

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

Shilo Inn
536 SW Elizabeth
Newport, OR

Thursday, November 30, 2006

The above-entitled matter came on for public meeting,
pursuant to notice, at 7:10 p.m.

MODERATOR: JOHN MUDRE, FERC

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:10 p.m.)

MS. MILES: Good evening everyone. I'd like to welcome you to our public meeting in Newport. We're so glad you're all here tonight. I wanted to just a couple of things before I turn it over to John Mudre.

I'm Ann Miles with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and with us tonight is John Mudre, who is the team lead for this project. Doug Hjorth, who is one of our contractors who is giving us input on our Environmental Impact Statement and in the back Marcelle, who is also with Louis Berger, as Doug is, giving input on our environmental document.

Before I turn it over to John and Doug, I wanted to say that we're hear tonight to listen to what you have to say. We've done a lot of work already and put together our thoughts, but now what we really want is your thoughts on what you think about this project. It isn't until we're done gathering all that information that the Commission will make a decision on what is the outcome of the Klamath Project. So we appreciate you all coming tonight and we're going to spend a few minutes going through sort of where we've been and what our next steps are with the Klamath River relicensing proceeding so that if some of you don't have that history you'll have a little bit of a sense of it.

1 And then the main part of our meeting tonight is your
2 opportunity to speak to us.

3 I think many of you have signed up who would like
4 to speak and we're a smaller group tonight than we have been
5 in some of the other locations, so even if you haven't
6 signed up there will be an opportunity for you too if you
7 want to give it a second thought later on.

8 Welcome to all of you. Thanks for coming.

9 MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Ann.

10 I would also like to welcome everyone for coming
11 tonight. Let's go ahead and get started. Like Ann said, I
12 want to spend just a few minutes explaining who we are and
13 what we do and then we'll get to the public comment section.

14 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC
15 is an independent agency that regulates electric power,
16 natural gas, oil pipelines and the hydroelectric industry.
17 The Commission consists of five commissioners that are
18 appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The
19 President designates the chairman of the Commission.

20 Within the Commission is the Office of Energy
21 Projects that administers the non-federal hydropower and gas
22 projects. It's organized into three divisions -- the
23 Division of Hydropower Licensing, which is the division that
24 we're in, has the authority under the Federal Power Act to
25 issue licenses to hydropower projects for terms ranging from

1 30 to 50 years.

2 Once the license is issued, the Division of
3 Hydropower Compliance and Administration their role is to
4 make sure that the projects are operated in accordance with
5 the license its issued. We also have the Division of Dam
6 Safety and Inspection whose job it is to ensure public
7 safety at the projects. Our main office is in Washington,
8 D.C., but we have regional offices that are comprised mainly
9 of engineers, our dam safety people and the regional office
10 that oversees the Klamath Project is our Portland regional
11 office.

12 Again, the purpose tonight is to receive oral and
13 written comments from agencies, non-governmental
14 organizations and interested persons. The Commission staff
15 drafts the Environmental Impact Statement for the Klamath
16 Hydroelectric Project. Just by reference, I'll show you
17 where the project is. I guess we're up around here, but the
18 mouth of the Klamath River is at reekway, I guess about 60
19 miles south of Crescent City. The first project dam is at
20 river mile 190 right about here, Iron Gate Dam. Upstream of
21 that is Copco No. 2 Dam, then Copco No. 1 Dam, J.C. Boyle
22 Dam and further upstream is Keno Dam, which has no
23 generating facilities, but is part of the existing project.
24 Then there are two small powerhouses associated with the
25 Bureau of Reclamation's Link River Dam at river mile 264.

1 So the project spans about 64 miles of the Klamath River.
2 There's also one other small powerhouse on the tributary to
3 the Klamath River.

