

**Additional Information Request (AIR) No. 14, Estimated Costs of Agency Recommendations not Included in Alternative 1 (Schedule B)**

On June 28, 2006, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) provided the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) its response to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC or Commission) AIR No. 14, for a 30-day review and comment period. SCE requested CDFG provide comments by July 30, 2006. As of today's filing, August 4, 2006, SCE has not received any comments from the CDFG. Consequently, CDFG's comments and SCE's responses to those comments will not be filed with this submittal. SCE has contacted CDFG regarding their response, but has received no firm commitment as to when their response will be issued. SCE will file CDFG comments received on AIR-14 and SCE's responses to those comments with the Commission, within 30-days of SCE's receipt of the CDFG comments.

SCE's June 28, 2006, submittal of AIR No. 14 to CDFG is attached.

June 28, 2006

William Loudermilk  
Regional Manager  
California Department of Fish and Game  
Region 4  
1234 East Shaw Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93710


Dear Mr. Loudermilk:

Subject: Additional Information Request No. 14  
Mammoth Pool Hydroelectric Project License Application  
(FERC Project No. 2085-014 - California)

Following up on our letter of May 16, 2006 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Additional Information Request (AIR) of May 12, 2006, regarding the Mammoth Pool Hydroelectric Project License Application; the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is providing its response to AIR No. 14, Estimated Costs of Agency Recommendations not Included in Alternative 1, for review and comment by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). In accordance with the Commission's AIR letter, SCE is providing the CDFG a 30-day review and comment period. SCE is requesting that CDFG provide comments by July 30, 2006. The CDFG comments and recommendations, and SCE's responses will be included in the submittal to the Commission of SCE's responses to these AIRs.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Mr. Geoff Rabone at (909) 394-8721.

Sincerely,



Enclosures:

1. Response to Attachment B, AIR No. 14
2. Attachments to Response to Attachment B, AIR No. 14

cc: M. Salas, Secretary (FERC)  
T. Yamashita, (FERC)  
J. Means (CDFG)  
D. Mitchell (CDFG)  
G. L. Rabone (SCE)  
N. J. Mascolo (SCE)  
W. M. Messner (SCE)

**SCHEDULE B – ADDITIONAL REQUEST INFORMATION No. 14**

The Commission's Additional Information Request No. 14 stated:

“14. Estimated Costs of Agency Recommendations not Included in Alternative 1 (response due in 90 days)

On page 4-5 of the PDEA you note that California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) filed additional recommendations for the project on October 26, 2005, which were not fully addressed in the PDEA, due to the late filing of the recommendations. We presume that you have had adequate time to review the recommendations in this CDFG filing and have assessed the potential cost implications of those recommendations where they differ from those included in the proposed alternative or the agency-recommended alternative (alternative 1). Please provide a breakdown of the estimated costs to implement any such recommendations made by CDFG in that filing, unless these recommendations have been superceded by subsequent filings.”

**SCE Response to Additional Information Request No. 14:**

On October 26, 2005, CDFG filed a letter (CDFG 2005) with the Commission that provided recommended measures for certain fish and wildlife resources (Attachment 14-A to this response). SCE reviewed CDFG's (2005) letter and met with CDFG on February 8, 2006 regarding this and other issues related to SCE's Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP) and again on June 15, 2006 to discuss outstanding issues identified in this letter (Attachment 14-B). In the June 15, 2006 meeting, SCE and CDFG focused on CDFG recommendations related to the Mammoth Pool Project for the AIR No. 14 response.

SCE's response to the Commission's AIR No. 14 is based on review of CDFG's (2005) letter, consultations with CDFG, and analyses conducted by SCE. Specific CDFG recommendations related to the Mammoth Pool Project are addressed in the order in which they appear in the CDFG letter.

***Aquatic Resources: Downstream Anadromous Fisheries and Temperature Control Issues (CDFG letter page 2)***

At the June 15 meeting, CDFG and SCE discussed CDFG's concern that flexibility may be needed in responding to changing needs for anadromous fish restoration in the San Joaquin River downstream of Friant Dam in the future. It is unclear whether Project operations have the potential to affect or contribute to these uncertain future needs, which may be affected by the outcome of a pending court case and proposals for new potential downstream projects that have not been sufficiently developed to be analyzed. At this time, SCE believes that no estimated cost can be associated with this CDFG recommendation.

***Resident Fish Instream Flow Recommendations (CDFG 2005, page 7)***

CDFG continues to support their minimum instream flow (MIF) recommendations, while acknowledging they may eventually agree to the flows currently being negotiated among the other parties to the Big Creek ALP. CDFG MIF recommendations were identified in their letter (CDFG 2005). However, CDFG has not made recommendations for channel and riparian maintenance (CRM) flows, such as those recommended in the PDEA Proposed Action and Alternative 1 (SCE 2005a).

SCE has analyzed the CDFG proposal and has found that the proposed MIFs would result in a Project-wide weighted average loss of 171.35 GWh per year of generation compared to current MIFs, based on the frequency of water year types that occurred in the period of study (1983-2002). The loss of generation to the Mammoth Pool Project is estimated to be 18.54 GWh per year on the same basis. The cost associated with this loss of generation is an annual levelized loss of \$9,884,398 per year to the overall Big Creek Projects and \$1,069,391 annual levelized loss to the Mammoth Pool Project alone. The CDFG flow recommendation differs from alternatives analyzed in the PDEA with different MIFs from either the Proposed Action or the Alternative 1, and no specific recommendations for CRM flows, as with the other alternatives analyzed in the PDEA.

***Mammoth Pool Silver Iodide Monitoring and Project Reservoir Minimum Pools (CDFG 2005, page 8)***

SCE and CDFG discussed CDFG (2005) monitoring requests related to Mammoth Pool silver iodide during the June 15 meeting. CDFG's interest in monitoring silver in fish and crayfish is focused on determining if silver found in fish tissue from Mammoth Pool is due to upstream (non-Project) mining or from SCE's application of silver iodide to enhance rainfall in the upper San Joaquin watershed. CDFG expressed concern that raptors and other large wildlife that consume the entire carcass of fish or crayfish may bioaccumulate silver.

Separately, CDFG (2005) also expressed a concern that protection, mitigation and enhancement (PM&E) measures designed to enhance stream habitat for fish downstream of Project reservoirs may result in changes in reservoir operations, and recommended that monitoring be conducted for impacts to aquatic resources in reservoirs. SCE notes that Project operations analyzed in the PDEA would not result in a significant change in minimum reservoir elevations. However, based on settlement discussions within the ALP, SCE believes that a fish monitoring program for Project reservoirs will be included in the settlement. That monitoring program will likely include fish monitoring of the reservoirs during the 5<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> years after license issuance, and every 10 years thereafter for the length of the license, to determine any significant long-term trends in fish populations.

To address these CDFG monitoring recommendations SCE, in consultation with CDFG, proposed a study program that would monitor fisheries resources, as well as trends in bioaccumulation of silver in Mammoth Pool, Huntington Lake and Lake Thomas A. Edison. Study objectives of reservoir fish monitoring would be to characterize trends in

the relative abundance and species composition of the fish community. Sampling methods and locations would be consistent with methods utilized during the Combined Aquatic Working Group (CAWG) 7 study (e.g. gillnetting, trapping) (SCE 2005b, PDEA Vol. 3 SD-C CAWG 7, Characterize Fish Populations, Final Technical Study Report, SCE 2003). In conjunction with the collection of fish for the reservoir monitoring study, trends in the levels of silver accumulation in adult wild fish (muscle and liver) in these reservoirs would be characterized, as well as in crayfish in Mammoth Pool. Analyses and reporting of results would be completed following each study period.

Ten wild fish (with no external signs of hatchery origin) and ten crayfish would be collected from Mammoth Pool Reservoir. Similarly, ten wild fish would be collected from Huntington Lake and ten fish from Lake Thomas A. Edison. Juveniles are not large or old enough to indicate the level of silver bioaccumulation occurring in the reservoir and therefore fish of catchable size or larger would be collected.

