

ORIGINAL

Whitmore, Ca  
2 June 2007

RECEIVED  
THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY  
REGULATORY  
COMMISSION  
JUN 13 P 4:37

**Chairman Joseph T. Kelliher  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 – 1<sup>st</sup> Street, N.E.,  
Washington, D.C. 20426-0001**

**Kilarc/Cow Creek, Project No. 606  
Re: Your letter to Representative Wally Herger on 14 May 2007  
Communication of J. Mark Robinson, Director Office of  
Energy Projects 31 May 2007**

**Dear Chairman Kelliher:**

**I am writing not as an individual, but as a representative of the citizens of Whitmore, California, surrounding communities, Shasta County, and visitors from throughout California and other States. As Chairman of the "SAVE KILARC" Committee I am obligated to request your attention and indulgence in our efforts to save the facilities inherent in Project No. 606, which has been an asset to children, adults, seniors, and the handicapped for over 100 years.**

**The Kilarc/Cow Creek Power Stations, forebays, recreational, fishing, hiking, and wild life viewing have been local assets that deserve retention. In a PG&E Technical Meeting, 16<sup>th</sup> May 2007, it was reiterated that PG&E was "walking away" from operating the facilities under license from FERC. In fact this decision was made in an agreement at a meeting of organizations in March 2005. Community representation was not present or invited and knowledge of the decision was not recognized until after Synergics LLC (since dropped out) had local meetings required for licensing the facilities. Your rejection of Davis Hydro LLC (31 May 2007) stated that "Following consultation with stakeholders, in March 2005, PG&E chose not to file an application for a new license based on it's determination that decommissioning was a viable and cost effective alternative to relicensing". This decision violated (re: referenced letter) the conditions of the agreement to include stakeholders and only an entity in Maryland monitoring**

**FERC documents applied for a license. Any locally published data was not recognized by the stakeholders in the affected community.**

**You clearly state that “it is premature to accept an NOI for this project.” Time and many “ratepayers” dollars will be wasted while PG&E spends two years preparing a “Surrender Application”. With proper studies, recognition of water rights, and adequate assessment of fish recovery (not introduction), a new entity (KC/LLC) could retain 100 year old status quo with minimal ecological effect and significant savings to stakeholders-ratepayers.**

**To support retention of the facilities a petition was circulated addressed to the Governor of California. After collecting over 700 signatures of affected personnel, the effort was torpedoed by a rumor that the license had been granted. The effort came to a close and out standing copies of the petition were not returned (destroyed). Copies of the 700 signatures were transmitted to Synergics, but I understand they were not forwarded to FERC to establish local opposition to the March 2005 agreement to go forward with the decommissioning.**

**PG&E has stated that the decision not to relicense was based on economic factors. One of the major factors is anadromous fish protection, improvement of fish spawning grounds, and the associated costs. This issue I would like to address at some length to provide data for reconsideration by FERC:**

- 1. Environmental studies were underway when PG&E made the decision not to seek relicensing and were discontinued.**
- 2. The studies were deemed proprietary and JW Associates could not release any studies or continue them for another entity without PG&E approval.**
- 3. Some changes in position on requirements may have occurred in more recent years.**
- 4. California Fish & Game no longer requires Salmon beyond the barrier falls on Old Cow Creek (below Kilarc Power Station) and the probability of Steelhead migration can only take place in very high water flows. Local residents and fishermen (up to 65 years of fishing Kilarc) have never reported observing Steelhead or Salmon above the falls (a very popular swimming hole for the younger generation).**

5. **A NOAA representative (Steve Edmondson) reported at the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting that 95% of spawning grounds were in the Sierra Nevada Watershed.**
6. **If 5% of spawning grounds are in Northern California an infinitesimal amount, if any, can be attributed to the Old Cow Creek due to natural barriers. Recent fish counts/studies indicate South Cow Creek has essentially met the targeted amount of Salmon transiting the creek.**
7. **Members of the Shasta Trinity Flyfishermen as well as unorganized local fishermen strongly support Kilarc forebay retention in opposition to the Friends Of The River and Trout Unlimited who have limited local knowledge and community concern.**
8. **Kilarc forebay is the only reasonable fishing facility, since Old Cow Creek is isolated by rugged terrain and private property.**
9. **To pay \$10.4 Million to decommission Kilarc/Cow Creek at ratepayers (authorized by the CPUC) expense is questionable in an environmentally stable ecology of over 100 years.**