4 Just briefly, I'll explain what we're doing here
5 and how we got here. The existing license for the Klamath
6 Hydroelectric Project expired at the end of February 2006,
7 so two years before that PacifiCorp filed an application to
8 get a new license for the Klamath Hydroelectric Project. In
9 April 2004, we started our scoping project to try to
10 identify which issues we needed to look at as we did our
11 Environmental Impact Statement. We held site visits and
12 scoping meetings in June of 2004.

13 In August 2004, we decided the application had
14 all the elements required by law and we accepted the
15 application and solicited motions to intervene and protests
16 from people. In May 2005, we issued what we call Scoping
17 Document 2, which was our final listing of the issues that
18 we would examine in our environmental document.

19 In December of 2005, we issued what we call our
20 Ready for Environmental Analysis Notice and that basically
21 says we have all the information that we need to go ahead
22 and begin the preparation of our environmental document.
23 But it also sets in motion a process that has some key time
24 lines associated with it, the most important being the
25 agencies had 90 days to submit recommendations and

1 preliminary terms and prescriptions that would be included
2 or recommended for inclusion into any new license that was
3 issued.

4 Then in April 2006, and this is a new twist that
5 arose from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, but PacifiCorp
6 filed alternative mandatory conditions and requested trial-
7 type hearings on disputed issues of material fact in areas
8 where they disagreed with the agencies on the basis for some
9 of their recommendations.

10 Yes, sir?

11 MR. BECKER: A quick question for you. At what
12 point in that process did NMFS and the Pacific Fishery
13 Management Council interject their letters requesting
14 removal of all four dams?

15 MR. MUDRE: I think that would have been in
16 response to the notice that I just mentioned. But let me
17 interrupt myself here briefly and bring up something I was
18 going to say later. Today we have a court reporter over
19 here and his role is to make sure that we get an accurate
20 record of everything that people say so when we get back to
21 Washington and we start looking these things over we'll know
22 who said what and we'll know exactly what people said.
23 That's the good news. The bad news is that when you talk
24 from your seat like you just did, he's probably not going to
25 be able to hear what you said So when we do get to talking

1 later on, people will need to come up to these microphones
2 in order to make sure that they're heard and that we have an
3 accurate record established here tonight. Okay.

4 September 2006 we issued our draft Environmental
5 Impact Statement for the Klamath Project. Two days after
6 that Administrative Law Judge McKenna issued his decision on
7 the issues of disputed fact that was a week-long trial that
8 was held in California, but the actual process was a lot
9 longer. Anyway, he issued his decision in September 2006.

10 In October, we requested biological opinions from
11 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine
12 Fishery Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered
13 Species Act. Also in October we sent letters to the fish
14 and wildlife agencies concerning some apparent
15 inconsistencies between some of their recommendations and
16 the Federal Power Act or some other laws. In November 2006,
17 we're holding these meeting on the draft EIS. This is our
18 sixth meeting tonight. We had meetings in Klamath Falls,
19 Oregon. Two meetings in Yreka, California, one in Eureka,
20 California. One last night in North Bend and this meeting
21 tonight.

22 The National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA
23 requires us to conduct an independent analysis of
24 environmental issues associated with our licensing
25 decisions. Our analysis considers water quality, fish and

1 wildlife values of the involved waterways, but also we have
2 to equally consider electric energy and other developmental
3 values. So we need to do a balancing of developmental and
4 non-developmental values.

5 We have to give strong consideration to terms and
6 conditions recommended by the resources agencies and our
7 conclusions and recommendations are based on the public
8 record for this project. The public record is basically
9 everything that has come in. Since this is a contested
10 proceeding, we have to share information with all the
11 parties and with the public in general. This meeting and
12 people's comments tonight becomes part of the public record
13 for the proceeding. The public record is available. You
14 can review it on the Internet at our website, www.FERC.gov.
15 If you have a handout in the back, it has instructions on
16 how you do that.