Samples would be sent to a qualified laboratory for analysis of silver content. Analysis of silver content would be performed on the following: 1) fish muscle tissue; 2) fish liver; and 3) whole-body crayfish. Fish muscle tissue and fish liver tissue would be homogenized, then digested with HNO<sub>3</sub>, and ICP-MS analysis performed for silver. The whole body of crayfish would be homogenized, digested with HNO<sub>3</sub> and analyzed for silver content.

SCE estimates study costs for fish and silver monitoring in the three reservoirs identified above (sampling fish populations and collecting samples for silver analysis concurrently) as approximately \$107,000 per sampling.

Annualized costs for monitoring conducted every 10 years would be approximately \$15,291 in 2006 dollars over a 44-year license term.

### ***Fish Entrainment Mortality (CDFG 2005, page 9)***

In their letter, CDFG (2005) recommends that drop tube intakes in the Project area, primarily those diversions that provide water to the Ward Tunnel, be screened. Despite the results of the entrainment studies conducted by SCE, which found that the risk of entrainment at these diversions is low, CDFG asserts that "entrainment loss does occur, we deem it significant, and will require mitigation."

Three diversions in the upper basin (tributary to the South Fork San Joaquin River) have a vertical intake, including Camp 62 Creek, Chinquapin Creek, and Bolsillo Creek diversions. SCE notes that analyses conducted to date (SCE 2005c, PDEA Vol. 3 SD-E CAWG 9 Entrainment Report, SCE 2005) indicate there is no evidence of an entrainment issue at these intakes, nor any data that would suggest that there is likely to be one. Ward Tunnel and these intakes are not part of the Mammoth Pool Project and no diversions within the Mammoth Pool Project have vertical intake structures. Therefore, there is no cost associated with the Mammoth Pool Project for screening these intakes.

***Hatchery Support for Stocking of Project Impoundments and Project-affected Reaches (CDFG 2005, page 9)***

CDFG states that the Project attracts a high amount of public recreation use and that this has become an important economic element in nearby communities, intensifying fish pressure in Project stream reaches, reservoirs and nearby waters. CDFG also asserts that the Project, as a whole, has adversely affected the upper basin fishery by changing timing and amount of instream flows from those that occurred historically, in addition to the level of entrainment and entrapment in Project facilities and diversion. CDFG requests that SCE reimburse CDFG for the ongoing cost of fish stocking, fish production, and monitoring to sustain a recreational fishery in Project-affected impoundments and reaches, as well as nearby waters in the upper San Joaquin River watershed.

SCE believes that there is no basis for assertion that fish stocking is necessary to mitigate for Project impacts. Fish stocking represents a recreational enhancement for the public, which in part meets an expectation of numerous easily catchable fish created by that same stocking. SCE points out that the reaches identified in their letter were fishless prior to stocking, which began in the late nineteenth century, so did not evolve with "historic" flows. SCE does not consider it reasonable for SCE to pay for the entire cost of fish stocking, since the CDFG collects money for fishing licenses that is supposed to help support the costs of fish stocking. SCE has included in this analysis costs for monitoring of Mammoth Pool Reservoir fisheries at a 10 year interval as part of its response to the CDFG request to monitor silver.

CDFG (2005) estimated the current cost of stocking is in the range of \$300,000 each year, but provided no basis for this amount. In the June 15, 2006 meeting, CDFG identified a \$3.02 per pound price for hatchery trout, based on all statewide production costs and overhead, and stated that SCE should use this number when estimating costs associated with fish stocking. CDFG also provided stocking estimates for 2003 and 2004.

SCE analyzed CDFG's fish stocking records for fish stocked into all Big Creek system waters by CDFG in the periods of 1990 to 1999 and 2000 to 2004. This included both ALP and non-ALP Project waters. Table 14-1 presents the approximate weight of fish stocked by CDFG for these periods and the value of the stocked fish based on CDFG's price of \$3.02 per pound (2005) for hatchery trout and kokanee.

**Table 14-1. Average Yearly Weight and Value of Hatchery Fish Stocked by CDFG into Big Creek Project Waters by Time Period.**

Period	Average Pounds of Fish Stocked Per Year	Cost per Pound	Total Cost (2005 Dollars) Per Year
1990-1999	55,200	\$3.02	\$166,704
2000-2004	57,620	\$3.02	\$174,012

For the period 1990-1999, the average yearly cost of stocked hatchery fish for the overall Big Creek system, based on CDFG numbers, was approximately \$166,704 per year based on 2005 dollars. For the period 2000-2004, the average yearly cost of stocked hatchery fish for the overall Big Creek system was approximately \$174,012 per year based on 2005 dollars. SCE also investigated costs of stocking fish from other sources as a supplement or partial replacement of hatchery fish provided by CDFG, costs for catchable-sized fish were \$2.25 per pound. Trout fingerlings were \$2.00 per pound.

Table 14-2 provides similar information on the amounts and average yearly costs of stocked hatchery fish for the Mammoth Pool Project only. During the 1990-1999 and 2000-2004 fish were stocked into Mammoth Pool and Rock Creek. The amounts stocked in both locations are combined in Table 14-2. For the period 1990-1999, the average yearly cost of stocked hatchery fish based on CDFG numbers, was approximately \$22,788 per year based on 2005 dollars. For the period 2000-2004, the average yearly cost of stocked hatchery fish was approximately \$50,371 per year based on 2005 dollars.

**Table 14-2. Average Yearly Weight and Value of Hatchery Fish Stocked by CDFG into Mammoth Pool Project Waters by Time Period.**

Period	Average Pounds of Fish Stocked Per Year	Cost per Pound	Total Cost (2005 Dollars) Per Year
1990-1999	7,546	\$3.02	\$22,788
2000-2004	16,679	\$3.02	\$50,371

Regardless of the source, SCE believes it should not be responsible for more than half of the average annual cost, which based on CDFG prices would be \$83,352 to \$87,006 for all of the Big Creek Projects (including non-ALP Projects). For the Mammoth Project, these costs would be \$11,394 to \$25,186. Annualized costs are summarized in Table 14-3 for the CDFG letter amount and the 2000-2004 stocking of hatchery fish. SCE reserves the right to provide some portion of the stocking as fish produced at SCE's hatchery or purchased from some other source.

**Table 14-3. Annualized Cost of Hatchery Fish Stocked by CDFG into Big Creek Project Waters by Scenario for 2000-2004 (2006 Dollars and 44 Year License Term).**

Cost Scenario	Cost Basis	Annualized Cost (2006 Dollars)	SCE Proposed Portion (50 Percent of Annualized Cost)
CDFG Letter	\$300,000	\$373,959	- <sup>1</sup>
2000-2004 Fish Stocking Level Big Creek System	57,620 pounds of fish	\$216,911	\$108,456
2000-2004 Fish Stocking Level Mammoth Project Only	16,679 pounds of fish	\$62,789	\$31,394

<sup>1</sup>-SCE proposes to provide no more than 50 percent of the cost of stocked fish or to provide some portion of the stocked fish from other sources.

***1600 Stream Alteration Maintenance Agreement for Sediment Maintenance (CDFG 2005, page 10)***

In their October 26, 2005 letter, CDFG recommended that the Stream Alteration Maintenance Agreement, which expires on July 31, 2006, be updated. The current Streambed Alteration Maintenance Agreement will be updated and completed prior to license issuance as part of current operations and maintenance under the existing license. The Sediment Management Plan for the Mammoth Pool Project will be prepared for inclusion in the Big Creek ALP License Settlement Agreement and license. The length of the standard agreement is five years. The cost of the agreement is \$1,200 and an additional \$100 per Project action. The agreement would cover removal of sediment from Rock Creek and Ross Creek diversions. This would result in a total cost of \$2,200 per five years for the permit. SCE labor is estimated to be \$5,000 for each permit issuance. The overall cost would be \$7,200 per five years. The annualized cost for this item in 2006 dollars is \$1,556 for the term of the license.

