

11 October 2007
198 Sprucemont Place
San Jose, CA 95139

PG& E
c/O Brian Frantz
ENTRIX, Inc.
2300 Clayton Road
Suite 200
Concord, CA 94520

Brian,

1. First Draft on Decommissioning Plan for P-606 is an excellent document with good structure. Please find enclosed a “Comment” package, and a copy of the Draft with those same comments pasted in on the appropriate page. Hopefully the latter makes reading more convenient. That hard copy is also needed for detailed understanding on such things as the maps, pictures, schematics, tables, etc.

2. At first glance, the comment package appears lengthy but much of the text is simply a verbatim copy of existing text, and I doubt it would lengthen your document a few pages at most - maybe none at all since many of the suggested changes would fit easily on existing pages. Changes focus on adding more explicit detail { facts & figures } that I believe will be helpful at precluding future questions and other long discussions. Hopefully you find no emotional or non rational material in the comments. Actually, I think I only objected to the intent or meaning of two items in the Draft:

2.1 Diversion Structures (3) : Tried to modify words to be consistent with PGE perspective, Environmental Resource Agencies perspective, and my perspective.

2.3.4 Proposal for Disposition on first stage of Cow Creek Canal: This was only disposal proposal that I believe was done hastily and w/o logical thought.

3. My expanded description of the Cow Creek diversion dam is not simply because it is on my property, but because this is one of just two P-606 structures that removal will require significant work activity in the stream bed; and the other (Kilarc) dam removal work is minor in comparison to the Cow Creek one. Work of this nature brings into play a host of governmental regulations, and environmental concerns by the Resource Agencies; and it should be helpful in the long run to include upfront as much fundamental relevant fact as possible.

4. Tried to do the same with other facts/figures that pertain to Section 3.0; for example in terms of adding exact distances and including on the maps certain environmental text references. Also please consider if you need additional text on all, and not just the last 0.5 miles of Hooten Gulch that would be helpful in the future for putting additional perspective on this seasonal water course.

5. In Draft text markup at the appropriate places, I probably should have included a few other

simple sentences on “ private ownership lands/landowner preferences. Other than roads, there are not that many places in the Draft: North Canyon facilities, South County facilities, a tad of the main Kilarc development, and Cow Creek Forebay and Penstock. I erred in only doing it for the Dam & Canal facilities on Cow Creek.

6. Since I am on the FERC mailing list for P-606 I am well aware of the volume of correspondence on the P-606 Decommission. Please discuss with Steve the pro/cons of having an Appendix “B” spreadsheet Index acknowledging and tabulating that FERC correspondence, and a few others like the REU letter; that is pertaining to just the decommissioning. Don’t include periodic operational documents. My thoughts for such a spreadsheet would be one with columns for Date, Recipient, Sender, Sender Title { ie. Stakeholder, Whitmore resident/landowner /landowner*(* w/ FERC infrastructure, etc.), Subject / Comments / Summary. The last column needs the most space. Come 8/2008, such a spreadsheet may be useful to reference to with respect to summarizing the overall thoughts/concerns therein.

If there are any questions, don’t hesitate to call or send E-mail. I will even drive up to Concord if necessary, and it is the right time of day.

Respectfully,

David Albrecht
(408) 225-7600
dtalbrecht@sbcglobal.net

cc softcopy: Steve Nevares w/o Draft paste

2 Atch:
Decommission Comment Package
Draft Decommission Plan w/ pasted in comments