

VERBATIM MINUTES BofD 2-8-99

Sorell: Why don't we take the item of Diversion

Stock: We are in receipt of a revised Mitigation Section---mostly editorial--Right Matt.

Matt: That's right

Stock: Walking briefly through this, I guess we are all familiar with the original mitigation measure which essentially concluded or stated that we were going to divert water for glen residents down the channel from the Delores Tunnel Well. After further discussion and assessment of this we thought perhaps in the interest of the glen residents and particularly the Board's interest of getting the water to the Sierra Madre Debris Basin which is the objective of sharing the water. Excuse me if i'm not using all the proper terms.

Schindler: Well the purpose is to provide a continuous flow from the Delores Tunnel Well to the Sierra Madre Debris Basin.

Stock: That is essentially what the original said. Where I'm going to---it has been suggested that perhaps the diversion at the falls might be an alternative.

Schindler: Before, there was a diversion initially at the falls. Okay. That was continuous down to the S.M. Debris Basin. The change is that there are now 2 diversions--one specific at the Delores Tunnel and one specific above the falls. That's what this document reads.

Jean: There's a minor diversion at the tunnel.

Schindler: Minor diversion at the tunnel

Stock: That's where we are now but what I'm saying is that the original document said diversion only at the tunnel. We are now at diversion at both points--a small diversion at the tunnel and a primary diversion at the falls.

Kruse: And that draft modification results primarily from comments from the staff as to the fact that it is extremely difficult to vary the flow at the mouth of the well itself because of the terrain--because of the need to run staff people up the hill and so the compromise position that is being discussed at the staff level is the possibility of having a continuous flow of the lower amount at the mouth of the well itself with a variable amount within the area where it can be buried and be accessible to the staff in the vicinity of the falls.

Schindler: Above the falls specifically so that the falls still continue to flow. Also I believe a safety issue was discussed.

Kruse: That's right.

Stock: So for the sake of discussion let me go back to Matt and say--Matt, what was the rationale for requiring the release of a small amount of water at the tunnel for this roughly four or five hundred feet when in fact the primary object is down here.

Matt: The primary mitigation was to offset three environmental impacts--the loss of surface flow to drainage, the recreation associated with that surface flow , and to maintain wetlands downstream of the falls. So to meet all three of those objective there needed to be surface flow from the tunnel well all the way down to the Debris Basin.

Stock: But in the report--bear with me--we only talk about wetlands and maintaining habitat below the falls. The region between the tunnel and the falls had flow primarily for recreation.and of course my argument has been and my request for you to listen --that recreation here for a number of reasons is exceptionally limited and your classification of a very special recreational area wasn't justified on a number of basis --primarily safety and the fact that very, very few, in fact only young healthy kids can enjoy that and I would add that climbers, not hikers, can enjoy this region without a drop of water. It's very picturesuq. And I would close by saying I think that the Glen residents as well as the Water Board would benefit if we relied on natural flow which ein years past--we've had dry years and we 've had no water at the falls, no water throughout the channel nor a the tunnel. My point is simple--We could benefit if somehow we got a volumetric number of 10 gals/min.--I know of times when we've had

less than 40 gals/min total flowing from the tunnel and no surface water--And I anticipate that we will experience that in years to come and my whole point is we could all benefit by just diverting at the tunnel..

Schindler: Benefit in what way Jay?

Stock: Benefit by this. We don't lose any water through very low levels of percolation.

Schindler: Because the KID loses less water.

Stock: No you lose less water.

Kruse: Gentlemen--it is not necessary for you to argue the relative merits of the mitigation measures under discussion. Mr. Stock has a motion to request that the consultant consider an issue that he needs to

Schindler: I didn't hear a motion. I'm sorry

Kruse: The issue is if he has a motion he should make it. If there is a second then we will do that and if there are three votes then the consultant.

Schindler: Do you want to discuss it further Jay?

Sorell: I have a request.

Stock: I was going to try and wrap it up. But any