***Terrestrial Resources: Mammoth Pool Deer Protection (CDFG 2005, page 10) and Bear Mitigation (CDFG 2005, page 12)***

CDFG agreed that the Mule Deer License Article and Bear/Human Interaction License Article developed and approved by the Big Creek ALP Plenary address their concerns and that no additional measures would be necessary (SCE 2005d).

Therefore, for both the Proposed Action and Alternative 1, Mammoth Pool Project costs associated with the Mule Deer License Article and the Bear/Human Interaction License Article would remain the same.

**Wildlife Mortality (CDFG 2005, page 11)**

CDFG (2005) expressed a concern that a level of Project-induced wildlife mortality and loss of habitat occurs now and will continue.

For wildlife mortality, CDFG agreed that there is no hard data that specifically identifies Project operations or maintenance activities that have resulted in significant wildlife mortality. SCE attempted to obtain additional information from CDFG on Project operations and maintenance activities that have or could result in significant wildlife mortality. Based on consultation completed to date and the lack of evidence that the Project could cause significant wildlife mortality, SCE is unable to identify potential measures and costs to address wildlife mortality. CDFG requested that the Wildlife Mortality License Article developed during Plenary meetings be withdrawn and not included as part of the Application. SCE has withdrawn the Wildlife Mortality License Article from the Application.

Therefore, for both the Proposed Action and Alternative 1, Mammoth Pool Project, approximately \$500 in annual costs associated with the Wildlife Mortality License Article would be removed. This results in an annualized reduction in cost of \$623 in 2006 dollars over the term of the license.

**Literature Cited**

- Southern California Edison Company (SCE). 2005a. Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) for the Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP); Mammoth Pool (FERC Project No. 2085), Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 (FERC Project No. 2175), Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8, and Eastwood (FERC Project No. 67) and Big Creek No. 3 (FERC Project No. 120). Submitted to FERC November 21, 2005.
- SCE. 2005b. CAWG 7, Characterize Fish Populations, SCE 2003, 2002 Final Technical Study Report Package (FTSRP) for the Big Creek Hydroelectric System Alternative Licensing Process prepared by Southern California Edison. December 2004. *In*: Volume 3 (No. 5 of 7 Volumes) and Volume 4 (No. 4 of 7 Volumes), Supporting Documents (SD-C) of the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) for the Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP); Mammoth Pool (FERC Project No. 2085), Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 (FERC Project No. 2175), Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8, and Eastwood (FERC Project No. 67) and Big Creek No. 3 (FERC Project No. 120). Compact Disk Volume 3 and Volume 4 (Part 2 of 4; No. 7 of 10 disks). Submitted to FERC November 21, 2005.

- 
- SCE. 2005c. CAWG 9, Entrainment, SCE 2005, 2004 Technical Study Report (TSR) for the Big Creek Hydroelectric System Alternative Licensing Process prepared by Southern California Edison. December 2004. *In:* Volume 3 (No. 7 of 7 Volumes) and Volume 4 (No. 4 of 7 Volumes), and Volume 7 (contains Critical Energy Infrastructure Information); Supporting Documents (SD-E) of the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) for the Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP); Mammoth Pool (FERC Project No. 2085), Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 (FERC Project No. 2175), Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8, and Eastwood (FERC Project No. 67) and Big Creek No. 3 (FERC Project No. 120). Compact Disk Volume 3, Volume 4 (Part 2 of 4; No. 7 of 10 disks), and Volume 7 (contains Critical Energy Infrastructure Information). Submitted to FERC November 21, 2005.
- SCE. 2005d. Mule Deer License Article and Bear/Human Interaction License Article *In:* Volume 3 (No. 7 of 7 Volumes), Supporting Documents (SD-G) of the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) for the Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP); Mammoth Pool (FERC Project No. 2085), Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 (FERC Project No. 2175), Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8, and Eastwood (FERC Project No. 67) and Big Creek No. 3 (FERC Project No. 120). Compact Disk Volume 3. Submitted to FERC November 21, 2005.

**ATTACHMENT 14-A**



State of California - The Resources Agency  
**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**  
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov>  
San Joaquin Valley and Southern Sierra Region  
1234 East Shaw Avenue  
Fresno, California 93710  
(559) 243-4005

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor**



October 17, 2005

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
Manager, Northern Hydro Region  
Southern California Edison Company  
Hydro Generation Division  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770

ORIGINAL

FEDERAL ENERGY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

2005 OCT 26 P 3:23

FILED  
OFFICE OF THE  
SECRETARY

Dear Mr. McPheeters:

Comments on the Settlement Proposal recommended by Southern California Edison for relicensing of the Big Creek Hydroelectric Projects Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8 and Eastwood (FERC No. 67), Big Creek No. 3 (FERC NO. 120), Mammoth Pool (FERC No. 2085, and Big Creek Nos. 1 & 2 (FERC No. 2175)  
San Joaquin River Watershed  
Fresno County

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) is charged, under State law, with responsibility as California's principal steward of public trust for fish and wildlife resources (see State Fish and Game Code, Sections 1802, 711.4). In that capacity, we are participating, along with Southern California Edison (Licensee), other agencies, and stakeholders in the Alternative Licensing Procedure (ALP) process for the above listed Hydroelectric Projects. We have reviewed the current Settlement Proposal advanced by the Licensees, along with alternative proposals that were submitted by other Stakeholders that are participating in the ALP Collaborative. We understand that the final Settlement Agreement anticipated to be developed by the ALP Collaborative will propose resource recommendations that include fish and wildlife protection, mitigation and enhancement measures, which will be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for inclusion in the FERC license for the above referenced hydroelectric Projects.

We believe that the ongoing collaborative process is one useful forum for the scoping of issues and for stakeholder involvement in developing protective resource measures. The Department generally concurs with the individual measures that have been proposed thus far within the Collaborative, and we offer some additions herein. We hope to eventually become a signatory to the Settlement Agreement when it is finalized by the ALP Collaborative. Based on a review of the current Settlement

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 2

proposal, and our ongoing participation in the Collaborative, the Department has the following comments on the Settlement Agreement Proposal that has been developed thus far, along with the draft recommendations proposed by the group.

## **AQUATIC RESOURCES**

### **Downstream Anadromous Fisheries and Temperature Control Issues:**

Our Department is the jurisdictional agency which enforces the California Fish and Game Code. Section 5937 of this Code states that "the owner of a dam shall allow sufficient water at all times to pass through a fishway, or in the absence of a fishway, allow sufficient water to pass over, around or through the dam, to keep in good condition any fish that may be planted or exist below the dam."

The Department is concerned that current Project operations, water storage and seasonal patterns, and quantities of water releases from Project reservoirs fail to keep in good condition fish below Project dams several downstream reaches of the San Joaquin River watershed. These fishes' condition, survival and recovery are partially dependent upon adequate releases of water now held and used seasonally within the subject Project reservoirs. This concern includes the maintenance of stream channel and floodplain function, normally associated with regular interval flows which form and maintain the fish habitat characteristics. The operation of Project reservoirs is proportionally responsible for direct, indirect and cumulative fishery impacts in the tributaries and San Joaquin River. The issues associated with downstream fishery protection, including Section 5937 have not been adequately addressed by the ALP to date.

Downstream of the subject Project locations, and dependent upon their operations, is Friant Dam, operated by the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). Behind Friant Dam is Millerton Lake, with a total volume of 578,000 acre feet. The dam dynamically regulates a much larger quantity of water each year; however, the seasonal inflow to Millerton Lake is largely dependent upon the timing and volumes of water releases made upstream at the Big Creek Project system reservoirs (4 under ALP; 3 others under traditional relicensing). Thus, the Big Creek system operation has direct, indirect and cumulative effects on reservoir operations and protection of fishery resources well downstream in the watershed.

