

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - -x  
IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket No.  
KLAMATH HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT : P-2082-027  
- - - - -x

Yreka Community Theatre  
812 North Oregon Street  
Yreka, California

Wednesday, November 15, 2006

The above-entitled matter came on for public meeting,  
pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m.

MODERATOR: TIM WELCH

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (7:10 p.m.)

3 MR. WELCH: We'd like to get started here. It's  
4 about ten after seven; there's still a few people rolling  
5 in. But they'll move in and join us.

6 My name is Tim Welch. I'm with the Federal  
7 Energy Regulatory Commission at our headquarters in  
8 Washington, D.C. I'd like to welcome everyone to our public  
9 meeting on the draft environmental impact statement on the  
10 Klamath River project that we issued on September 25th.  
11 We're here this evening to gather public comment on our  
12 document so that we can incorporate those comments in our  
13 final environmental impact statement.

14 To my right I'd like to introduce Dr. John Mudre.  
15 John is a fishery biologist and he is the project manager.  
16 John will be in a few minutes giving a little presentation  
17 about where the proceeding is at this time.

18 On my left is Doug Hjorth. Doug works for the  
19 Lewis Boerger, who is the Commission's environmental  
20 contractor. And Doug and his associates assisted us in  
21 preparing this document.

22 The Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
23 Commission, Joseph Kelleher, in Washington, D.C., has a  
24 tradition of beginning the Commission meetings, the monthly  
25 Commission meetings, with the Pledge to the Flag. So I

1 would like to continue that. And I would ask you to rise  
2 and give the Pledge to the Flag.

3 (Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag recited.)

4 MR. WELCH: Thanks very much, everyone.

5 Okay. I apologize for the sort of the air of  
6 formality here. Sometimes we have to rent these large  
7 auditoriums where we have to sort of sit up here at this  
8 table. I much prefer a much more informal atmosphere,  
9 especially with a small crowd like this. But regardless, we  
10 sort of sometimes are forced to do things that way. So  
11 there's no intentional air of formality here on our part.  
12 We are not here tonight to make any decisions or we're not  
13 the judge and the jury. We're basically here to listen.  
14 And so this is your meeting and we're here just to hear your  
15 comments on our environmental document.

16 So having said that, I'm going to turn everything  
17 over to Dr. John Mudre now, who will sort of take you  
18 through a presentation and sort of set the stage of where we  
19 are in this re-licensing proceeding.

20 John.

21 DR. MUDRE: Thank you, Tim.

22 I want to thank everyone for coming out tonight  
23 and welcome you to this meeting.

24 Just briefly, the agenda: Tim went through the  
25 introductions. We'll talk about the purpose of the meeting

1 -- we touched on it some -- the history of the process. But  
2 again, the most important thing is the last item, and that's  
3 your comments. So we're not going to spend a lot of time  
4 talking to you.

5 But just briefly, the Federal Energy Regulatory  
6 Commission is an independent agency that regulates electric  
7 power, natural gas, oil pipelines and the hydroelectric  
8 industry. There's five Commissioners and they're appointed  
9 by the president and confirmed by the senate. The president  
10 designates the chairman of the Commission.

11 The Office of Energy Projects administers the  
12 federal hydropower and gas projects. As far as hydropower  
13 goes, we're organized into three divisions: the Division of  
14 Hydropower Licensing, which is the division that we are in.  
15 We have -- Under the Federal Power Act we can issue licenses  
16 for hydropower projects that range from 30 to 50 years in  
17 length.

18 We have a Division of Hydropower Compliance and  
19 Administration. That's the division that oversees projects  
20 once the licenses are issued to make sure that the projects  
21 are being operated in accordance with the license.

22 And finally we have the Division of Dam Safety  
23 and Inspections, whose purpose is to make sure that all the  
24 structures and facilities are safe.

25 Our office is in Washington, D.C. We do have

1 five regional offices where -- mainly composed of engineers  
2 that belong to the Dam Safety and Inspections group. With  
3 respect to the Klamath project the regional office is the  
4 Portland Regional Office.

5 Again, our purpose tonight is to receive oral and  
6 written comments from agencies, non-governmental  
7 organizations, and interested persons on our draft  
8 environmental impact statement for the Klamath Hydroelectric  
9 Project.

10 I'll just briefly go over the history here. In  
11 February 2004 PacifiCorp filed their application to re-  
12 license the Klamath Project. And that sort of set the  
13 process in motion. In the spring of 2004 we conducted  
14 scoping meetings and site visits. The purpose of the  
15 scoping meetings was to get input on what people thought  
16 were the issues that we needed to look at in our  
17 environmental document.

18 And in August of 2004 we accepted the application  
19 and issued a notice soliciting motions to intervene and  
20 protests to the re-licensing. And we received a number of  
21 both.

22 In May of 2005 we issued what we call scoping  
23 document two, or SD-2, and that reflected the scoping  
24 comments we received and outlined exactly what it was we  
25 were going to be looking at in our environmental impact

1 statement, or EIS.

2 In December 2005 we issued what we call a ready  
3 for environmental analysis notice, which sets a few things.  
4 It says that we have all the information that we need to  
5 start our environmental analysis; but it also sets the clock  
6 rolling for the agencies to submit preliminary terms and  
7 conditions and recommendations as to how they think the  
8 project should be operated.

9 There was a new law passed in I think November,  
10 maybe, of last year or late last year: the Energy Policy  
11 Act of 2005. And this sort of put a new wrinkle into the  
12 re-licensing process because it allows PacifiCorp, the  
13 licensee for the project, to propose alternate mandatory  
14 conditions to what the agencies may have proposed. And it  
15 also allowed PacifiCorp to request trial-type hearings of  
16 disputed issues of material fact. And these are both new.  
17 And really, the Klamath Project is the first one that's come  
18 up where they have had hearings and, you know, we're going  
19 through every step of the new process.

20 September 2006 we issued the draft environmental  
21 impact statement. Two days later the Administrative Law  
22 Judge McKenney issued his decision on the issues of disputed  
23 fact under the EPACT hearings..

24 October 2006, we've requested biological opinions  
25 from the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Fish &

1 Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act. We also  
2 sent letters to the fish and wildlife agencies to begin some  
3 discussions as to their recommendations and some perceived  
4 inconsistencies we saw between their recommendations and the  
5 Federal Power Act.

6 And finally, November 2006 we're holding these  
7 meetings on the draft EIS. We had one yesterday, one this  
8 morning here, this one now, tomorrow evening in Eureka,  
9 California; And then the 29th of November in North Bend,  
10 Oregon; and the 30th of November we're going to have our  
11 final meeting in Newport, Oregon.

12 Okay. The NEPA -- or the National Environmental  
13 Policy Act -- requires federal agencies, including FERC, to  
14 conduct independent analysis of environmental issues for  
15 their actions. And our analysis, we have to consider the  
16 water quality, fish and wildlife values of the involved  
17 waterway. But we also need to consider equally the electric  
18 energy and other developmental values. So we need to sort  
19 of do some balancing.

20 We have to give strong consideration to terms and  
21 conditions provided by the resource agencies. And our  
22 conclusions and recommendations are based on the public  
23 record for this project. So all the letters that we get in,  
24 the comments, everything goes into the public record and  
25 it's available for people to see. And it all can be seen on

1 our website, as I'll tell you about just a little bit later.

2 But the purpose of our EIS is to -- is that it  
3 serves to inform the Commission's decision in this re-  
4 licensing proceeding. In other words, whether and under  
5 what conditions to issue a new license for the project.

6 In the DEIS we looked at four action  
7 alternatives. The first one was re-licensing the project as  
8 proposed by PacifiCorp proposed in its license application.  
9 We looked at a staff recommended alternative, which  
10 consisted of PacifiCorp's proposed project with additional  
11 staff recommended environmental measures. We also  
12 considered an alternative that was staff's recommended  
13 alternative but with some of the agency mandatory conditions  
14 that we didn't recommend in our alternative. And we also  
15 looked at an alternative that included the retirement of  
16 Copco number one and Iron Gate Dams with dam removal.

17 Okay. As I said, the information is all  
18 available on our website. Our website is [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov). And  
19 what you want to do is look for the e-Library link, which is  
20 our electronic library. Once you get there you enter in the  
21 docket number P-2082, and you should be able to figure it  
22 out from there. If you can't you can give me an e-mail or a  
23 call and I'll try to walk you through it.

24 Okay. Just briefly, what's coming up. The  
25 comments on the draft environmental impact statement are due

1 by December 1st, 2006. Originally it was November 24th but  
2 we did extend it. So now the comment due date is December  
3 1st, 2006.

4 We'll be meeting with the fish and wildlife  
5 agencies in December to discuss some of the recommendations.  
6 Any agency-modified mandatory conditions or fishway  
7 prescriptions are going to be due by January 30th of 2007.  
8 We need to get biological opinions from the Fish & Wildlife  
9 Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

10 We're scheduled to issue our final EIS in April  
11 of 2007. This is from both the States of California and  
12 Oregon. We cannot issue a license without them. And once  
13 we do get those then the Commission would be ready to issue  
14 its decision on the re-licensing.

15 Okay. If anyone wants a copy of the DEIS they  
16 can write me or e-mail me and I can send you one. Of if you  
17 want to, you can go through out public reference office at  
18 the Commission.

19 Again, comments are due, written comments due no  
20 later than December 1st, 2006. It's very helpful to make  
21 sure you have the words Klamath Hydroelectric Project and  
22 the project number 2082-027 somewhere on the top of the  
23 front page so they can make sure it gets filed in the right  
24 place so we can get it into that public record that I spoke  
25 of.

