the inlet can only carry a couple hundred cubic feet per  
5 second. And it becomes real obvious that somebody's missing  
6 the boat here on this deal.

7 So I think another thing by the inlet's starting  
8 to pulling a lot of mud, it's going to just pollute the  
9 reservoir down below real bad. And I just think it will end  
10 up being a real disaster. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. MUDRE: Thank you, John. I think from what  
13 we can tell here, those are all the people that indicated on  
14 the sign-up sheet there that they're wanting to speak.  
15 There was a number of people that listed "Maybe." And if  
16 someone didn't list "Yes" or "Maybe," but changed their mind  
17 and want to talk now, we'll go ahead and take people in the  
18 order they want to raise their hands.

19 (No hands raised.)

20 MR. MUDRE: No one else? Okay. Well, I want to  
21 thank everyone for coming out here today. We've heard a lot  
22 of good information. Again, the due date for written  
23 comments with the Commission is November 1st. And we'll go  
24 ahead and adjourn this meeting. Thanks, again, for coming.

25 (Applause.)

26

1 (The Public Meeting was adjourned at 3:03 o'clock  
2 p.m.)  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings  
before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the  
Matter of:

Name of Proceeding: COMMENTS on DRAFT EIS for the  
UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER  
PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Project No.: 2105

Place: CHICO, CALIFORNIA

Date: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2004

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original  
transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy  
Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription  
of the proceedings.

Nancy Palmer,  
Official Reporter