Last year, in Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) v. Rodgers, a federal district court in Sacramento ruled that the USBR had violated Section 5937 by failing to release sufficient flows to keep in good condition the downstream fish populations, including anadromous salmon runs that were ultimately extirpated in the late 1940s when Friant Dam became fully operational. The federal court will be determining remedies for the USBR's Section 5937 violation in a trial commencing in February, 2006

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 3

with a decision expected by May, 2006. That decision is anticipated to include recommended flows for downstream fisheries pursuant to Section 5937. Preliminary analyses of the appropriate instream flows needed for fishery recovery purposes indicate that the timing of releases from the upstream reservoirs operated by the Licensee (with a total volume of about 630,000 acre feet) may be useful in seasonally supplementing any Friant Dam fishery releases in certain water years. Coordinated operations of the Big Creek system to supplement any flows from Friant Dam required by the federal court may assist in providing for optimum fishery flows downstream. It is the Department's opinion that modifications will eventually need to be made in Big Creek Project operations in order to proportionally mitigate for the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of those operations on downstream fisheries, and keep those fisheries in good condition as suggested by Section 5937. Project modifications should eventually be coordinated with Friant Dam operations. Although Friant Dam was a prime contributing factor to the decline of downstream freshwater and anadromous fisheries, the Big Creek Project dams also had proportional impacts. Again, the Department believes such proportional impacts must be addressed through operational changes such as flows release of appropriate temperature and timing.

Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon (about 120,000 per year), fall-run Chinook salmon (about 25-30,000 per year) and steelhead rainbow trout (undetermined numbers) annually migrated up the San Joaquin River to spawn each year within the Project's reach. Spring-run salmon were documented to over-summer in the upper (cooler) reaches of the river at elevations up to 6,500 feet; i.e., well within the boundaries of the subject power licenses. A significant percentage of the spring run's access to cooler over-summer habitat was blocked in 1916 by the construction of Kerckhoff Dam by (then) Pacific Power and Light Company (FERC Project No. 96; Pacific Gas and Electric Company). After that time, a smaller population of spring-run salmon persisted within the remaining summer habitat downstream. Kerckhoff Reservoir storage is very small, consequently, this Project was, and still is, operated as a run-of-the-river power plant. This reservoir has insufficient storage capacity to alter major water flow volumes, or to modify downstream temperatures, yet is of sufficient height to block fish migrations upstream.

The Big Creek Project reservoirs were constructed after 1916. While this series of Project dams may not have directly obstructed the upstream salmon and steelhead migrations, they did directly, indirectly and cumulatively affect the timing and magnitude of water releases; essentially by storing spring snowmelt runoff, then releasing the water later in the summer and fall periods, for power production. A subtle increase in fall flows may have been beneficial for the upstream migrant fall-run salmon, and steelhead below the dams, but the seriously reduced spring water flows downstream of Kerckhoff Dam remain a serious concern today. We have completed 50-plus years of research on the other major San Joaquin River tributaries, which indicates that today, salmon populations in the San Joaquin watershed are strongly dependent upon the

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 4

timing, volumes and temperatures of spring flows originating from the upper watershed areas. As the Big Creek Projects are within this upper watershed, and did have the impacts described, we feel it is entirely appropriate and necessary to address these issues in this relicensing venue.

Flow volumes during migration periods are a critical controlling factor in the survival of juvenile salmon as they migrate to the Pacific Ocean and, juvenile survival is directly and strongly related to adult salmon production. Consequently, there is little question that the Big Creek Project facilities and operations have directly contributed to reduced spring and fall-run salmon populations in the San Joaquin River watershed. To supplement fishery restoration in the lower watershed, stored Big Creek Project water may need to be released to downstream reservoirs and thence the river earlier in the drier series of years. To the extent other uses of Millerton Lake water are allowed in the NRDC v. Rodgers litigation, then water from the upstream Big Creek reservoirs may be useful in larger volumes in many more years.

It is apparent to us that: (i), the federal court has found that the federal Friant Unit of the Central Valley Project is governed by Section 5937, (ii) fish protection and recovery downstream of Friant Dam, is expected to be required by the court, (iii) such protection and recovery may be supplemented by the operations of the upstream reservoirs of the Big Creek Project now undergoing license renewals, (iv) the FERC and USBR should work collaboratively to determine the relationship of upstream storage to fishery flow requirements downstream (including the San Joaquin River below Friant Dam), (v) direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of Project operations on downstream fisheries should be addressed in the NEPA analysis associated with the Project relicensing proceedings, with appropriate mitigation and enhancement considered, and (vi) water quality (e.g. temperature) issues should be addressed in the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Section 401 water quality certification and elsewhere as necessary. In conclusion, it is our position that the downstream fishery protection mandate under Section 5937 has not been adequately addressed in the ALP or the Licensee's current Settlement Proposal. Because each of the Hydroelectric Projects participates directly, indirectly and cumulatively affecting the downstream flow quantity and quality (e.g., temperature) issues, we request that these effects be specifically considered in the process of developing license articles and provisions for the individual licenses, and the Big Creek system comprehensively. These effects should also be considered in the CEQA and NEPA process related to the Project. Our downstream fishery and water quality concerns were identified and documented as significant issues during the collaborative proceedings, in particular, during discussions related to CAWG-13 Anadromous Fish technical study.

We emphasize that today, the Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) is listed as "threatened" under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Populations of Central Valley spring-run Chinook

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 5

salmon are significantly reduced below historical levels. Within the San Joaquin River Basin, the spring-run Chinook salmon population has been extirpated, (although a few adults originating from northern Central Valley watersheds stray into the San Joaquin in wet years). The loss of the huge historical San Joaquin Basin contingent of spring-run in the Central Valley rivers is a major basis for their ESA listing.

Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon are classified as a "Species of Concern" under the federal ESA, in part due to the tenuous year-to-year status of their populations in many of the San Joaquin River tributary streams. Although currently not protected under the ESA, recovery of fall-run Chinook salmon and recovery will involve all of the water operations mitigation measures discussed herein that will be cross-coordinated among and/or between the various other water operators within the major San Joaquin River tributaries, so as to achieve a coordinated schedule of flows and temperatures, and to cumulatively satisfy the Federal Clean Water Act water quality standards as adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board within the downstream Delta and Estuary.

Central Valley steelhead rainbow trout are also listed as threatened under the ESA and, like fall-run Chinook salmon, are represented by seriously reduced San Joaquin River populations. Recovery of steelhead and fall-run Chinook salmon is a focus of our present concern. The present-day total absence of populations of these species within their historical upper main-stem San Joaquin River habitat is a key factor in their current status in California. They are now geographically restricted to habitats below low-elevation dams in the other major San Joaquin River tributaries, and even those populations are subject to the modifications made by those dams to natural water flows and temperatures.

We believe that the collective operations of SCE's four subject upstream hydroelectric Projects (along with the three SCE hydroelectric Projects currently in traditional relicensing) and the other hydroelectric licenses within the other tributaries of the San Joaquin River watershed, materially affect the hydrological, thermal and water quality regimes on much of the San Joaquin River watershed. If those operations and/or the associated facilities are appropriately modified, downstream fish populations can be maintained in good condition.

Restoration objectives for all of these anadromous species are shared by the Department, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), NOAA Fisheries, and the joint Federal-State CALFED Bay-Delta Authority. The restoration objectives are also reiterated within the Federal Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), which specifically calls for measures intended to double the natural production of anadromous fish populations throughout the Central Valley watersheds. The CALFED Bay-Delta Authority and the USFWS's Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (pursuant to the CVPIA) have jointly expended in excess of \$30 million on anadromous fish

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 6

restoration projects within the San Joaquin River watershed over the past decade. This has included millions of dollars expended specifically within the San Joaquin River watershed to recover historically reduced salmon spawning and rearing habitats and fish screens.

We understand that the USBR is currently developing a comprehensive water temperature model for Millerton Lake, for the lower San Joaquin River watershed, in recognition of the importance of water temperatures downstream of Friant Dam to anadromous fish survival, reproduction, and ultimate recovery. Further studies, hydrologic and temperature modeling, are necessary to determine appropriate, contributinal Project releases for fisheries downstream of Friant Dam.

