

AP

Written Comment Form
Public Scoping Meeting
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR
UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT
WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION

State Water Resources Control Board

Your input is important to us; please use this comment sheet to provide input on issues, alternatives and mitigation measures to be evaluated in the Draft EIR. Your comments will assist in preparation of the Draft EIR. Please include your name and address below to receive a copy of the Draft EIR.

As recent residents to Lake Placer we were shocked to hear this proposal was still being considered. This option has not been proven scientifically to solve a problem 25 miles away! It is not supported by the public. It would be extremely economically detrimental to this area for business and residents alike. It is disrespectful to the local tribes. There would be loss of hydroelectricity at a crisis time in Calif and the Nation. It is really unknown what all that predominate would do - both from health position for humans. I just not to mention the clarity of the water down stream. There is the issue of safety for water enthusiasts with lower water levels. What about earth quake and landslides concerns? How about the unsightly eas during the project.

Additional space? Please use other side. →

Name* Brock & Vickie Hinek
 Address [Redacted]
 City/State/Zip Code [Redacted]

Comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, will be made available for public review. Individual respondents may request their home address be withheld from public disclosure. Please check this box if you wish your name and/or address withheld from public disclosure.

Please submit your comments at the Sign-in Station or send your comments to

Sharon Stohrer
 State Water Resources Control Board
 P.O. Box 2000
 Sacramento, CA 95812-2000
 or
 via e-mail to: 2105comments@nsrnet.com

2005 OCT - 7 PM 2:54
 DIV. OF WATER RIGHTS
 SACRAMENTO
 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

To ensure that your comments are considered in the Draft EIR, comments must be received by October 17, 2005.

and what about the cost of this project compared to the possible benefit? \$57 million this is a pristine area that should not be used as an expensive scientific experiment with too much to lose both for the fish and humans!

In your own regulations a project shall not be given approval with benefit for one area at the detriment of another

WHY IS THIS STILL BEING CONSIDERED ~~with this~~

It makes us wonder ~~what~~ why has so much time and money been wasted on this project, who is behind this ????

You can not have a unique lake with both cold water and warm water fish if you take any cold water out. It's a delicate balance. --- leave it alone!

The settlement agreement signed April 2004 should be followed to the letter. A lot of input went into this agreement. Summer ^{work} water levels should be maintained. How about alternative D?

Let's get on with it!! Quit wasting any more time & money on this!

Sincerely
Brock Visher Hiner