1           Okay. I think everyone heard about the sign-in  
2 sheets. We had some people come in late but I think they  
3 were still out front. If you wanted to speak you should  
4 have signed in. But we can accommodate you later after  
5 everyone who has signed in speaks. So you don't need to  
6 rush up there and try to sign in now.

7           We do have a court reporter today. He's located  
8 up in the back there. He's making a record of everything  
9 that people say. And the importance here is to make sure  
10 that we get your comments correctly entered into the record.  
11 That's a good thing.

12           The downside is that we have to speak slowly and  
13 we have to speak into these microphones. So when you come  
14 up to give your comments you need to speak into the  
15 microphone and you need to be close enough so you can sort  
16 of hear your voice over the, you know, the loudspeakers  
17 here. But if you do that we'll get a good copy of what you  
18 have to say and we'll be able to refer to it later on.

19           And you need to identify yourself before you  
20 start to speak. And if you have a name that's hard to spell  
21 or could be spelled a couple of different ways then why  
22 don't you just spell it for the court reporter so we make  
23 sure we get it right.

24           There will be transcripts available from the  
25 court reporter. If you're interested in it you should see

1 him later on or see us after the meeting and we'll tell you  
2 how to go about getting those.

3 In order that we can make sure that we --  
4 everyone has a time to provide their comments let's try to  
5 limit any oral statements to no more than five minutes. And  
6 that will ensure that we can hear from everybody.

7 And I think that's all I want to say. So at this  
8 point we'll turn the meeting over to you guys.

9 MR. HJORTH: Okay. The way that I will be taking  
10 testimony is I'll call out the name of the speaker and I'll  
11 also call out the person who will be following that speaker.  
12 So if the person in essence on desk could come on down and  
13 probably take a seat next to the mike, that way it will make  
14 sure that we're efficiently handling the proposed speakers.

15 The other thing I wanted to point out is one of  
16 the things that has impressed me throughout this process,  
17 through scoping and meeting with the various tribes and at  
18 yesterday and today's meeting, is the amount of respect that  
19 people have for other people. And I have no reason to  
20 believe that's going to change tonight. It's -- Obviously  
21 there are incredibly complex and emotional issues involved  
22 with this project. And I would ask you to respect the views  
23 of the speakers and allow them to say their piece and --  
24 just as we're looking forward to hearing what you have to  
25 say.

1                   So without further ado, I'll -- the first speaker  
2 tonight will be Leaf Hillman. And Leaf will be followed by  
3 Craig Tucker.

4                   MR. HELLMAN: I guess that was the luck of the  
5 draw, John.

6                   VOICE: That's what you get for getting here  
7 early. You were the first one to sign in.

8                   MR. HELLMAN: Well, you caught me before I had a  
9 chance to write my speech.

10                  MR. HJORTH: If you'd like we could skip over and  
11 --

12                  MR. HELLMAN: That's fine.

13                  MR. HJORTH: Okay.

14                  MR. HELLMAN: My name is Leaf Hillman. I'm the  
15 vice chairman of the Karuk Tribe.

16                  My comments tonight, I wanted to start by  
17 reminding folks by telling you a little story. Say at the  
18 beginning of time the spirit people roamed the earth prior  
19 to the great transformation. The spirit people at the time  
20 of transformation were transformed into rocks and trees and  
21 birds and fish, the air, the water, all of these things in  
22 the natural world. Some were transformed into human beings.  
23 This is the -- explains where we fit into the world.

24                  We are a part of the world, this natural world we  
25 live in, and it's a part of us. It's inseparable. In

1       today's modern world some people have a hard time  
2       reconciling that with the times that we live in. The  
3       technology, the needs of humans seem to be placed in a more  
4       dominant role. But this life lesson, this creation story is  
5       important and it's just as important today as it has ever  
6       been -- more so, probably, than it's ever been, because we  
7       can as human beings live on this earth and make  
8       accommodation for all of our relations in the natural world  
9       as well.

10               Klamath Basin in recent years has been a rotating  
11       crisis. Upper basin, the lower basin, farmers, irrigators,  
12       ranchers, the upper basin, middle basin, have been punished,  
13       regulated out of business and have been damaged economically  
14       by having irrigation water cut off. It's caused great  
15       instability in their communities; likewise throughout the  
16       basin, top to bottom.

17               This year we have 700 miles of coastline where  
18       commercial fishermen are in port and are going bankrupt;  
19       can't pay the mortgages on their homes. And we have the  
20       tribes. In the upper basin we have the Klamath tribes who  
21       have federally protected treaty rights to fish for salmon  
22       who haven't seen a salmon in 90 years.

23               In the lower basin, we're now relegated to a  
24       diminishing -- rapidly diminishing population of fall  
25       Chinook salmon. Spring Chinook salmon dominated this basin

1 since the beginning of time until PacifiCorp's dams came  
2 along. The adjustment's been made. Now nobody talks about  
3 spring Chinook salmon. Nobody talks about them because  
4 they're not a part of anyone's reality because they barely  
5 exist.

6 So the focus is on fall Chinook salmon. We want  
7 to protect them, we want to restore them, we want to do all  
8 these wonderful things. Everybody's relying on them. The  
9 tribes in the basin are relying on them; the sport fishing  
10 community in the basin. In the ocean the Klamath Management  
11 Zone is relying on them; the commercial fishermen are  
12 relying on them. And they're not doing so hot.

13 This rotating crisis pretty much you name a party  
14 and the communities up and down the river, top to bottom,  
15 have been impacted negatively. The only party that hasn't  
16 seemed to have been a part of that mix is PacifiCorp, who's  
17 operated these dams now for many, many years beginning in  
18 1917 with the first lie to the Indian people that they would  
19 provide for fish passage through the upper basin.

20 The lies have continued. They've continued to  
21 generate the profit for their shareholders, for their  
22 company. And at the time progress -- everything was done in  
23 the name of progress. Everybody wanted electricity and all  
24 that good stuff that it brought. And people still want that  
25 today. And I'm here to tell you we can still have that

1 today. We can have it today without the Klamath Project for  
2 sure.

3 The communities -- I don't care if you're a  
4 rancher, farmer, a miner, or an Indian in this basin. Your  
5 future, the stability, the economic stability, the social  
6 stability of your communities depend on removing dams in the  
7 Klamath River.

8 I'm disappointed in the EIS for taking a short  
9 road and looking at an option to remove two dams instead of  
10 four dams. It fell short of expectations a bit.

11 The EIS also -- well, it's a pretty voluminous  
12 document; it takes a while to get through it. But so far I  
13 haven't come across one reference to Tribal trust  
14 responsibility that the federal government owes to the basin  
15 tribes.

16 The time is now to hold PacifiCorp accountable.  
17 And the time is now to restore this once great river system  
18 from top to bottom and the fisheries along with it. With  
19 the restoration of this river system and its fisheries will  
20 come economic stability, will come community stability for  
21 all of our communities.

22 I spent the last year and a half in smoke-filled  
23 rooms with irrigators, ranchers, farmers, and have come to  
24 realize that they're not so much different than the Tribal  
25 people. They're not so much different whether they're off-

1 project irrigators, on-project irrigators, Shasta River  
2 irrigators. We're all in this boat together and this boat  
3 is sinking. It's time to quit blaming one another and for  
4 all of us to stand and to do what's right. And that's to  
5 uphold our responsibility individually and collectively to  
6 this river system and its great potential wealth.

7 We started off tonight with the Pledge of  
8 Allegiance, which ends "with liberty and justice for all."  
9 The farmers, the ranchers, the Tribal people need to stand  
10 together and demand that liberty and justice for all.

11 This document that we're commenting on tonight  
12 falls short of delivering that to any of us. They've  
13 conquered all the rivers of the west for progress,  
14 prosperity. Those days are gone. Those days are gone in  
15 this basin for sure.

16 This is not the Columbia River. This is not --  
17 these are not great engineering marvels. These are  
18 antiquated mounds of dirt with a little bit of cement and  
19 mud throwed in there that creates several small, shallow  
20 reservoirs, produce very little power and have an  
21 overwhelming destructive effect on the water quality and the  
22 fisheries: 350 miles of spawning habitat.

23 We're not asking that this be done -- don't do it  
24 for us. Do it for your neighbors, do it for the communities  
25 in this basin.

1           The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission -- and  
2 I've heard it before a couple of years ago when this process  
3 started, that their job is to balance. It seems pretty  
4 clear, even with the flaws in the document that exist today,  
5 it seemed pretty clear that the balancing has been done on  
6 the backs of the communities and the people who live in this  
7 basin. And it's time to bring some real balance to the  
8 equation. And that's the job of the Commission, and I  
9 understand that.

10           And I appreciate you being here tonight and  
11 taking my comments.

12           MR. HJORTH: Thank you very much.

13           The next speaker will be Craig Tucker. And he  
14 will be followed by Brian Colegrove.

15           MR. TUCKER: I'm Craig Tucker. I'm the Klamath  
16 coordinator for the Karuk Tribe.

17           And I just want to submit comments in writing  
18 that are extensive. But I want to hit some of the high  
19 marks here because I can't resist the opportunity to talk to  
20 you. And I'm glad to see you guys from D.C. here in the  
21 Klamath Basin.

22           The first comment I would make about the draft  
23 EIS -- and it was most glaring problem with the document --  
24 that there is no analysis of a four dam out scenario. And  
25 that's despite the fact that the four fairly recognized

1 Indian Tribes in the basin, the fishermen in the basin, the  
2 conservation groups in the basin, counties in the basin,  
3 have asked for that analysis. And in fact, NOAA, fisheries  
4 and the Tribes -- the Federal Power Act Section 10(j)  
5 recommendations have recommended the removal of the lower  
6 four dams. FERC failed to do that analysis.