**Other issues that affect the loss of the subject Power Stations and forebays are offered for FERC review. PG&E filed the required "Surrender Schedule" with FERC on 4/23/07. The first Community Meeting (Whitmore) was held after the fact on 4/27/07. Water rights and the transfer from PG&E is a thorny issue that may have wide spread effects on property owners (letters to PG&E on Kilarc/Cow Creek were not affective – attached) and the community in general (adjudicated rights were established in 1969). Water flows, hydrology, and temperatures are items yet to be determined as influencing aquatic habitat and resident water stability. The altitude of the Kilarc forebay of at 3800 ft assists cool water temperatures in Old Cow Creek, a recognized problem for fish survival. A private (unofficial) measurement by a concerned citizen, registered a Creek temperature at the Kilarc Power Station as 58 degrees F and the outlet of the penstock turbine flow at 48 degrees F. The obvious indication is that loss of the forebay would increase the hazard to fish. A formal independent study is needed. A local hydrologist has indicated**

**that the seepage from Kilarc forebay provides ground water for wells and ponds in the area and has been since inception.**

**The subject Power Houses are considered Historic (Shasta County Historical Society). The Kilarc forebay/reservoir is an established recreational area, Shasta County residents use it at 84%, the balance is visitors. The forebay is a forage area for the Bald Eagle, Osprey, and a breeding area for ducks (all personally observed).**

**Decommissioning would involve many permits and extensive terrain alteration. The riparian vegetation along the canals and forebays would be disrupted, county grading permits, and private property intrusion would be required. All of the information/data is to be collected by PG&E in preparing the "Surrender Application". In being questioned about an independent overseer of the data input, PG&E stated that they would feed back at regular monthly meetings the comments for public review. Since the Community was so late being brought into the process there is some question as to the timeliness of this review process. Data from the Environmental Policy Act indicates this overview to be by FERC. It is recognized that FERC staffing makes it difficult to cover these meetings. However, this particular decommissioning process appears to be a first, lacking in precedence and may well be the model of many future decommissioning activities when FERC licenses for small Hydropower facilities require renewal.**

**In closing it must be stated that the community is firmly opposed to impacting a 100+ year old stable environment. There appears to be little logic for remote agreements (without community "stakeholders" participation) that would decommission Power Stations that, though considered insignificant in power generation (PG&E small hydropower generation totals only 4% of generated power) still provides pollution free, renewable "green" power for several thousand homes. The historic value of the Kilarc Power Station, the recreational use of the forebay, adherence to ADA, the global warming assistance, and the elimination of long term legal action on water rights should provide fuel for reconsideration of decommissioning. Case in point, the forebay and channels for the South Cow Creek Power Station are on private**

**property which would be severely impacted by changes in water distribution.**

**Fire safety for the Community is also a major factor. Three major fires in recent years have threatened the Community, the Kilarc Power Station, and the stability of the watershed. Two of these fires destroyed homes. The Kilarc forebay/reservoir has figured prominently in the suppression of these fires. Helicopters have dipped their buckets in the reservoir for water drops. The CDF/Calfire has used the reservoir area for training fire fighters as well. Even in times of stress fire fighters lighten it with a bit of humor, such as wondering about the retrieval of BBQ'ed trout from Kilarc.**

**A new entity (KC/LLC) has emerged that is competent and extremely active in working with the community and PG&E to salvage Project # 606. They have filed a "Motion to Intervene Out of Time" and speaking for the Community and many citizens of Shasta County, and outside visitors, we request FERC to seriously reconsider this motion. Your letter of 14 May indicated entities can file applications after FERC issues a final order. Millions might be saved the "ratepayers" if the project can be salvaged early.**

**Sincerely**



**Thomas Glenn Dye**

**30655 Whitmore Rd**

**Whitmore, CA 96096**

**Retired registered professional**

**California State Engineer**

**CC: Ms Magalie R. Salas**

**Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

**Congressman Wally Herger**

**Matthew Bubyoff, Hydro West Branch, FERC**

**J. Mark Robinson, Director office of Energy Projects**

**Attachments:**

**Whitmore Volunteer Fire Department Letter**

**Tetrick Ranch Letter**

**Abbott, Farrell, & Jones Letter**