In summary, the Department requests that the Project Licenses be conditioned to require a study of fishery requirements downstream of the Project dams, including a proportionate contribution to flows and water quality (e.g. temperature) downstream of Friant Dam in coordination with any flows required by the NRDC v. Rodgers litigation. A public review of such study results should be required at an appropriate time interval, similar to the review provisions included in other projects in the San Joaquin River watershed (see FERC License No. 2299, New Don Pedro Project, on the Tuolumne River). We request that such a review would be combined with a well-focused license re-opener condition that would allow consideration and adoption of additional or revised license conditions/articles on one or more of the Big Creek licenses currently in relicensing (ALP or Traditional). The review should include the results of the upstream operational and temperature modeling conducted by the Licensee for the ALP process, linked together with the model developed by the USBR, along with other ongoing basin-wide modeling to assess the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the Projects and evaluate and define alternative operational strategies over the next five years (2005-2010). Changes in License conditions or other outcomes could occur thereafter.

In development of the NEPA documentation for the subject Project licenses, we request that an appropriate analysis be provided, which takes into consideration the current (at the time) products of the above-described modeling efforts, thermal tolerance criteria of the San Joaquin River salmon, as developed and described above. The NEPA documentation should also address the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the continued operation of upstream reservoirs upon the downstream anadromous fish populations and the already-costly efforts to restore these historically numerous populations, at least to the doubling goal, as established by Congress in the CVPIA, and as necessary to satisfy ESA requirements.

Finally, the NEPA document should be structured in such a manner that ESA and NEPA compliance associated with subsequent decisions to add/revise license articles and any protection, mitigation and enhancement measures adopted, can be accomplished efficiently. We have many years of pragmatic experience and scientific

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 7

information concerning the runs of salmon within the major San Joaquin River tributaries and along the San Joaquin River, including the subject Project areas. We can provide this assistance upon request.

Resident Fish Instream Flow Recommendations:

Based on its review of instream flow studies, geomorphology studies, and other aquatic technical studies prepared for the current relicensing, the Department has developed recommended instream flows for the twenty-three (23) stream reaches of the Upper San Joaquin River and tributaries that are affected by the Projects (not including the stretches below Friant Dam). These recommended instream flows are summarized in an attachment to this letter (Attachment A). The general rationale for the Department's flow recommendations includes the following concepts:

- 1) In general the Department recommends more gradual transitions during seasonal changes in required minimum flows (ramping criteria). This avoids abrupt changes in water levels, which could result in the stranding of fish, macroinvertebrates, and other aquatic organisms and will serve to provide a more natural annual hydrological regime.
- 2) The recommended flows reflect improved provision of increased flows for spring spawning fish, and increased thermal protection for the stream fisheries and other aquatic organisms, along with fish passage in late summer and fall, when low water levels often result in temperatures that are deleterious to cold water fish.
- 3) For diverted reaches that are located at lower elevations within the upper San Joaquin River watershed, the Department recommends that higher flows for spring spawning fish and other aquatic organisms be initiated earlier than at high elevations, in order to coincide with earlier warm up of these lower elevation areas.
- 4) The Department's recommended instream flows are assumed to be Minimum Instream Flow (MIF), or inflow, whichever is less. Regular frequencies of high channel and floodplain maintenance flows are to occur as well.
- 5) The management of sediment accumulating at Project facilities is critical to healthy stream ecosystems. The sediment management program for the Big Creek system is a key element of the Licenses.

Some flow recommendations may need to be re-evaluated based on the need to coordinate flow releases with Friant Dam operations in the future.

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 8

### Mammoth Pool Silver Iodide Monitoring:

The Licensee currently contracts for the application of silver iodide in the watershed to enhance rainfall in the upper San Joaquin River watershed which is intended to increase water yields for Project operations. Silver iodide applications are delivered using both aerial application and ground generating stations. Water quality studies conducted in support of the current Project relicensings have identified elevated levels of silver in composite liver samples of adult trout in Mammoth Pool Reservoir. Muscle tissues (filet) in sampled fish did not demonstrate elevated silver levels. While silver levels in fish muscle tissues do not appear to be present at levels that would adversely affect humans or wildlife, live sample results are of concern to the Department. Consumption of fish that contain elevated levels of silver in liver tissue may not pose a threat to humans, who normally consume only muscle (filet) tissue. However, raptors and other large wildlife that regularly consume the entire carcass, including liver tissues, may eventually consume and bioaccumulate sufficient silver to cause deleterious effects. Wildlife at other trophic levels may be more sensitive. In addition, the source of the uptake of the silver in fish tissues, which may be macroinvertebrates such as crayfish, should be identified.

The Department recommends that a monitoring program, designed to identify trends in the levels and source(s) of silver accumulation in pertinent fish tissues (e.g. liver and muscle), and the tissues and whole bodies of aquatic organisms regularly consumed by fish (such as crayfish or other macroinvertebrates), over time, should be conducted on appropriate intervals (e.g. every 3 years) during the term of the license for the Mammoth Pool Project area. The program should be conducted in the balance of the Project reservoirs and stream reaches, but with longer sampling intervals (e.g. every 5-10 years) as warranted by the geography of, silver iodide application, and as more limited "spot" sampling suggests. The program should be developed in consultation with the Department, SWRCB, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and other appropriate agencies. A schedule/table describing the various monitoring and reporting elements for silver in fish and macroinvertebrates should be defined as a Project license term.

### Project Reservoir Minimum Pools:

The Department recommends that retention of water in Project reservoirs for recreational resources be balanced with the needs of resident trout and downstream anadromous fisheries. Current operational minimum pools in the Project area do not appear to adversely affect the fisheries within Project reservoirs; however, changes in reservoir operations developed during the ALP may result in different operational scenarios, related to timing of flows and minimum pool levels, which could affect aquatic resources in reservoirs or downstream. Monitoring for impacts to aquatic

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 9

resources in reservoirs should be included as part of the resource monitoring program developed for inclusion in the Settlement Agreement. Provisions for remedial actions should be included.

#### Fish Entrainment Mortality:

The Department has the authority, based upon Fish and Game Code Chapter 3, Articles 1 through 5, et seq., to require installation of fish screens on power diversion facilities that the Department has determined to cause entrainment of a significant number of fish. Based upon our review of the entrainment studies conducted for the relicensing, the Department will propose that drop tube intakes in the Project area, primarily those diversions that provide water to the Ward Tunnel, be screened to exclude and not impinge adult fish. Larval and juvenile fish, invertebrates and other wildlife will continue to be lost there and elsewhere in the Projects area. In addition to construction of the screens described above, the Department will require that additional mitigation for ongoing fish loss from entrainment/impingement at Project facilities and diversions to offset these losses. Despite the results of the entrainment studies conducted by consultants for the Licensee, which found that entrainment in Project facilities does not appear to be substantial, the Department is aware that entrainment loss does occur, we deem it significant, and will require mitigation. We encourage the Licensee to consult with us as soon as possible to define the scope and mechanism(s) to satisfy this mitigation obligation in a pragmatic manner.

#### Data used to Determine Fish Densities in Project Reaches:

The Department is concerned that data used as a reference for fish densities within the Project area is limited to those found in the report entitled "Fish Population and Yield Estimates from California Trout Streams" (Eric Gerstung, CDFG, 1973). The Department considers the fish density numbers in this report to be relatively low, and likely not representative of the range of current fish densities in Project reaches. More recent data is available, which we understand that the Licensee obtained from our Wild Trout Program office in Sacramento. It appears that this more recent data was not used, and that the Licensee has relied entirely on fish density information contained in the "Gerstung" report. The Department continues to recommend that more recent information be used to provide more current reference information for fish densities in the Project area and as a basis in environmental documentation or evaluations.