7 After -- just days after the draft EIS was  
8 released the California Coastal Conservancy released a  
9 sediment analysis study. This study essentially looks at  
10 removing four dams and what the environmental consequences  
11 are based on the sediment that's trapped behind those dams.  
12 That study concludes that dam removal is safe and affordable  
13 as there would be modest impacts from the release of  
14 sediment. And I hope that study and its findings will be  
15 included in the final EIS.

16 Although I am proud of the fact that you did look  
17 at at least removing the two largest dams in the system,  
18 Copco and Iron Gate, and you make the right conclusions --  
19 that removing dams is the best thing you can do to improve  
20 water quality and it's the best thing you can do to improve  
21 the fishery. And you even find that it's cheaper for  
22 ratepayers -- by \$22 million a year it's cheaper for  
23 ratepayers -- to remove those dams than it is to put ladders  
24 on them.

25 And since the federal agencies, their current

1 Section 18 prescriptions are for ladders and those  
2 prescriptions are mandatory, we feel like at the very least  
3 FERC is going to have to use that recommendation for  
4 ladders. And if it's cheaper for the ratepayers by \$22  
5 million a year, it's better for the water quality, it's  
6 better for the fish to simply remove dams, we hope that it  
7 would be FERC's conclusion.

8 FERC staff recommendation to implement a trap and  
9 haul program frankly is laughable. There is -- there's more  
10 fish species that we're concerned about than fall run  
11 Chinook. And that's the only species addressed by the trap  
12 and haul. Nowhere on the planet do people trap and haul  
13 lamprey. It's a tribal trust species. It's an important  
14 species to the ecosystem. And trap and haul does nothing  
15 for lamprey.

16 The plan does not include trapping and hauling  
17 for spring Chinook. The run of salmon that's been  
18 devastated by these dams, whose habitat is the Sprague,  
19 Williamson and Wood Rivers above upper Klamath Lake, they're  
20 not accommodated by trap and haul.

21 The Tribes have submitted to FERC a  
22 reintroduction plan. And, like I said, NOAA's 10(j)  
23 recommendations point out why trap and haul is not the best  
24 strategy for reintroducing fish to the upper basin.

25 The administrative law judge's ruling that came

1 out a day or two after the draft EIS came out, that -- the  
2 ruling -- the judge ruled on issues of material fact -- and  
3 now it's like case law fact -- that within the project  
4 reaches there's 58 miles of habitat for ESA-listed Coho  
5 salmon. We've got to get Coho back in those reaches to  
6 utilize the cold water refugia that's in between those dams.

7 I'll also point out that the Tribes are paying  
8 the biggest price for these dams. These dams were built --  
9 the California Oregon Power Company promised the BIA,  
10 because the Tribes were concerned that if you build dams  
11 it's going to kill the salmon -- in writing the company  
12 assured BIA that provisions would be made for functional  
13 fish ladders on those dams. It was a lie because it never  
14 happened. And now we've set these fish on the path to  
15 extinction. And if we don't have a landscape scale change  
16 in the basin soon we're going to lose those fish.

17 The Tribes and their culture is paying the price  
18 for these dams. They're paying the price and receiving very  
19 little of the benefit. The majority of Karuk ancestral  
20 territory and large portions of the Yurok Reservation have  
21 no electricity. So this company came in, killed their fish,  
22 and they don't even get the benefit of electricity. There's  
23 churches and schools in Tribal territory with no power. And  
24 if that's not the definition of a social injustice, I'm not  
25 sure what is.

1           The document, the EIS should have an entire  
2 section on Tribal trust in the way this re-licensing and the  
3 way the Commission has a mandate to fulfill the federal  
4 government's Tribal trust responsibilities to the Tribes.

5           FERC has been asked time and time again to define  
6 the fishery as a cultural resource. I'm not a Tribal  
7 member. I work for the Tribe and live in Tribal territory.  
8 And I can tell you that for Karuk people those fish coming  
9 up the river is just as important as the sun coming up in  
10 the morning. And if those fish aren't a cultural resource  
11 then I don't know what is. But those fish are a cultural  
12 resource and FERC should take that into consideration as  
13 they write their EIS.

14           And then I'll end by talking about the rotating  
15 crisis that Leaf started talking about. And if you live  
16 here in this basin, for 50 years, since the last license was  
17 established, resource managers have had very few  
18 opportunities to deal with the salmon issue. All they can  
19 do is either cut water off the farmers and so farmers are  
20 lining up for federal disaster relief, or they can tell  
21 fishermen not to fish. And that's what happened this year.  
22 And we've got fishermen lined up for disaster relief.

23           So every year somebody's kind of getting the  
24 short end of the stick except PacifiCorp.

25           FERC's responsibility is to hold these

1 corporations in check. And it is unjust to allow these  
2 corporations to run roughshod over these communities,  
3 extract our wealth from the Klamath basin and ship it to  
4 Scotland or Iowa or Omaha, Nebraska to Warren Buffett or  
5 wherever our wealth is being shipped to. We need to keep  
6 the wealth of this basin in this basin because this -- the  
7 poverty rates in this basin are much higher than the  
8 national average and we can't afford to have our wealth  
9 shipped to somebody else, especially a guy like Warren  
10 Buffett.

11 So this is a corporate responsibility issue. And  
12 if we're going to bring economic stability to this basin we  
13 have to have stable populations of salmon, because right now  
14 we have one ESA listed species. And if we don't get these  
15 dams out we're going to be looking at listing spring salmon;  
16 we're going to be looking at listing sturgeon; we're going  
17 to be looking at listing lamprey. And if you think the  
18 regulatory burdens aren't bad for people now, when those  
19 species get listed it is going to be a disaster.

20 So if we want this basin to have economic  
21 stability we have to have a stable population of fish. And  
22 the primary action that has to be taken to restore those  
23 fish and have a stable population is removal of the lower  
24 four Klamath dams.

25 MR. HJORTH: Thank you, Mr. Tucker.

1                   The next speaker will be Brian Culgrove. And he  
2 will be followed by Tammy Clayton.

3                   MR. CULGROVE: Good evening. My name is Brian  
4 Culgrove. I'm a Hoopa Tribal member but I'm Yurok and  
5 Karuk. And I participate within ceremonies for all three  
6 Tribes since I could start walking.

7                   I can remember when I first started walking, I  
8 can remember the salmon being just like all these chairs:  
9 you couldn't see any water; you'd see all these salmon  
10 everywhere. And now for ceremonies it's hard to even  
11 accumulate enough for a meal for some of the ceremonies.  
12 And that's part of the medicine for our ceremonies. It's  
13 part of our life.

14                   I just want to stress, I guess, the importance of  
15 responsibility from everybody's part. I mean I have to do  
16 my part. And if I'm -- I've lived on the river all my life  
17 and I've fished most of my life. And I share that with our  
18 elders and stuff. And now I can't even get enough to share  
19 with the elders.

20                   Salmon and acorns, when some of the elders get  
21 sick and stuff they won't even eat the hospital food. They  
22 want some almar (phonetic); they want some salmon and acorns  
23 because it gives them nutrition. And the acorns also  
24 nutrition but it helps flush your system out and everything.

25                   But it's everybody's responsibility. I just want

1 to stress that. It's -- no matter what you do, I mean the  
2 river and everything around it is all life. It's not a  
3 story; it's not history. It's still life. We live it all  
4 year long.

5 Salmon is very important to us and we need to do  
6 whatever we can to make sure that it's going to continue and  
7 improve. It hurts my heart to see how many salmon used to  
8 be here and how little there is now.

9 And with the water quality and controls and the  
10 flows of water and everything now, it's -- we need to step  
11 up to the plate and take care of business.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

14 Our next speaker will be Tammy Clayton. And she  
15 will be followed by Regina Chichozoles.

16 MS. CLAYTON: Hi. My name's Tammy Clayton.

17 And first of all, I want to recognize everybody  
18 who came who drove a long ways for this meeting, up to three  
19 hours from the mid-Klamath. I think that's great all you  
20 people came up.

21 Also -- I guess I just want to address the issue  
22 of not including dam removal in the EIS. I have spent a lot  
23 of time this summer up in the reservoir sampling for toxic  
24 algae. And I don't know if you guys have visited the  
25 reservoirs in the middle of August, but I took a near

1 record-setting, world record-setting sample of toxic algae  
2 this summer. It was 4000 times the recommended contact  
3 level from WHO.

4 I can see these dams are creating a lot of  
5 problems. And I notice -- or I read that you had addressed  
6 the toxic algae by possibly putting copper sulfate into the  
7 water to deal with that. Or I've read about aerators being  
8 installed into the reservoirs. I just don't see the point  
9 of building all these more elaborate structures to get rid  
10 of these problems that the dams are creating. If we just  
11 take out the infrastructure there we're going to solve a lot  
12 of these issues. We're not going to have the back up of the  
13 water at the dams where it's like a bathtub where the algae  
14 is growing. It's warm water. There's nutrients in it. And  
15 it--

16 I just get frustrated thinking about it because I  
17 have seen -- I have put my water bottle into the water and I  
18 actually have to push it into the algae it's so thick. It's  
19 disgusting.

20 And I just want to express my disappointment that  
21 the removal of the four lower dams on the Klamath was not  
22 considered.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

25 The next speaker will be Regina Chichozales.

1 MS. CHICOZOLES: Yes.

2 MR. HJORTH: And she will be followed by Don  
3 Flickinger.

4 MS. CHICOZOLES: Hello. My name is Regina  
5 Chichozoles. I've gone to just about every meeting like  
6 this I've ever been able to, including the scoping meetings  
7 in Arcada.

