

August 16, 2005

To: Amador Water Agency, Board of Directors
Jim Ambercrombie, General Manager AWA

In reply to: Comments and Responses to Comments on Revised
Section 4.1 of the Amador Transmission Project
Environmental Impact Report, SCH 000022106

My name is Carole Marz, 19220 Clinton Road.

For the record, I am handing you a copy of what my comments are tonight.

I would like ask how many of you, besides Heinz, have actually driven up Clinton Road in the last week or two. The creek is as low as I have ever seen it. This was a very wet water year, and I know the canal is still leaking.

Many times over the past few years Craig Miller, a Water Agency employee, and I have measured the same 4 locations of leaks on my ranch. The data from August 2004 shows there was a total of 500 gallons per minute leaking. This August, 2005, there is a total of 112 gallons per minute. That is almost an 80% reduction. The KASL report said section 1 was the worst area for leaks..... For all practical purposes, that area is fixed. Good job Craig and crew. Boardmembers, do you understand what this means? You could save yourselves MILLIONS of dollars, by just letting the crew do their job.

So the question is ...Do you still have to do this pipeline?

If you answer yes,

Then I still maintain you have some responsibility to the habitat. I know you will quote me "*The Court of Appeal did not find the EIR to be deficient with respect to its discussion and evaluation of the potential impacts...and as a consequence, no supplemental assessment was necessary, required, or prepared*" yada yada yada . We all have read that sentence at least 453 times!

But even if you tell me you have no LEGAL responsibility
You still have an ethical responsibility.

But I say you DO have a legal responsibility because in the March 2004 Ruling from the Third District Court of Appeal, the AWA was told... *"The Agency's EIR Is Inadequate Because It Fails To Explain The Reasons Why The Reduction In Stream Flow, The Pipeline Project Will Cause, Does Not Constitute A Significant Effect On The Environment."*

I asked several questions about the environment, and was told impacts to private property, oak and Pine trees, wildlife and other animals were not found to be deficient.....but how can you come up with reasons apart from effects on the environment? It doesn't make sense! [response to

comments G-8, G-10, G-12]

Webster's dictionary defines environment as... surroundings, specifically all of the external conditions and influences affecting the life and development of organisms, an ecological community that ultimately determines its form and survival.

How do YOU, The Board of Directors, define "environment"?

Seems to me if you are ordered to explain the reasons WHY stream flow reduction does not constitute a significant effect on the environment..... YOU HAVE TO **LOOK AT THE ENVIRONMENT!**

Can this Board, in good conscience, approve an ENVIRONMENTAL Impact Report, that refuses to include the impacts on the environment??

You are elected officials, sworn to make decisions based on facts.

The facts in this latest document are flawed, and the reporting muddled. Others will attest to this... but

For an example.....in my letter, the response to G-4 is totally wrong. It is not what I asked, and you threw in a creek not on any of the maps, called Clinton Creek.

Because our family has lived on our ranch for 7 generations that gives me factual knowledge... and that

certainly gives you, THE BOARD, the responsibility to listen carefully to me.

When Larnsen and Fremier found my well and one of my springs to be 40+% canal water, my concern is not only for myself, but all my neighbors, downstream. Mitigation for the effects of this project, is essential.

But remembering the 80% improvements you have already made, It might be the decision tonight could be *maintaining low flows in the summer months.*

Who could not want the Best of Both Worlds.....???