#### Hatchery Support for Stocking of Project Impoundments and Project-Affected Reaches

The Project attracts a high amount of public recreation use, which includes angling in Project affected reservoirs and stream/river reaches. This has become an important economic element in the nearby, mountain communities, and is an attractive feature for stimulating recreational expenditures in the Fresno Metropolitan area and elsewhere. This intensifies fishing pressure in Project stream reaches, reservoirs and nearby waters. The Department also recognizes that the Project, as a whole, has adversely affected the upper basin fishery by changes in timing and amount of instream

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 10

flows from those that occurred historically, in addition to the level of entrainment and entrapment in Project facilities and diversions. Therefore, the Department requests that the Licensee reimburse the Department for the ongoing cost for fish stocking, along with efforts for fish production and monitoring, that are needed to sustain a high quality recreational fishery in Project impoundments and Project affected reaches and nearby waters in the upper San Joaquin River watershed. The current cost, as estimated by the Department, is in the range of \$300,000 each year. This excludes mitigation for entrainment and entrapment losses discussed above. This amount would need to be provided on a consistent basis over the term of the renewed License, and re-evaluated annually, and adjusted for inflation and increasing levels of use over time. We encourage the Licensee to consult with us as soon as possible to define the scope and mechanisms to satisfy this mitigation obligation.

#### 1600 Stream Alteration Maintenance Agreement for Sediment Maintenance:

A Stream Alteration Maintenance Agreement is currently in place that addresses the ongoing annual removal of sediment, vegetation, and other debris from many of the small and mid-sized impoundments in the upper San Joaquin River watershed. This Agreement expires on July 31, 2006. We recommend that this Agreement be updated (perhaps for a longer term) upon its expiration, to ensure that adequate fish and wildlife protection is implemented during sediment management activities at Project facilities. Recommended sediment management plans may be attached to and incorporated into this Agreement consistent with, or in addition to sediment management measures approved by the ALP Collaborative and FERC.

### **TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES**

#### Mammoth Pool Deer Protection:

The Department recommends the continuation of License conditions included in the present FERC License, with one exception described below. These original measures were intended to protect deer by avoiding or partially mitigating impacts during migrations and/or residence in the area of Mammoth Pool Reservoir. The original conditions included the requirement that the Licensee construct ramps in the vicinity of Mammoth Pool Dam to facilitate the entry and exit of deer that must swim the reservoir. As stated previously by Department staff during the collaborative meeting process, this measure has not been completed to date, and we now recommend that this item be deleted from the current list of protective measures. The Department does not continue to recommend the construction of deer access ramps near the Mammoth Pool spillway, as these were located in solid rock, and not conducive to efficient use by deer.

The Department remains concerned about the potential accumulation of trash and debris in the reservoir, which could cause deer to drown while swimming the reservoir. The technical report for the mule deer study indicated that SCE does not

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 11

regularly remove large debris from Mammoth Pool. Although no trash or other debris was observed in the reservoir during the deer migration study conducted in 2002 for this relicensing, historically, floating trash and debris are observed at both the entry and exit points along the defined deer migration routes, which could increase mortality of migrating deer.

To ensure that the presence of debris is monitored, and that any build up of debris is removed in a timely way to protect migrating deer that swim the reservoir during annual migrations, the Department recommends that the Licensee provide annual photo documentation of the area of primary concern to the Department, along with an estimate of the aerial extent of debris buildup well in advance of the deer migration periods. This area is located at the floating boom above the spill way. If, based on the Department's review of the photograph, and other information regarding the aerial extent of any debris buildup present, the Department considers the buildup sufficient to expose deer to increase mortality, the Licensee would be requested to remove the debris before migrations begin. This measure should be added as a condition of the license and/or an element of the Settlement Agreement.

#### Wildlife Mortality

The technical studies that were conducted for the current relicensing did not identify significant wildlife mortality within the Project area. However, because the study design was not intended to obtain such information, the study would not likely identify the subtle, ongoing and significant mortality that occurs to diverse wildlife species as a result of Project reservoirs, operations (particularly in spill years) and Project associated traffic. The wildlife mortality observed in the study and generally by our staff on a regular basis is indicative of the wildlife mortality that occurs as a result of these Projects. The Department receives reports of deer and other wildlife mortality at Mammoth Pool and other Project reservoirs over time. We believe that as recreational uses at Project reservoirs has increased, traffic to/from recreational destinations has increased, and the wildlife loss due to road kill or injury has and will continue to increase. Based on the above discussion and the Department's knowledge of wildlife and their migrations and use of the Project area, it is clear that a level of Project-induced wildlife mortality occurs now and will continue through the term of relicensing.

We believe this loss is significant due to the consequences suffered at population levels over the life of the Projects. For instance, a loss of a single doe (deer) may seem insignificant on the surface. But, when the consequential losses of fawns that the lost doe and their successive offspring would have produced over their lifetimes are considered, the impact of each mortality expands substantially. This represents "opportunity loss" to the population and to the beneficial uses. It is the Department's position that deer and other wildlife are lost on a consistent basis over time due to the Projects. Therefore, appropriate mitigation measures should be implemented as an element of this relicensing.

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 12

A broad array of mitigation strategies should be considered and implemented in a Wildlife Mortality Mitigation Program. Some of these strategies to offset the mortality impact can be conducted at areas outside of the Project boundary in order to provide population benefits to the species involved. For instance, improvement of fawning or wintering habitat for the San Joaquin Mule deer herd to increase productivity is an appropriate mitigation measure to offset losses to this herd caused by Project operations. Since these habitat types may not exist directly on the Project area, SCE and the Department would need to collaborate with the landowner(s) and implement projects, with funding from the Wildlife Mortality Mitigation Program. This mitigation will need to be conducted on an ongoing basis during the entire lifespan of the Project's license in recognition of the ongoing wildlife mortality. Similar to the Fish Entrainment and Hatchery Support mitigation funding, a consistent source of funding over the term of the license is necessary for an effective program. The Department encourages the Licensee to consult with us as soon as possible to define and develop the scope and mechanism(s) to satisfy this component of Project's mitigation obligation.

#### Bear Mitigation:

The Department is very concerned about recurring bear/human and other wildlife incidents at facilities in the Project area, especially in the town of Big Creek, which is a residential area for SCE employees. The bears are attracted to improperly stored food and garbage, causing potentially dangerous conflicts with humans. Bears conditioned in a manner that present human safety or property damage, may be removed or killed under State law. Thus, a Project induced impact (human development and mishandling of refuse), results in wildlife mortality, threats to safety and property damage in some cases. The Department strongly recommends that the Licensee purchase, employ and maintain bear proof dumpsters at all facilities within its scope of responsibility in and adjacent to the FERC Project area and within the town of Big Creek for the duration of the relicensing period. The dumpsters should be of a quality and design equivalent to those effectively used in our local National Parks. We also recommend that the Licensee assist the Department by developing and monitoring a mandatory educational program on proper food storage and garbage disposal for its employees and visitors, so that some bear/human incidents are prevented throughout the Project area. The Department can identify specific sites for these containers and for educational material dispersal in consultation with our many partners in the Project area.

#### Department Access to Restricted FERC Project Areas:


The Department regularly conducts wildlife and aquatic surveys and enforcement activities in portions of the Upper San Joaquin River watershed, which may require access to Project roadways that are currently closed to public access by locked gates. The Department will need to continue to access these areas during the renewed license term, and requests continued cooperation by the Licensee in granting access to these restricted areas. As in the past, Department staff will contact the Licensees as

Mr. Jeff McPheeters  
October 17, 2005  
Page 13

appropriate, and check out necessary keys to obtain access to these areas, with the exception of Department law enforcement personnel who will have access to restricted areas at all time. Law enforcement personnel will make prior arrangements with the Licensee to ensure that they have appropriate keys and/or lock combinations to restricted areas. No additional demand for fish and wildlife enforcement efforts are anticipated under the above conditions of this relicensing.

We hope that these comments will assist you in completing the development of conditions and License articles for inclusion in a viable Settlement Agreement and conditions for relicensing of the subject Projects. If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact Ms. Julie Means, Environmental Scientist, or Mr. Dale Mitchell, Environmental Program Manager, at the address on this letterhead or telephone number, extension 141. Thank you for this opportunity to provide the Department's comments.

