FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Office of Energy Projects
Division of Dam Safety and Inspections - San Francisco Regional Office
901 Market Street, Suite 350, San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 369-3300 Office (415) 369-3322 Facsimile

August 24, 2005

In reply, refer to:
Project No. 2079-CA
NATDAM: CA00856

Stephen J. Jones, Power System Manager
Placer County Water Agency
24625 Harrison St
P.O. Box 667
Foresthill, CA 95631

RE: Review of the Supplement to the June 2003 Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) Study for L.L. Anderson Dam (French Meadows Reservoir), FERC Project 2079-CA

Dear Mr. Jones:

By letter dated July 14, 2005, the PCWA submitted a supplement to the June 2003 PMF report prepared by Mead & Hunt that addressed review comments contained in our March 31, 2005 letter. We have completed our review of the supplement and consider the results adequately conservative and acceptable. We have the following comments for your information.

1. Your consultant utilized the short record of data available in the basin to calibrate and make comparisons to historical flood discharge events to justify the snow melt parameters selected. The PMF represents the upper bound and a comparison of the PMF to a return period discharge event is generally not done.

Your consultant utilized the maximum recorded wind speed data for the last ten years of record from Hell Hole reservoir wind gage in lieu of the wind data contained in HMR 58. Although your consultant's analysis used data from a short period of record, the approach and results are reasonable considering the overall conservative nature of the assumptions used in this PMF evaluation.

2. Since the spillway will be physically modeled, your consultant's recommendation to resolve the hydraulics as part of the design process is acceptable. If

the physical modeling results indicate that the tailwater during the PMF discharge causes weir submergence effects, then the spillway should be analyzed with the appropriate weir coefficient correction and the weir and spillway redesigned as appropriate.

3. Based upon the consultant's analysis, it is accepted that a submergence weir coefficient correction should not apply to the 1997 calibration flood. However, the consultant did not directly address our concern that the unit hydrograph was calibrated against the outflow hydrograph and not the inflow hydrograph for the 1997 event. However, we agree with the consultant that with the relatively low 1997 peak outflow of 4,100 cfs through the spillway would not cause significant differences between the inflow and outflow hydrographs. Therefore, for this evaluation a calculation of the inflow hydrograph is not necessary.

We accept the July 2005 Supplemental Report to the 2003 PMF Study prepared by Mead and Hunt for L.L. Anderson Dam. The July 2005 Supplemental Report calculated the PMF inflow to be 59,100 cfs. Since remedial repairs appear necessary, please submit a plan and schedule to complete any necessary design and construction activities. The plan and schedule should include the performance of a potential failure modes analysis (PFMA) for an assessment of the alternatives developed and the selection of the proposed remedial measures. Please submit your plan and schedule by October 3, 2005. Thank you for your continued cooperation in our dam safety program. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. John Onderdonk at (415) 369-3339.

Sincerely,

TAKESHI YAMASHITA

Takeshi Yamashita, P.E.
Regional Engineer

cc: Mr. Dave A. Gutierrez, Chief
Division of Safety of Dams
California Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Mr. Bruce C. Muller, Jr.
Chief, Dam Safety Office
Bureau of Reclamation
Denver Federal Center, Bldg. 56, Room 2150
P.O. Box 25007 (D-6000)
Denver, CO 80225-0007