8 I'm really disappointed that -- I am also, like  
9 many people who are really disappointed that the four dams  
10 out option is not addressed in the EIS. It should be. It's  
11 actually illegal that it's not. It was suggested many  
12 times. All alternatives are supposed to be addressed within  
13 an EIS.

14 I am the Klamath River keeper. I deal with  
15 Klamath water quality issues throughout the river. I also  
16 have seen the toxic algae and have dealt with the toxic  
17 algae. I recently printed a picture of the toxic algae at  
18 Kinko's and the whole staff came over to tell me how  
19 disgusted they were with whatever that picture was. So just  
20 when people look at it they get disgusted.

21 I don't think there's much value to these dams at  
22 all. I just heard a story on the radio yesterday that right  
23 now the Pacific Northwest has an excess of 2000 megawatts  
24 for the winter supply this year. These dams put out, tops,  
25 150 megawatts, usually 90 megawatts. I don't understand the

1 economics of destroying a river system and shutting down  
2 fishermen for 700 miles for 90 megawatts. That does not  
3 make sense economically. It doesn't make sense in any  
4 manner whatsoever.

5 I'm currently working with the State of  
6 California to set standards for microsystem. It is a huge  
7 violation to the Clean Water Act. I feel like the FERC  
8 document is a violation to many laws, including the Clean  
9 Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. I think it was an  
10 incredibly huge disappointment that it came out just days  
11 before the findings and recommendations hearing was over.

12 So I've -- I mean that's a blatant violation of  
13 NEPA to not even wait to the end of the court hearing to  
14 figure out whether or not bladder -- whether or not trap and  
15 haul is even possible, which it's not. If you look at the  
16 water quality issues in these reservoirs, those fish are  
17 going to die as soon as you put them in there. The DO  
18 reading in Iron Gate reservoir was .8 last time I went here.  
19 .8. That's -- fish cannot just be trapped and hauled and  
20 put in Iron Gate reservoir. That's not going to work. It's  
21 not going to work to put them in any reservoir.

22 So I believe that the EIS is illegal. I believe  
23 that if dam removal is not considered in the EIS the EIS  
24 most likely will be litigated because you're not allowed to  
25 just not look at different alternatives and different

1 options. You have the State of California, National  
2 Fisheries, NOAA, all these different agencies saying trap  
3 and haul won't work. And that's the recommendation? It  
4 seems pretty blatant to me that it's not going to work that  
5 way.

6 Plus why put the coastal communities out of work  
7 for 90 megawatts, maybe 150 at peak? It doesn't make sense,  
8 so the second richest man in the world can get richer;  
9 someone in Iowa can sit around counting their money. We  
10 have 2000 excess megawatts this year. That's enough power  
11 to supply Seattle twice over. We don't need these dams.  
12 These dams are ridiculous. They're destroying water  
13 quality. They will not be certified for water quality  
14 issues. They're a nightmare.

15 And so I support four dams out. I'm glad you at  
16 least considered two dams out, but I don't feel that you've  
17 fulfilled your responsibility to the public by considering  
18 that. And definitely the trap and haul preferred  
19 alternative, it's not going to work. It's not going to work  
20 for anyone and it's just going to continue to devastate the  
21 communities of the Klamath River.

22 So that being said, also the toxic algae needs to  
23 be dealt with. And it's not going to be dealt with through  
24 aeration. And I have a really big feeling that the State of  
25 California is not going to allow status quo as far as toxic

1 algae goes.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

4 The next speaker will be Don Flickinger. And he  
5 will be followed by Marilee Jenkinson.

6 MR. FLICKINGER: Good evening.

7 I'm Don Flickinger. That's spelled F-l-i-c-k-i-  
8 n-g-e-r. I am a resident of Yreka, California.

9 And I'd like to also thank you all for coming  
10 here and allotting us a chance to come both this morning and  
11 this evening here in Yreka to make comments, especially for  
12 those of us who hold day jobs and we're out busy actually on  
13 the river today learning how to survey for Coho salmon. So  
14 we're really grateful to be able to come here this evening.

15 I've got two short specific comments and then a  
16 general one which will echo kind of what we've heard already  
17 tonight.

18 This is with respect to the staff alternative for  
19 downstream trap and haul. As it's written in the document,  
20 the way I read it, there's an inability to distinguish  
21 resident fish from out-migrants in the collecting facility  
22 that's been described in the document. FERC has not  
23 identified a way to distinguish steelhead and Pacific  
24 lamprey from resident red-band trout and resident lamprey in  
25 this kind of trap and haul alternative.

1           The fish are really indistinguishable. It's  
2 impossible to tell them apart in these early life stages.  
3 And this is a real critical imitation from the trap and haul  
4 component of the staff alternative. I wanted to call that  
5 to your attention.

6           Then with respect to reintroductions, there's a  
7 description of reintroductions of fall Chinook after doing  
8 an initial test release on radio telemetry of Chinook salmon  
9 at least in one reach and perhaps in three reaches directly  
10 above Iron Gate, Copco One and JC Boyle. And that fails to  
11 include Coho and steelhead, obviously. And so there is not  
12 a clearly defined methodology for doing those  
13 reintroductions beyond fall Chinook.

14           And that would be inconsistent with the goals and  
15 objectives that have been outlined by the Fish & Wildlife  
16 Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. So we'd like  
17 some clarification in the document about those  
18 reintroductions as they would be addressing those other  
19 species.

20           And generally, I think that in the last probably  
21 four to five months there's been a tremendous amount of  
22 information flow that's come from a variety of sources, some  
23 that were mentioned just earlier, particularly relating to  
24 the California Coastal Conservancy in its studies and some  
25 other studies that have come out more recently relating to

1 the process of removing dams and what you do about the  
2 sediment, and also the characteristics of the sediment  
3 behind the structures that you're removing. And in our case  
4 it appears like we've got a fairly benign amount of material  
5 behind there.

6 So I think it would be good for those of you who  
7 are going back and reviewing this information that's come  
8 from the public through these public fora and also through  
9 this information that's come out to make a firm commitment  
10 to re-doing your analysis -- whether it's in a final EIS or  
11 perhaps a supplemental that's for you to determine -- but to  
12 make it clear that you've gone back and considered all this  
13 information that's coming out now.

14 And I think that there's kind of a sea change in  
15 public attitudes that's resulting from that. And one thing  
16 I would like to cite is that Humboldt County has recently --  
17 I guess it was just a couple days ago the board of  
18 supervisors has voted unanimously to remove all four dams.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

21 The next speaker will be Marilee Jenkinson, to be  
22 followed by Norelle Harrigan.

23 MS. JENKINSON: Thank you.

24 My name is Marilee Jenkinson and I'm from Talent,  
25 Oregon; originally from the San Francisco Bay area. And

1 I've seen many changes in my 60 years. And sometimes I'm  
2 not happy with it.

3 My father was a builder of dams. I don't think  
4 he knew what he was doing sometimes. He's long gone and I'm  
5 still here. And sometimes in due respect to him, I wish  
6 he'd seen the world in a different way than he did.

7 I want to read this. And -- Can you hear me  
8 okay?

9 (No response.)

10 MS. JENKINSON: A friend of mine said to me, 'Be  
11 sure you make a statement before you read to let people know  
12 that you care very deeply about what you're speaking of.'  
13 And I do.

14 Restoring the river to the salmon and the land to  
15 the people for future generations is a top priority. It  
16 cannot wait. As to the present, talk about global warming  
17 and sustainability, action toward alternative energy  
18 resources, then the dams on the Klamath River is an  
19 immediate solution here in Oregon and in California and  
20 elsewhere. This decision will help the world to do the  
21 right thing as well.

22 As a mother I remember the words to my son at  
23 two, who was in need of the wisdom of an elder mentor. And  
24 it was my responsibility to teach him truth. You need to  
25 put your coat on. Either you do this by yourself or I will

1 help you, or I will have to do it for you. I would say in  
2 respect to himself he would choose capability and he did put  
3 the jacket on.

4 I respected his choice. He learned to respect  
5 himself. He chose a path toward maturity.

6 I think we have a similar path here. No, we are  
7 not two years old. But in world time we are so very young  
8 and immature. Our mother is and has been very kind to us  
9 and so far is very forgiving. But this can change quickly  
10 if we do not -- if we do forget consequences of not  
11 listening to wise counsel which is always available to us  
12 all on this planet earth.

13 Back when I first fished it was from a dam. We  
14 did not question whether we fished from it. We were young.  
15 We never connected the dots and the floods downstream or our  
16 water quality. It was still relatively clean then. For me  
17 that is just over 50 years ago. We did not know salmon-  
18 time. We went out and caught a small trout and we  
19 participated in the life of the lake assuming an abundant  
20 supply.

21 Compared to the people of this land we were  
22 spectators doing pretend play. After all, we had our local  
23 grocery store. We visited the power plant and the fish  
24 hatchery on field trips. Part of our education then, we  
25 took pride in technology. We as children live in the now.

1                   We did not see that we lived on clear-cuts or the  
2                   loss of habitat to all our relations. We studied science  
3                   and we saw the phenomenal beauty of the paradisiacal place  
4                   we call home. We saw change and mourned quietly, accepting  
5                   our technological assumptions as truth. This grief we feel  
6                   palpably in our culture today.

7                   What we need is joy. It is genocide to ignore  
8                   the call to return the salmon to their rightful home. It is  
9                   not okay to truck them around these four dams on the Klamath  
10                  or construct fish ladders. It is that we need to take down  
11                  the dams, period. Now. So they can go home.

12                  Thank you very much.

13                  MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

14                  The next speaker is Norelle Harrigan. And she  
15                  will be followed by L. Chook-Chook Hillman.

16                  MS. HARRIGAN: Hi. My name is Norelle Harrigan.  
17                  And I'm a resident of Orleans in the middle of Klamath.