Sincerely,



W. E. Loudemilk  
Regional Manager

Attachment

cc: See Pages 14 -16

**Mr. Jeff McPheeters**  
October 17, 2005  
Page 14

cc: ✓ **Secretary Magalie R. Salas**  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

**Mr. Mike Henry**  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

**Mr. Jim Canaday**  
State Water Resource Control Board  
Division of Water Rights  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812

**Ms. Deborah Giglio**  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
2800 Cottage Way, W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825

**Mr. Michael Aceituno**  
NOAA Fisheries  
650 Capitol Mall Blvd, Ste 8300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Mr. Steve Edmonson**  
NOAA Fisheries  
777 Sonoma Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

**Mr. Stacy Li**  
NOAA Fisheries  
777 Sonoma Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

**Mr. Phil Strand, Fisheries Coordinator**  
Sierra National Forest  
1600 Tollhouse Road  
Clovis, CA 93611

**Mr. Wayne White**  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
2800 Cottage Way, W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825

**Mr. Jeff McPheeters**  
**October 17, 2005**  
**Page 15**

**cc: Mr. Michael Hoover**  
**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**2800 Cottage Way, W-2605**  
**Sacramento, CA 95825**

**Mr. Russel Bellmer**  
**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**4001 N. Wilson Way**  
**Stockton, CA 95205-2486**

**Mr. Bill Luce**  
**US Bureau of Reclamation**  
**1243 "N" Street**  
**Fresno, CA 93721-5116**

**Mr. Ed Cole**  
**Forest Supervisor**  
**Sierra National Forest**  
**1600 East Tollhouse Road**  
**Clovis, CA 93611**

**Ms. Cindy Whelan**  
**FERC Relicensing Coordinator**  
**Sierra National Forest**  
**1600 East Tollhouse Road**  
**Clovis, CA 93611**

**Ms. Kelly L Catlett**  
**Hydro Reform Policy Advocate**  
**Friends of the River**  
**915 20th Street**  
**Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Mr. Banky Curtis, Deputy Director**  
**Habitat Conservation Branch**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Ms. Ann Malcolm, Chief Counsel**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Harlee Branch, Staff Counsel**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Jeff McPheeters**  
**October 17, 2005**  
**Page 16**

**cc: Mr. Kevin Hunting,**  
**Habitat Conservation Planning Branch**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Sonke Mastrup, Deputy Director**  
**Wildlife and Inland Fisheries Division**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Stan Stephens**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Dale Mitchell**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Randy Kelly**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Mr. Dean Marston**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**Ms. Julie Means**  
**Department of Fish and Game**

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Department of Fish and Game  
 Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations  
 For the Southern California Edison  
 Upper San Joaquin River Hydroelectric Projects  
 Big Creek ALP Relicensing**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Balsam Creek Reach: Diversion to Big Creek

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	2	1
Nov	1	1
Dec	1	1
Jan	1	1
Feb	1	1
Mar	2	1
Apr	3	2
May	3	2
Jun	2	1
Jul	2	1
Aug	2	1
Sep	2	1

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Balsam Creek Reach: Forebay to Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	2	1.5
Nov	1.5	1.5
Dec	1.5	1.5
Jan	1.5	1.5
Feb	1.5	1.5
Mar	1.5	1.5
Apr	3	3
May	4	3
Jun	3	3
Jul	2	1.5
Aug	2	1.5
Sep	2	1.5

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Big Creek      Reach: Dam 4 to Dam 5

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	10	7
Nov	7	7
Dec	7	7
Jan	7	7
Feb	7	7
Mar	7	7
Apr	20	15
May	20	15
Jun	20	15
Jul	15	10
Aug	15	10
Sep	15	10

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Big Creek      Reach: Dam 5 to the San Joaquin River

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	10	8
Nov	8	8
Dec	8	8
Jan	8	8
Feb	8	8
Mar	8	8
Apr	20	15
May	20	15
Jun	20	15
Jul	15	10
Aug	15	10
Sep	10	10

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Ely Creek      Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	1
Nov	1	1
Dec	1	1
Jan	1	1
Feb	1	1
Mar	1	1
Apr	3	2
May	3	2
Jun	3	1
Jul	2	1
Aug	2	1
Sep	1	1

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

**Huntington-Shaver Area**

**Stream: NF Stevenson Creek Reach: Below Tunnel 7 to Shaver Lake**

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	12	12
Nov	12	12
Dec	12	12
Jan	8	8
Feb	8	8
Mar	8	8
Apr	25	20
May	25	20
Jun	20	20
Jul	15	12
Aug	15	12
Sep	12	12

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Huntington-Shaver Area

Stream: Pitman Creek    Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	2	1.5
Nov	1.5	1.5
Dec	1.5	1.5
Jan	1.5	1.5
Feb	1.5	1.5
Mar	1.5	1.5
Apr	5	3
May	5	3
Jun	5	3
Jul	3	1.5
Aug	2	1.5
Sep	2	1.5

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Lower San Joaquin River

Stream: Rock Creek

Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	2	2
Nov	2	2
Dec	2	2
Jan	2	2
Feb	2	2
Mar	4	3
Apr	4	3
May	4	3
Jun	3	2
Jul	2	2
Aug	2	2
Sep	2	2

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Lower San Joaquin River

Stream: Ross Creek

Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	.5
Nov	1	.5
Dec	1	.5
Jan	1	.5
Feb	1	.5
Mar	2	2
Apr	3	2
May	3	2
Jun	2	1
Jul	1	.5
Aug	1	.5
Sep	1	.5

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Lower San Joaquin River

Stream: San Joaquin River      Reach: Dam 6 to Redinger

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	75	50
Nov	25	25
Dec	25	20
Jan	25	20
Feb	25	20
Mar	75	60
Apr	100	80
May	100	80
Jun	100	80
Jul	75	60
Aug	75	50
Sep	75	50

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Lower San Joaquin River

Stream: San Joaquin River      Reach: Mammoth Pool to Dam 6

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	120	100
Nov	100	100
Dec	80	80
Jan	75	60
Feb	75	60
Mar	75	60
Apr	120	120
May	150	120
Jun	150	100
Jul	120	100
Aug	120	100
Sep	120	100

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Lower San Joaquin River

Stream: Stevenson Creek      Reach: Shaver Lake to San Joaquin River

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	8	5
Nov	5	5
Dec	5	5
Jan	5	5
Feb	5	5
Mar	5	5
Apr	15	10
May	15	10
Jun	10	9
Jul	8	8
Aug	8	8
Sep	8	8

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

South Fork San Joaquin River

Stream: Bear Creek

Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	7	7
Nov	7	7
Dec	6	5
Jan	4	4
Feb	4	4
Mar	4	4
Apr	12	10
May	12	10
Jun	10	9
Jul	8	7
Aug	7	7
Sep	7	7

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

South Fork San Joaquin River

Stream: Mono Creek

Reach: Downstream of Mono Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	30	25
Nov	25	25
Dec	20	20
Jan	20	20
Feb	20	20
Mar	30	20
Apr	35	30
May	35	30
Jun	30	25
Jul	30	25
Aug	30	25
Sep	30	25

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

South Fork San Joaquin River

Stream: S. Fork San Joaquin River    Reach: Florence Lake to Bear Creek

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	40	35
Nov	35	35
Dec	30	25
Jan	30	25
Feb	30	25
Mar	30	25
Apr	45	40
May	45	40
Jun	45	40
Jul	40	35
Aug	40	35
Sep	40	35

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

**Upper Basin Tributaries**

**Stream: Bolsillo Creek**

**Reach: Below the Diversion**

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	1
Nov	1	1
Dec	1	1
Jan	1	1
Feb	1	1
Mar	1	1
Apr	3	3
May	4	3
Jun	4	3
Jul	3	1
Aug	2	1
Sep	1	1

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Upper Basin Tributaries

Stream: Camp 62 Creek

Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	.5
Nov	.5	.5
Dec	.5	.5
Jan	.5	.5
Feb	.5	.5
Mar	.5	.5
Apr	5	4
May	5	4
Jun	5	4
Jul	2	1
Aug	2	1
Sep	1	1

