

**State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Water Rights  
Attention: Kari Kyler  
P.O. Box 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000**

**Re: Sep 29 2011 Revised Notice Spring-Gap Stanislaus Hydroelectric Project at Pinecrest Reservoir Minimum Lake-Level**

Dear Ms. Kyler,

Following are my comments on the Pinecrest Reservoir Lake Level Study Report, Final, April 2011, (FERC Project No. 2130).

- 1. Recreation Season:** *The end of seasonal recreation use at Pinecrest Lake should be changed from Labor Day to October 1. The Lake continues to see visitor use between Labor Day and the middle of October. This is also the time we enjoy up there away from the crowds to swim, hike, and close our cabin for the winter. Since we only are allowed limited time up there, we prefer the end of summer rather than the high rush of July/August. Fall is beautiful in Pinecrest and our favorite time.*
- 2. Surface Recreation:** *As the Lake shrinks in perimeter, watercraft activities are condensed into a smaller area. Submerged hazards in various parts of the Lake begin to impair use of the Lake surface. Rocks and rock islands surface as elevation recedes, presenting serious navigational hazards and minimizing surface area available for boating. Lower levels exacerbate overcrowding of watercraft on the Lake.*
- 3. Clearing Beaches:** *Some larger rocks on the beaches are useful as back and foot rests. The larger rocks are quite beautiful. They definitely add to the shoreline. Some are used as landmarks. Pristine beaches are not expected at Pinecrest. It is a mountain lake and should be managed in as natural a state as possible.*
- 4. Beach Sand:** *Importing beach sand is only a useful mitigation measure if the importation is scheduled on a regular basis. Water flow within the lake coupled with natural precipitation run-off from the day use areas adjacent to the lake cause continuous dislocation of the sand into the lake. The current deep ravines on the beaches in the swim area are a hazard and should be fixed.*
- 5. Swim Area Buoys:** *Construction of an adjustable buoy line in the main swimming area would be a positive management action. I do not support placing a fixed buoy line within the swimming area because initial placement early in the season would have to extend too far out into the Lake*

*in order to maintain a sizeable swimming area later in the season as the water recedes.*

6. **Lower Fishing Platform:** *I strongly urge the lower pod and walkway be removed. They are dangerous and ineffective structures. By no means should a third platform be constructed as suggested in the Report as a mitigation measure for elevations below 5605ft.*
7. **Upper Fishing Platform:** *The upper fishing platform should also be removed. It was originally erected to meet an ADA requirement, but a poor design was chosen. It is only useful as a fishing pier for a very short time during the season. The rest of the time it is a hulking and ugly protrusion of concrete that detracts from the aesthetics of the Lake and creates an impediment to shoreline use until the mud dries out as the Lake recedes.*

*The FS should reconsider the benefit of retaining a decidedly useless and inelegant structure.*

*Maybe the Forest Service could find an alternative location and/or type of facility to achieve an ADA compliant feature at the Lake. Perhaps there is someplace else along the shore of the Lake to create an observation area/fishing deck, at little expense. The Summit District Trail Crew, who well know the perimeter of the Lake, might be engaged to assist with brainstorming. Creative thinking should be applied to this dilemma.*

7. **PG&E Requests Lower Elevations:** *PG&E is currently held to a License condition of no lower than 5608ft. elevation at Labor Day. Based on the results of the Lake Level Study, PG&E can request modification of this target minimum Pinecrest Reservoir elevation between End of Spill through Labor Day that protects recreational uses (specifically, Day-Use Area beaches, the marina to just east of the handicap fishing access, and other areas as directed by the State Water Board). I understand that PG&E is planning to request a target elevation of 5600ft. in dry-normal dry years, and 5605ft. in wet-normal wet years. Neither of these elevations will adequately preserve recreation uses at Pinecrest Lake.*

*Recreational users at Pinecrest Lake enjoy the Lake when it is as full as possible, after early drawdown that creates beach area where people can enjoy the sun or can opt to sit closer along the tree line for shade. Mitigation measures for lower elevations cannot deliver the same experience as exists when the water is held higher. By 5605ft. the Lake has shrunk to a former slip of itself, and the navigational hazards are extreme.*

*I would suggest the following Lake levels:*

*5610ft at Labor Day;  
5608ft on October 1.*

*Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We have had our family cabin in Pinecrest for 75 years. We have all grown up with this area and have seen many changes. As cabin owners we need to be sought after for our knowledge of the area and our comments taken seriously.*

*Sincerely,*

*Jan DeLano  
229 Sugarpine  
Pinecrest, CA 95364  
October 14<sup>th</sup>. 2011*

*cc  
Karen Caldwell  
U.S Forest Service  
Stanislaus National Forest  
No. 1 Pinecrest Road  
Pinecrest, CA 95364*

*Susan Skalski  
Forest Supervisor  
Stanislaus National Forest  
19777 Greenley Road  
Sonora, CA 95370*

*Tim Welch  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N. E.  
Mailstop PJ-11.7  
Washington, DC 20426*