18                  And I also wanted to express my extreme  
19                  disappointment that only -- that all four dams aren't being  
20                  considered for retirement.

21                  And I wanted to talk a little bit about some more  
22                  of the problems with the trap and haul scenario. Some of  
23                  the people before talked about the issue of how toxic algae  
24                  will still be affecting these fish once they get around the  
25                  reservoir.

1           Another issue is that it's not merely the  
2 physical barrier of the dams that's causing the salmon to  
3 drying off but the conditions that they're creating in the  
4 water, the low flows, the lower oxygen content, the growth  
5 of other types of algae that are creating the fish diseases,  
6 the die-off of juvenile fish.

7           This year lots of juvenile fish in the river are  
8 dying off because of the conditions in the water that's not  
9 affected by their ability to pass by the dam. And so I  
10 really feel like the trap and haul scenario only looks at  
11 one isolated facet of the issue and one isolated facet of  
12 what's affecting these fish because there's really a huge  
13 amount of factors that's causing all -- all I believe linked  
14 to the dam -- that's causing this.

15           It also seems to me like nobody is benefiting  
16 from this except Pacific Power. Like the economy of the  
17 area would be benefited by dam removal that would create the  
18 jobs of dam removal. It would raise the property value in  
19 the areas where like people are -- houses on toxic algae,  
20 reservoirs.

21           It also seems to me like right now I believe as  
22 of like last week or something the dams were producing 90  
23 megawatts. I think that their whole capacity is 150. And  
24 it just seems to me just a small amount of power. I just  
25 learned about that figure when Regina was talking about it

1 and it's just shocking to me that there's 2000 megawatts  
2 excess and we're causing all this trouble over 90 megawatts.

3 I also think that it's a really different world  
4 than when these dams started being built. And it's a really  
5 different situation. And it may be people were building  
6 dams then, but like there's a lot of ways that we've claimed  
7 that this world is better and that we've claimed that this  
8 country is better; but it seems to me that we're just doing  
9 the same thing over and over again to the Tribes that we've  
10 been doing for -- since we -- like, forever.

11 And it just -- it seems to me like real progress  
12 would be to respect the -- like, the -- to respect the --  
13 all of the people of the basin and to -- excuse me -- and to  
14 remove all of the dams.

15 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you very much.

16 The next speaker will be L. Chook-Chook Hillman,  
17 followed by Chris Denney.

18 MR. HILLMAN: I am Chook-Chook Hillman. I'm from  
19 Orleans, California, born and raised. I'd just like to say  
20 thank you guys for being here and listening to us. I know  
21 it feels like everybody's yelling at you folks.

22 But I don't have much to say. But I'd say I'm  
23 disappointed with the two dams being proposed to be taken  
24 out. It definitely needs to be four. Our fishery not being  
25 considered as a cultural resources seems like blatant

1       disrespect to Tribal folks, in my opinion.

2               A few other things. I just -- I was born and  
3       raised on this river and I just hate to see it like this.  
4       You know what I mean? I don't swim in it. I've been  
5       swimming in it my whole life. I won't even touch it.

6               I mean I've been working water quality and that  
7       dissolved oxygen level that our water quality person threw  
8       out earlier is wild. You know what I mean? No oxygen for  
9       salmon to breathe; high temperatures in the water. It's way  
10      disgusting.

11              And then, like we're saying, trap and haul isn't  
12      going to deal with any of those issues.

13              And like I said, I'm going to keep it short and  
14      sweet. I've said it before and I'll say it again: This  
15      river is my school; it's my church; it's my home; and it's  
16      my grocery store. And that's pretty much it.

17              Thank you guys for listening.

18              MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

19              The next speaker will be Chris Denney, to be  
20      followed by Josh Saxon.

21              MR. DENNEY: Howdy.

22              My name is Chris Denney and I'm a field biologist  
23      on the Salmon River doing spawning surveys. It's an  
24      undammed tributary of the Klamath that the fish have to  
25      migrate through to get to the spawning grounds up there.

1 And I'm concerned with even if the alternative for the  
2 project is to remove the lower four dams that the upper dams  
3 will still be water quality issues as the toxicology and  
4 sediment loads coming into that system anyway.

5 So I'm hoping that's going to be addressed or  
6 possibly managed, set up a management practice for  
7 PacifiCorp or whoever's going to be controlling the upper  
8 dams such as A-Canal and others of that nature.

9 Thanks.

10 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you.

11 The next speaker will be Josh Saxon, to be  
12 followed by Lindia Hammer.

13 MR. SAXON: Good evening. My name is Josh Saxon.  
14 I'm a Karuk Tribal member. I live on the river in Orleans.

15 And I kind of wrote some stuff on my hand but I  
16 can't read it any more.

17 I think I kind of approach this from a different  
18 perspective. I'm not really a scientist. But it seems to  
19 me just from what I've known through this process of the  
20 dams and the proposed--- the EIS that you guys have here,  
21 the draft one, it seems to me from my perspective that it's  
22 a direct violation of my First Amendment rights to practice  
23 my religion on the river.

24 If the salmon are gone I don't get to practice my  
25 religion any more. It's an integral intrinsic part of my

1 religion. And if the dams stay the fish go. It's as simple  
2 as that in my mind from the science that I've heard and from  
3 the science that you guys have weighed in balancing your  
4 views.

5 I think that -- you know, I was talking with my  
6 83 year old grandmother a couple days ago. I told her I was  
7 coming up here. And I said, 'Hey, Gram, do you want me to  
8 tell anything to those people?' And she said, 'Yeah. Tell  
9 them they need to fix the river because if they don't all  
10 the fish will be gone.'

11 Thank you.

12 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

13 The next speaker will be Lindia Hammer, to be  
14 followed by Crescent Calimpong.

15 MS. HAMMER: Hello. My name is Lindia Hammer.

16 Can you hear me okay?

17 Pertaining to the EIS, specifically I think there  
18 needs to be another option: that the one you've been  
19 hearing about, the four lowest dams need to be removed. I'm  
20 speaking as a biologist and a citizen of the region. I live  
21 in Ashland currently.

22 And the aeration doesn't address all of the  
23 myriad of problems of dams. And the fish biologist  
24 mentioned something about it. There's the starvation of the  
25 channel of spawning gravels, the obvious walking off of all

1 the spawning habitat. I mean, I'm -- you know them all; I  
2 don't need to list them all.

3 But the option of just removing two doesn't  
4 address all of those. And aeration is not going to fix the  
5 problem. These are amazingly extreme water quality issues.  
6 And though I haven't really spent a whole lot of time on the  
7 Klamath, I've read a lot of studies about reservoirs and  
8 rivers and streams -- and I'm sure you have -- and it's  
9 really -- the document doesn't go far enough in addressing  
10 all of the options and the options that would actually  
11 restore salmon to the basin.

12 I mean actually the six lower dams need to come  
13 out and a couple other ones on the side channels need to  
14 come out, too. But I know you just have four to deal with.  
15 So I hope that you can rework your alternatives and come  
16 back with the option of all four dams being removed.

17 And just briefly, you know, as a citizen who uses  
18 electricity and talks with other people, I can tell you that  
19 a large proportion of society appreciates salmon. And, you  
20 know, since these dams have gone in we have a much greater  
21 understanding of aquatic ecology and we also have a much  
22 greater understanding and appreciation for the Native  
23 culture that has systematically been destroyed by the U.S.  
24 government. And this would be one small step in the right  
25 direction. Very small, but small -- excuse me.

1           It would be a small and important step. And  
2 without it, you know, the salmon are pretty much doomed.  
3 You know, you can talk to -- you can talk to Tribes members  
4 and you can talk to aquatic ecologists and fish biologists.  
5 And I think most people would be willing to pay a little bit  
6 more for their electricity if it comes down to that, if it  
7 comes down to the cost of the dam removal to ensure that the  
8 salmon survive. So -- and again it's not just the salmon,  
9 it's the whole river system.

10           So I really hope that, you know you can do your  
11 work as public servants, public employees, act in the  
12 public's best interest, and do whatever you can to make sure  
13 these four dams come out as soon as possible.

14           Thank you.

15           MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

16           The next speaker is Crescent Calimpong. And she  
17 will be followed by Chris Hatton.

18           MS. CALIMPONG: Hi. My name is Crescent  
19 Calimpong. And I'm a recent transplant to the Soames Bar  
20 area but I grew up on the coast in Eureka, California. And  
21 I'll just read what I wrote.

22           I believe we have been given a once in a lifetime  
23 opportunity to take down Iron Gate Dam, Copco One and Two,  
24 and JC Boyle, four dams that are hydrologically  
25 insignificant to the Klamath Project but would provide

1 significant improvements to fish habitat access upon their  
2 removal.

3 Their removal would open up 350 miles of historic  
4 fish habitat to Chinook salmon, Coho, steelhead, lamprey and  
5 sturgeon. I believe that the four alternatives in the draft  
6 EIS do not go far enough to address the environmental and  
7 social impacts the dams have had on downstream commercial  
8 fishermen, recreational fishermen, and the Tribes within the  
9 upper and lower basin.

10 I believe the alternative retirement of Copco One  
11 and Iron Gate developments does not go far enough and needs  
12 to be developed to retire Copco Two and JC Boyle also. In  
13 FERC's own analysis FERC found that removing the dams is  
14 more cost effective than building fish passage. I hope FERC  
15 concludes to remove the four dams within the final EIS.

16 Thank you for your time.

17 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

18 The next speaker is Chris Hatton, to be followed  
19 -- well, by Nora and Clancy Grant.

20 I'm not sure both of you will be speaking.

21 MR. HATTON: All right. How you guys doing?  
22 Thanks so much for coming here.

23 My name is Chris Hatton. And my wife and I run  
24 the Soames Bar General Store, which is about 100 miles  
25 downriver on the Klamath. And, you know, I'm just going to

1 tell you mostly incidental stuff.