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations****Upper Basin Tributaries****Stream: Chinquapin Creek****Reach: Below the Diversion**

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	.5
Nov	1	.5
Dec	1	.5
Jan	.5	.5
Feb	.5	.5
Mar	.5	.5
Apr	3	2
May	3	2
Jun	2	2
Jul	1	1
Aug	1	1
Sep	1	1

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

**Upper Basin Tributaries**

**Stream: Crater Creek**

**Reach: Below the Diversion**

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	2	2
Nov	2	2
Dec	2	2
Jan	2	2
Feb	2	2
Mar	2	2
Apr	8	5
May	8	5
Jun	6	5
Jul	4	2
Aug	3	2
Sep	2	2

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

**ATTACHMENT A**

**DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations**

Upper Basin Tributaries

Stream: Hooper Creek

Reach: Below the Diversion

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	3	2
Nov	2	2
Dec	2	2
Jan	2	2
Feb	2	2
Mar	2	2
Apr	6	4
May	6	4
Jun	6	4
Jul	4	3
Aug	4	3
Sep	3	3

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

\* = or natural flow whichever is less

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations****Upper Basin Tributaries****Stream: N. Slide Creek****Reach: Below the Diversion**

DFG concurs with the USFS recommendation to remove this non-operating diversion from service. If that does not occur, then the MIF\* are as follows:

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	.75
Nov	1	.75
Dec	1	.75
Jan	1	.75
Feb	1	.75
Mar	1	.75
Apr	3	2
May	2	2
Jun	1	.75
Jul	1	.75
Aug	1	.75
Sep	1	.75

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

\* = or natural flow whichever is less

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations****Upper Basin Tributaries****Stream: S. Slide Creek****Reach: Below the Diversion**

DFG concurs with the USFS recommendation to remove this non-operating diversion from service. If that does not occur, then the MIF\* are as follows:

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	1	.75
Nov	1	.75
Dec	1	.75
Jan	1	.75
Feb	1	.75
Mar	1	.75
Apr	3	2
May	2	2
Jun	1	.75
Jul	1	.75
Aug	1	.75
Sep	1	.75

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

\* = or natural flow whichever is less

**ATTACHMENT A****DFG Minimum Instream Flow Recommendations****Upper Basin Tributaries****Stream: Tombstone Creek****Reach: Below the Diversion**

DFG concurs with the USFS recommendation to remove this non-operating diversion from service. If that does not occur, then the MIF\* are as follows:

Month	DFG wet year	DFG dry year
Oct	6	4
Nov	4	3
Dec	4	3
Jan	4	3
Feb	4	3
Mar	4	3
Apr	6	4
May	6	4
Jun	6	4
Jul	6	4
Aug	6	4
Sep	6	4

wet year = above average and wet water year types

dry year = below normal, dry, and critically dry water year types

\* = or natural flow whichever is less

**ATTACHMENT 14-B**

**Attendees:**

Dale Mitchell, CDFG

Geoff Rabone, SCE

Julie Means, CDFG

Wayne Allen, SCE

Kevin O'Connor, CDFG

Wayne Lifton, ENTRIX

Janelle Nolan-Summers, Robertson-Bryant

**Meeting Notes**

We focused on Mammoth issues at this meeting for the AIR No. 14 response.

We noted the concern for flexibility in responding to changing needs for anadromous fish restoration that may be identified in the future. This may or may not affect Project operations. New projects for water storage are being considered by state and federal agencies that may, when proposed, affect SCE operations. CDFG would like to work with SCE to facilitate benefits for anadromous fish downstream of Friant Dam without the need for a license re-opener. This may be accomplished through the MPOA or some other means, but it is difficult to address at this time, as the outcome of pending court cases have not been announced, nor have proposals for new potential projects been sufficiently developed.

SJR Mammoth Pool Dam to Mammoth Pool Powerhouse reach flows. CDFG still officially supports their MIF proposal. While they may eventually agree to the flows currently being negotiated, no settlement has been finalized yet, so the cost of the flows in their letter should be analyzed for purposes of this AIR. CDFG has not identified CRM flows, while recognizing the potential need for these flows in some locations. Therefore, the CDFG proposal will be analyzed on the basis of MIFs only and compared to MIF costs for PDEA Proposed Alternative and Alternative 1.

CDFG has indicated that they would likely support language that would allow for decreased MIFs in critical dry years, especially in drought periods. Dale Mitchell requested a copy of the weighted usable area tables for the Mammoth Pool bypass reach shown during the meeting. SCE agreed to provide those tables. CDFG requested clarification of how WY types were defined. CDWR Bulletin 120 was identified as the reference for WY types.

CDFG wants SCE to provide funding for fish stocking and for potential PM&E measures that could include compensation for fish management, entrainment effects, and terrestrial wildlife losses. This mechanism also could be used to address timber management issues not related to the FERC licenses. CDFG thinks that this funding could either be in the form of a license condition or a separate agreement including the USFS. CDFG wants SCE to identify an acceptable funding level. CDFG can bring fish and other things to the table, possibly a reservoir enhancement program.

Monitoring requests from the CDFG letter were discussed. CDFG's interest in monitoring silver in fish and crayfish tissue is focused on determining if the silver found

in tissue from Mammoth Pool Reservoir is due to upstream (non-Project) mining or from SCE's cloud seeding. A potential program of monitoring silver in fish and crayfish tissues (crayfish in Mammoth Pool Reservoir only) was discussed. SCE proposes to collect tissue samples from wild fish in Mammoth Pool Reservoir, Huntington Lake, and Lake Thomas A. Edison and analyze for silver content for whole body and liver. The program would be initiated after license issuance and repeated at 10-year intervals for the duration of the Project licenses. The collection of fish tissue samples would be performed in conjunction with fish community sampling in the major Project reservoirs, which would also take place, once every 10-years.

CDFG indicated that they would be concerned if changes in SCE operations because of PM&E measures altered the minimum pool in Project reservoirs. SCE indicated that analyses conducted to date indicated that there should be minimal effects on minimum pool in Project reservoirs.

There was a brief discussion of ALP intakes and entrainment. Based on SCE's fish and entrainment sampling there is no indication that there is an entrainment issue at these intakes. None of these is associated with the Mammoth Pool Project.

CDFG agreed that the Mule Deer License Article developed and approved by the Big Creek ALP Plenary addressed their mule deer migration concerns at Mammoth Pool. CDFG also agreed that the Bear-Human Interaction License article addressed their issues. CDFG did however still have concerns with potential wildlife mortality caused by the Project. CDFG was unable to provide any evidence that the Project has or would result in significant wildlife mortality for the term of the license. CDFG feels that the current Mammoth Project does not fully mitigate/compensate for wildlife mortalities that arise due to increased recreational use and effects on deer and native fish. SCE pointed out that many of the specific issues identified by CDFG are unrelated to the relicensing, or more closely related to loss of habitat in the Sierra foothills and U.S. Forest Service management practices. CDFG would like to have funding for a number of wildlife enhancement projects, but had no specifics at this time. CDFG will get back to SCE, possibly after the Ready for Environmental Analysis (REA) is issued by the Commission.

Fish stocking and costs of hatchery fish were discussed. CDFG identified a \$3.02 per pound price for hatchery trout. This number is based on statewide production costs and overhead. CDFG stated that SCE should use this number for all calculations of fish stocking costs. CDFG also provided stocking estimates for 2003 and 2004. It was unclear how the \$300,000 identified in the CDFG letter related to the price of stocked fish. SCE will analyze fish stocking in the Big Creek system by CDFG in 1990-1999 and 1998-2004 and calculate the cost based on the current CDFG price. SCE also indicated that they wanted to reserve the right to stock fish from their hatchery or other sources as a supplement or partial replacement of those provided by CDFG. SCE also indicated that it did not consider it reasonable for SCE to pay for the entire cost of fish stocking, since the CDFG collects money for fishing licenses which is supposed to help support the costs of fish stocking.