2 Most of store work is a lot of small talk with  
3 stray fishermen and a lot of great people that live down  
4 there. And, you know, people are there -- it's a very  
5 interesting place.

6 And the Klamath River is the most beautiful place  
7 I know in this country. It's the most diverse place and  
8 it's the most -- it's the type of place that kind of reveals  
9 itself slowly. You don't just drive down or take a picture,  
10 postcard of it. It's a very unique place. And a lot of  
11 that is because of the diversity of the forest and  
12 definitely the diversity of the Klamath River.

13 And there's creatures in the river. Just these  
14 last couple of years I've gotten to swim and see sturgeon in  
15 the river. And these animals are just -- they're almost  
16 imaginary how amazing they are, a green sturgeon swimming in  
17 the river. I mean they're huge and they're scary. They  
18 look like sharks, you know. And they're not -- they're kind  
19 of imaginary. I wouldn't have believed they existed until  
20 you see them, you know. And it's a place that is amazingly  
21 unique.

22 And the people that come there have been coming  
23 there for years. People come and tell stories of, 'hey, my  
24 family came up here; we've been coming here my whole life,  
25 for 30 years they've been coming up here; we meet here every

1 summer and we go fishing and every fall we go fishing and we  
2 catch steelhead and we catch salmon and we have this -- this  
3 is our place, you know, we love it here.' And it's just one  
4 of these amazing places.

5 And I guess I see this opportunity as the legacy  
6 that our generation leaves. If we do anything -- if we can  
7 take steps to repair the Klamath it will last generations.  
8 And the impact on the communities on this river will last  
9 for generations and we'll save it.

10 I mean the feeling now as you drive down the  
11 Klamath River is it's a place that's dying, that's on the  
12 verge of dying because you see these places, you see -- you  
13 drive through Happy Camp, California, which, you know,  
14 frankly, is -- I mean you look in the forest. It's  
15 beautiful but it's depressed. You know, people are very  
16 poor and are just getting by. There's a lot of social  
17 inequities. There's a lot of issues.

18 And, you know, their sign says -- which was  
19 probably painted 40 years ago, you know, because they don't  
20 have, you know, they don't make many new signs there, you  
21 know -- it says 'Steelhead Capital of the World.' You know,  
22 these are these places that base their identify on fishing  
23 and on fisheries.

24 And that is the common denominator of everyone  
25 that comes through the store is fish. And that's what's

1 going to build this place and make it a place. Otherwise  
2 when the fish disappears the communities will just  
3 disappear. They'll wither and die.

4 And so, you know, removing these dams is a legacy  
5 that we can leave. And it would be huge. You know, if we  
6 can create a sustainable way for fish to survive in this  
7 river that has so many impacts, you know, I mean -- and  
8 they're just going to increase, you know, as the water --  
9 you know, water is going to be the issue of the next 100  
10 years. You know, water is going to be more important than  
11 oil.

12 And when we realize that, you know, we'll realize  
13 that a place like this is so threatened and it will just get  
14 knocked by the wayside. If we can figure out a way to save  
15 it, it will be our greatest legacy.

16 So if you guys can look into this, you know -- I  
17 mean you don't know, too. I mean I understand it's a  
18 political game. There's all these games that people are  
19 playing. But when you get right down onto the ground it's  
20 the greatest thing that we could do as a generation in this  
21 basin if we could take down dams and figure out a way for  
22 these fish to survive. And it seems like all science points  
23 towards giving those fish access to the upper basin. And it  
24 will only, you know, increase the wealth of this area  
25 thousands and thousands-fold. Otherwise it's done.

1                   So thank you, guys. And I really hope you look  
2 into that.

3                   MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

4                   Let's see. Are both Nora and Clancy going to be  
5 speaking?

6                   MR. GRANT: Yes.

7                   MR. HJORTH: Okay.

8                   So Nora will be speaking -- Nora Grant will be  
9 speaking next, to be followed by Clancy Grant.

10                  MS. GRANT: Hi. My name is Nora Grant.

11                  And first off I want to apologize because I'm not  
12 a professional speaker, unlike some that have been up here.

13                  MR. HJORTH: Closer to the mike.

14                  MS. GRANT: Closer to the mike.

15                  Ours is more the other side of the story. As  
16 these people are disappointed that you aren't taking out all  
17 of the dams, we're disappointed that you're even considering  
18 taking any of them. We live here in Siskiyou County. We  
19 own property here and up at Iron Gate Estates. And maybe  
20 the dams weren't a good idea 90-some years ago. But they're  
21 done. It's already there. Let's don't use bad science and  
22 go backwards.

23                  We have an ecosystem that has been established  
24 now for almost 100 years. What happens to that ecosystem?  
25 Do we destroy one in an effort to save some of their -- I

1       respect their culture and I think that there's a solution so  
2       that we can save their culture, their religious practices,  
3       save our cultures and our way of life that is present there  
4       today.

5                I believe that it will affect this county  
6       tremendously, tax revenue-wise, property values, businesses.  
7       In speaking to a realtor just the other day, in the last  
8       week she's already had three houses fall out of escrow at  
9       Copco because of all of the press.

10              Yes, there are issues. Yes, there are problems.  
11       But I believe working together, the Tribes, the residents of  
12       Siskiyou County, the government, the water quality, I  
13       believe that we can all find a solution that works for  
14       everyone, not just one set -- side.

15              We don't want to be on two sides. We want to be  
16       a group together that works for a solution.

17              We all long for good old days. But I don't  
18       believe the good old days are going to come back. I don't  
19       think that you can go back and undo 90 years.

20              And what about the habitat that is there now?  
21       What happens to it? We have eagles, osprey, numerous fish,  
22       turtles, water fowl, deer, bear -- you could go on and on  
23       and on.

24              And when you take those dams out they say, 'okay,  
25       it's not going to affect anything.' But what happens to all

1 the sediment that is there? Where does that go? 'Oh, it's  
2 going to be a beautiful river front.' They try to tell us  
3 it's going to be, 'Oh, beautiful river front. You'll have  
4 river front property.' Okay. Once you slide down the hill  
5 and wade through muck that would bury you -- I mean it's  
6 going to totally destroy what is there now.

7 True, it doesn't make a lot of power. But that  
8 power that we are on is a clean power. It also provides  
9 power for this county. And without that, what are we going  
10 to do? Go on to an already strained California grid that  
11 has rolling blackouts and blackouts all the time because  
12 they can't sustain -- we're going to add more to them? Let  
13 alone that the power rates are much higher; the further  
14 south you go the higher they get.

15 I just think that together there is a way, there  
16 is a solution. Algae is a problem. We can solve that  
17 problem. It's not as bad as it's made out to be in the  
18 press. There's algae, yes, during July and August. Most  
19 common people don't go up and grab it by the handful and  
20 swallow it and ingest the toxin.

21 There's never been a reported death in the State  
22 of California from this toxin or from these lakes or  
23 sicknesses. What about the people that were raised in these  
24 areas for the last 60 or 70 years? No one has reported  
25 losing a pet, themselves ever being sick, any of their

1 children being sick.

2 I think it's just something to throw out there to  
3 detract from solving a problem to wanting to take out the  
4 dam. I think it's a scare tactic.

5 Our county supervisor legally had to report that  
6 the toxin was present in that lake. But the same weekend  
7 that she reports that -- and every weekend of the summer --  
8 our county health supervisor is up there water skiing. She  
9 must be real concerned about the health situation of it  
10 then.

11 It's around the edges. You move it out of the  
12 way. Maybe we can dredge it. Maybe we can drag it. We can  
13 remove it. Dry it; dispose of it.

14 There's people up in Klamath Falls, they harvest  
15 this. It's sold on the Internet and in health food stores.  
16 And it's not even regulated as to how much of this toxin can  
17 be in there. You can buy them anywhere. You can walk to  
18 the store down here in town and buy the pills that are made  
19 from the blue algae.

20 I just think this is an excuse. And instead of  
21 just wanting to work together I think that the side for the  
22 removal has dredged up any and every possible worse scenario  
23 that they could come up with to try to get you folks to not  
24 re-license PacifiCorp and to remove the dams.

25 Do away with the recreation, do away with the

1 property values, do away with the tax revenues for our  
2 county -- which they're right: We are in a depressed  
3 county. Our county has very, very little money. So let's  
4 take more away from it by taking all that tax revenue that  
5 PacifiCorp and stuff generate? I don't think that's a good  
6 science approach either.

7 And I appreciate the fact that you guys are here  
8 and that we get to finally voice an opinion. We have  
9 circulated hundreds and hundreds of opinion polls. And  
10 unfortunately a lot of the people in this county for a long  
11 time sat back and went, 'ah, never going to happen. They're  
12 not going to take this stuff out. No way.' And now it's  
13 here.

14 A lot of these people are complacent. They feel  
15 like, 'okay, there's nothing we can do.' But it's amazing  
16 when you send out opinion polls how many -- of which we've  
17 submitted some of them to you already -- they don't want it  
18 gone either. And these are people that have lived here  
19 forever. And some of the speaker that come up here, they're  
20 so young how do they know? They didn't live it 90 years  
21 ago. It's all hearsay.

22 And what we can find is that it's not quite like  
23 what it's being presented. Some of the salmon never did go  
24 all the way up according to the history at the museum. What  
25 about the flooding? We flood in the spring. We have high

1 water situations now on the Klamath. This last year a lot  
2 of the properties were semi-flooded. What happens when you  
3 take that dam out? What happens in the summer when they  
4 become a trickle?

5 What about the -- there's photos -- you can find  
6 them anywhere -- of Link Creek when in the summer before the  
7 dams it was a dry creek bed. Now how are salmon going to  
8 get up that?

9 I just don't think that everything is being  
10 represented from that side as it really is. And I'm not  
11 sure what the ultimate goal is. But I still feel that  
12 together we can find a solution to the current problem.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. HJORTH: The next speaker will be Clancy  
15 Grant. And he will be followed by Will Harling.

16 MR. GRANT: Thank you.

17 My name is Clancy Grant. And I've listened to  
18 everybody's speech down here tonight. The main thing that  
19 I've heard of is the fish. Everything -- everybody's  
20 concerned about the fish. Got a bigger picture here. It's  
21 not just the fish we have to worry about.

22 We have droughts. We have technology. We have  
23 heavy rains. Let's look at the whole picture.

24 Sometimes during the summertime, we take those  
25 dams out, people down the river, they're not going to have

1 any water. Wintertime, we get big rains, people down in  
2 Happy Camp aren't going to have any houses because they're  
3 going to be under water; they're going to be flooded.

4 Dams are built for many reasons. And they're  
5 there to take care of water control, flood control, and they  
6 regulated the flow of that river. Right now that river  
7 probably flows better than it ever has in the history of  
8 that river. And, you know, listening to the people up here  
9 about all the salmon that they've seen in that river, I  
10 don't think there's anybody old enough in this building  
11 right now that has been on that river without that dam being  
12 there.

13 We need the dams. They control so much more of  
14 our life. Technology we have to learn to live with.  
15 There's going to be problems with it. We're going to figure  
16 out how to eliminate those problems. They continue to make  
17 the flow work with us.

18 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

19 MR. HJORTH: The next speaker will be Will  
20 Harling. And he will be followed by Nate Pennington.

21 MR. HARLING: Good evening.

22 My name is Will Harling. And I'm the program  
23 director for the Mid-Klamath Watershed Council, which  
24 services the area from below Iron Gate Dam down to the  
25 Trinity River confluence.

1           And I just want to start out by saying that I am  
2           disappointed that there wasn't an alternative that looked at  
3           the removal of the four dams of -- the lower four dams on  
4           the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. I would love to see that  
5           alternative developed for the final EIS. And I know you've  
6           heard that from many voices.

7           And I was here in Yreka -- I don't know, was it  
8           two years ago or last year -- when you guys came to the old  
9           Boston Shaft. And there was a lot of people that said that  
10          same thing. And so I guess -- I don't know if we're being  
11          heard or what the process is. But I don't know what people  
12          need to do to see it. It's not saying this absolutely needs  
13          to happen. I mean there's a lot of people saying that, but  
14          I'm just asking can we see that as an alternative. Can we  
15          see how it looks in regards to the other alternatives that  
16          you've provided.

17          My concerns are that the hatcheries to date have  
18          not mitigated for the dams' blocking fish passage to the  
19          upper basin. We've lost our spring Chinook run. We've lost  
20          our fish. Our fall Chinook runs are now in trouble. And  
21          that was, you know, the one we were hanging our hat on.

22          And I guess what I really want people to  
23          understand, that it's not fish versus people. It's about  
24          people who depend on fish versus people who depend on a  
25          property on the shores of Copco Reservoir or, you know, a

1 fishing family out in the ocean. And change is scary. It's  
2 scary, you know, to imagine your whole backyard being  
3 changed apart. I understand that. I feel that. I feel  
4 your emotion. But, you know, I have that same emotion. And  
5 it's not just about a disconnection, you know, that I like  
6 to fish.

7           When I was growing up on the Salmon River my  
8 family was making maybe \$13,000 a year for us -- for the  
9 family and three kids. Me going down after school and  
10 catching a big fat spring Chinook in the Salmon River was  
11 what we ate. That was dinner on the table. And there's a  
12 connection there that's real.

13           And as much as I can feel that, you know, I feel  
14 the fear of the people that live in Siskiyou County. I was  
15 fishing on the Salmon River this morning for steelhead with  
16 my brother, who's a logger from Etna. And, you know, after  
17 I'd caught a couple steelhead and he finally landed this big  
18 old seven pound buck, and his son JT was with us and he gets  
19 to the shore and JT's like, 'Dad, Dad, you going to keep  
20 it?' 'No,' he said -- and he almost choked on his big chew.

21           You know, fifteen years ago we'd be eating that  
22 damn steelhead tonight and it'd be tasting real good. Now  
23 we can't keep fish any more because there's not enough in  
24 the system.

25           What I want people to understand is what as those

1 fish continue to decline it's not like the people who  
2 depended on those fish are just going to up and disappear.  
3 We're here. We're in this basin. And we need to work out  
4 what's best for the fish and what's best for the people.

5 Like a farmer friend from the Shasta said -- he's  
6 a religious man, and he said, 'These fish,' he says, 'I keep  
7 looking around the Klamath basin for an Elijah, somebody  
8 that's going to bring us all together so that we can work  
9 out our differences.' And then I turned around and I  
10 realized the fish, the salmon is Elijah. It is what's going  
11 to bring us all together. And restoring these fish runs is  
12 what's going to bring us all together. And if we from an  
13 ideological standpoint can't see what the benefits of a  
14 river as it once flowed without dams can do for fish and for  
15 people then we've missed that lesson and we've missed a once  
16 in a lifetime opportunity to restore this fishery.

17 I'm on the river a lot below Iron Gate Dam. I  
18 just rescued two drift boats with scuba getting towed around  
19 with a jet boat in 30 foot of water that you can only see  
20 about two feet. I'm there in the summer; I'm there in the  
21 winter.

22 I see the dead juvenile fish accumulating in the  
23 eddies and getting sucked up by the surge and disappearing.  
24 They're not -- they're never counted. But if you look at  
25 the data you'll see that that stretch below Iron Gate Dam

1 down to Happy Camp, it's a death zone for juvenile fish  
2 pretty much every year. We're having mortality up to 95  
3 percent. And the biologists are having study after study  
4 point to the relationship of dams and the reservoirs behind  
5 them contributing to the water quality down river that cause  
6 those fish kills.

7 So if we're not able as a community in this basin  
8 to at least put dams on the table and talk about it face to  
9 face and talk about the costs and the benefits then we're  
10 already lost. We've already lost.

11 That's all I have to say.

12 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you very much.

13 The next speaker will be Nate Pennington, to be  
14 followed again by James and Charlene Walden. I'll assume  
15 that both would like to speak.

16 MR. PENNINGTON: Thank you. That's Nat  
17 Pennington, N-a-t.

18 MR. HJORTH: Oh. I'm sorry.

19 MR. PENNINGTON: That's fine.

20 Well, I thank you for allowing us the opportunity  
21 to speak tonight.

22 I work -- I live on the Salmon River, a tributary  
23 to the Klamath, and I work for the Salmon River Restoration  
24 Council, a non-profit organization. And we for the last ten  
25 years have been striving to restore the ecosystems and

1 particularly salmon runs in our river system. And one of  
2 the things that we've been encountering is that the corridor  
3 of river between the Salmon River and the ocean -- namely  
4 the Klamath River -- has had a -- well we've found that it's  
5 probably one of the greatest limitations to our work in  
6 restoring the fishery.

7 In 2001 I believe it was 60,000 juvenile salmon  
8 were found below the Salmon River and that didn't really  
9 receive as much press or attention as the larger adult fish  
10 kill -- which also affected our river's runs -- did. But  
11 the 2001 juvenile fish kill was eight miles below the Salmon  
12 River and was likely caused by water quality conditions in  
13 the Klamath. And so on the Salmon River the last two years  
14 we've had the record lowest runs of both spring and fall  
15 Chinook.

16 The Salmon River has the last remaining wild run  
17 of spring Chinook salmon in the Klamath basin. So, you  
18 know, you've heard earlier that this was once the  
19 predominant fishery in the basin. And our river has the  
20 last remaining wild run. So as you can imagine, we were all  
21 very disappointed to find last year that we had the lowest  
22 in record history, and that's 90 fish that we counted in our  
23 efforts through the Restoration Council and some of our  
24 cooperators with the U.S. Forest Service.

25 So 25 years of data, and the last two years we've

1 had actually three consecutive lowest runs. So we feel like  
2 we're on the brink of fisheries -- our fisheries collapsing.

3 Another threat that I am concerned about in my  
4 community is the fact that we don't have any electricity in  
5 our watershed at all. And as I stated a moment ago, we're  
6 very much affected by the operations of PacifiCorp and their  
7 dams. But we receive none of the benefit.

8 We have 72 miles of river in our watershed and  
9 therefore approximately about 72 miles of road, main highway  
10 system road, actually, and only about a mile and a half of  
11 that is electrified at this time.

12 So our public school at which my three children  
13 attend has no electricity from the grid system. So that's  
14 been frustrating, particularly because we spend \$24,000 a  
15 year for diesel fuel to power our school. So that's been at  
16 cost to our students essentially, which has been  
17 unfortunate.

18 So I feel like this is largely a matter of a  
19 problem in a greater neighborhood, and that's the Klamath  
20 basin as a whole. And I want to acknowledge the Grants for  
21 speaking earlier on their concerns with alterations to their  
22 homes and their communities. As a member of the downriver  
23 community -- referring to the dams as downriver or upriver -  
24 - I'd like to say that we do not have to fear any heightened  
25 floods in the case of dam removal because the dams are not

1 flood control dams, as I'm sure a lot of folks know.

2 But in any case I do feel the concerns that they  
3 expressed towards the landscape of their homes and  
4 communities. And I would urge everyone involved in the  
5 process to get together on that issue in particular, having  
6 to do with residents in the areas of the reservoirs.

7 And I certainly hope that you -- that the FERC  
8 will analyze the removal of all four dams in their final EIS  
9 as an alternative. And I hope that along with that process  
10 will come some vision for how to provide power, especially  
11 being that we're facing potential changes in power supply in  
12 this nation and a need to change.

13 So as the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I  
14 am asking that you analyze any alternatives that might  
15 provide power locally that wouldn't have such a devastating  
16 effect on the economy and the ecosystem in my area.

17 But once again, I do feel like the residents  
18 around the lakes need to be included in the process, in the  
19 discussion, and that I feel like there are options that a  
20 lot of people probably aren't yet to be aware of, and that I  
21 think dialogue is important.

22 As to the DEIS, once again I urge you to consider  
23 removal of all four dams on the Klamath.

24 And I will also be submitting written comments in  
25 the future.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you.

3 Let's see. We have two more speakers scheduled.  
4 James and Charlene Walden. And it looks like Charlene  
5 Walden will speak first.

6 MS. WALDEN: No, James won't be talking tonight.

7 I wanted to -- I'm Charlene Walden. I'm from  
8 Iron Gate, and part of the Committee to Save our Dams.

9 And I wanted to thank everybody because it was  
10 really informational and very interesting. And some things  
11 were quite eye-opening. And I wanted to kind of clarify  
12 that it's not our property so much that we're so concerned  
13 about, it's everything involved.

14 And I'm glad some of you girls were really  
15 nervous, okay?

16 Anyway, we're urging the saving of the dams, of  
17 course. And I have here opinion polls that we did. We got  
18 over 500 in the last four months from residents of southern  
19 Oregon, Siskiyou County. We get them in the mail every day  
20 still. And I have forwarded them on to FERC with my letter.  
21 And some of them are quite interesting. Some of them are  
22 mostly, 'save the dam, save the dam, save the dam, damn it,'  
23 you know.

24 Anyway, this is one of our newly appointed  
25 supervisors who sent me this long before I got appointed.

1 But, 'I agree that we need to maintain our dams, lakes, and  
2 the Klamath River as they are today. The ploy is to  
3 devastate yet another Siskiyou County resource and industry  
4 related to Copco, Iron Gate, Dwinnell Dams. Don't let  
5 another spotted owl propaganda of bad science prevail. We  
6 learned from that escapade,' which unfortunately a lot of  
7 towns had to learn the hard way.

8 A lot of them Siskiyou County learned. Yreka was  
9 one of them. Happy Camp. Minimom. Towns that had mills;  
10 the mills are gone. And they're gone forever. The jobs are  
11 gone. The same thing with the dams. You take them out,  
12 they're gone forever.

13 I want the fish to come back. I fished all my  
14 life, ocean, river, lakes. I love my lake recreation along  
15 with many thousands that visit our county. And this year we  
16 felt a lot of hurt economically from the bad press that we  
17 received. People were afraid to fish, they were afraid to  
18 swim, they were afraid to do anything when it came to the  
19 water.

20 We've been doing a lot of reading and researching  
21 on this algae. Unfortunately we were not part of any of the  
22 studies that went on. Many, many, many of us had wished we  
23 had been part of a lot of the studies so that we could have  
24 been first-hand in it also and it wouldn't have been so one-  
25 sided. That's the way we kind of felt it was. But, you

1 know, when you get grants-- We kind of felt like if you're  
2 going to go through our property let us be part of the  
3 study.

4 We kind of feel that we can work together, find  
5 solutions to returning the fish to their home; to fixing the  
6 water quality problems without the drastic removal of dams.

7 Our power is important. It could always be  
8 replaced, of course, with wind. We have tons of wind up  
9 here. We have plenty of wind power.

10 But we like our dams. We like our rivers. We  
11 like our lakes. We like our recreation. We love our  
12 ecosystem that's up there. It goes all the way up the  
13 Klamath right into Oregon. And it affects everybody.

14 And there's going to be pros and cons on any  
15 direction we go, no matter what it is we do. It's kind of  
16 like the religion subject: Not only is their religion being  
17 affected by the fish, ours is being affected every day.  
18 It's being removed from schools. It's being removed  
19 everywhere, everybody's.

20 We need to work together to fix these problems.  
21 The fish right now, the dams, the river, the lakes, these  
22 are all the ones that are here right now in our face. We  
23 need to find a way to work together, find solutions. And  
24 hopefully use good science, not bad this time, and fix it.

25 And I think we can do it together as a society,

1 as a county, as a country. We can do it. The government  
2 can help us.

3 And I know there's the brains out there, there's  
4 the technology out there. If we put it all together maybe  
5 we can all live happy together, have the fish and the dams.  
6 Maybe not.

7 But I know it's going to take years to come down  
8 to removing anything. But hopefully we can get these  
9 solutions fixed before decisions are made at your tables.  
10 And we can all --

11 That's it. I'm done.

12 Thank you, guys.

13 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you.

14 Charlene Walden was the last scheduled speaker.  
15 But now we're going to provide the opportunity for anybody  
16 who has not yet spoken or signed up to speak to make any  
17 additional oral statements this evening. So if anybody does  
18 wish to do so if they could please clearly state their name.  
19 And again, if it's difficult to spell or to pronounce, it  
20 you could spell it out for the court reporter.

21 MR. KILMER: My name is Dan Kilmer. I reside in  
22 Cyad Valley, which is about 50 miles downriver. And I wish  
23 to thank all of you folks for allowing us to give our wisdom  
24 and our opinions.

25 One thing that -- in life is that there's always

1 tradeoffs. If we get rid of all the dams on the Klamath  
2 River we're going to be eliminating approximately 161  
3 megawatts of very, very clean power. Hydroelectric power  
4 has -- is probably the least polluting of all power sources  
5 that we have currently in this country.

6 If we have to replace that power source with a  
7 coal-fired or oil-fired, natural gas, or perhaps even  
8 nuclear source in order to provide electricity for our  
9 homes, those power sources are going to be extremely  
10 polluting. And so we're going to be trading off air  
11 pollution for a different situation on the Klamath River.

12 For example, if we replaced the hydro power by  
13 burning wood, for example, we would have to turn  
14 approximately 175,000 cords of wood every year to replace  
15 that 161 megawatts.

16 So I would urge you folks to include in your  
17 analysis the fact that if we do eliminate some of this hydro  
18 power that there is going to be another type of impact. And  
19 that impact may impact air quality.

20 I just wanted to point that out. Thank you.

21 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

22 Are there any other folks who would like to make  
23 comments this evening?

24 MR. MEAMBER: My name is Don Meamber. And I'm a  
25 local rancher in Montague.

1           And I'm on the board with the local Shasta Valley  
2 Resource Conservation District. And we've been working on a  
3 basin-wide incidental take permit for the Scott Valley and  
4 the Shasta Valley for months now with the California Fish  
5 and Game. And it's an effort -- what it does, it's --  
6 because of the Coho listing, it's a document that protects  
7 the landowners using water from accidentally killing a fish.  
8 And it's nearing completion now.

9           And the Resource Conservation District procures  
10 funding to do restoration work in our valley to help the  
11 fish. And one of the problems we're having is the fish that  
12 the river and tributaries put out, when they migrate back  
13 down to the Klamath, as has already been reported here, the  
14 Fish and Wildlife has been running these screw traps in the  
15 Klamath checking for little fish and are finding a 90  
16 percent death rate. And it's making our job more difficult  
17 because the fish we put out in trying to restore the stream  
18 run are dying when they get in the Klamath. And it seems  
19 like a no-win situation.

20           And I'd just like to comment on the Klamath a  
21 little bit.

22           My uncle was J.C. Boyle. He was the one that  
23 built all the dams on the river. And in my opinion -- I'm  
24 just one board member -- but the way I see it the dams are  
25 blocking the river for the fish to migrate up. And they're

1 also warming the water.

2           The algae issue I think is not entirely the dams'  
3 fault. It's also a problem with nutrients coming down from  
4 the upper basin. And I know that Oregon stream quality  
5 people and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control  
6 Board -- part of the California State Water Resource Control  
7 Board is working on -- it's a high priority issue from the  
8 Clean Water Act of cleaning up the water quality in the  
9 streams. And I think that these issues with the nutrients  
10 are going to be taken care of in time in the upper basin  
11 with the various ways they get put into the stream.

12           But the dams still warm the water, which is a  
13 problem. Temperature is one of the problems with the  
14 Klamath and it's a problem with our river, too, temperature  
15 and oxygen.

16           But it's a physical barrier. And it's a question  
17 of whether the various options of getting the fish past to  
18 their spawning grounds is the one issue. And if the dams  
19 coming out is the cheapest way then I think that's what  
20 should be done.

21           And then the temperature, any time you block the  
22 water and create a ponding effect you've got more solar  
23 collection and warms the water up. So--

24           Anyway, and I also have kind of mixed feelings  
25 about the electricity too, because ranchers use electricity

1 for irrigation. And that's a concern for me, too, is the  
2 cost of electricity and if the dams come out will it affect  
3 our electric rates. And you have to weigh the various  
4 options of what's the best choice. And in my opinion the  
5 dams coming out is probably the better choice.

6 Thank you for coming here and thank you for your  
7 time.

8 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

9 Are there any other individuals who would like to  
10 make a statement tonight?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. HJORTH: Okay. If not, we'll go ahead and  
13 wrap up this meeting.

14 I want to thank everyone again for coming. I  
15 know that some of you have come a long way. And it's  
16 certainly not the best night to be out and about. So we  
17 appreciate the fact that you came. And we'll take your  
18 comments into consideration as we go ahead and prepare the  
19 final environmental impact statement.

20 Thanks again for coming.

21 (Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m., the public meeting in  
22 the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

23

24

25