17 The purpose of the EIS is to inform the
18 Commission's decision as to whether and under what
19 conditions to issue a new license for the Klamath Project.
20 In the draft Environmental Impact Statement we considered
21 five action alternatives. We've considered the proposed
22 action alternatives relicensing the project as PacifiCorp
23 proposed. We have a staff recommended alternative, which
24 was PacifiCorp's proposed action plus some additional staff-
25 recommended environmental measures. The third alternative

1 that we considered was staff-recommended alternative, but
2 with some of the agencies mandatory conditions, including
3 the fishway prescriptions that we did not recommend in the
4 staff alternative. We also looked at an alternative that
5 consisted of the removal of Copco No. 1 and the Iron Gate
6 development with dam removal at those two developments.

7 Again, here's the public record. It's available
8 on eLibrary. That's our electronic library. We call it
9 eLibrary. So when you get to the FERC.gov website, just
10 look for the eLibrary link and again there are instructions
11 on the handout in the back.

12 What's coming up next? The DEIS comments are due
13 December 1, 2006. That is tomorrow and we realize we're
14 just having this meeting here tonight and some of you are
15 just becoming aware of this perhaps, so just get them in as
16 soon as you can. That's all I can say. If you can get them
17 in tomorrow fine, but if it takes a little bit longer than
18 that, we'll look at them when they come in.

19 We'll be having meetings in about two weeks with
20 the fish and wildlife agencies to discuss those apparent
21 inconsistencies that we saw with their recommended terms and
22 conditions for the license. Under that Energy Policy Act
23 process that I mentioned and the alternate conditions, the
24 agencies may provide modified mandatory conditions and/or
25 prescriptions by the end of January 2007. We need to get

1 the biological opinions from the Fish and Wildlife Service
2 and NMFS and we're still working with them to establish a
3 timetable for that.

4 Our schedule calls for issuing the final EIS by
5 April 23, 2007. Before the Commission can issue any license
6 for the project, however, we need to obtain water quality
7 certificates from both the State of Oregon and the State of
8 California. The Commission cannot issue a license until
9 those water quality certificates are issued and again only
10 then can the Commission issue its licensing decision.

11 You can obtain copies of the DEIS, you can view
12 it online at www.FERC.gov at any library. I've got a few CD
13 copies up front here. I mailed out a bunch of hard copies
14 here, but the post office didn't them get here in time.
15 Otherwise, on the handout there is an address where you can
16 contact or e-mail to get a copy sent to you or you can send
17 me an e-mail at john.mudre@FERC.gov and I can get you one in
18 the mail.

19 When you make comments, though, you should put at
20 the top of the page Klamath Hydroelectric Project, FERC No.
21 2082-027 and that just ensures that they get it in the right
22 place and it goes to the right people and it gets into the
23 public record that we talked about. Again, all comments
24 should be sent to the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory
25 Commission, 888 First Street, N.E, Washington, D.C. 20426.

1 I think that's pretty much it. I mentioned the
2 court reporter. There will be transcripts of this and if
3 you want copies of the transcripts, you can talk to the
4 court reporter after the meeting tonight or talk to me later
5 and we can tell you how to get them.

6 We're now about ready to turn it over to you guys
7 and hear what you have to say. Based on the number of
8 people that have signed up, let's try to keep it to about
9 five minutes per person so that everyone has a chance to
10 provide their input.

11 With that, I'm going to turn the meeting over to
12 Doug on my left here and he'll take it from there.

13 MR. HJORTH: Thank you, John.

14 The way that we'll do this is I'll call the
15 speaker who's on deck to speak right now and then I'll also
16 call the person who is on deck who will be speaking after
17 that person. When I do that, I'd like that person to come
18 up and perhaps sit up close to the podium so that we can
19 transition between speakers quickly and efficiently.

20 With that having been said, the first speaker
21 tonight will be Michael Becker and he will be followed by
22 Wayne Hoffman.

23 MR. BECKER: I have a letter for the Commission.

24 (Pause.)

25 MR. HJORTH: Could you get a little closer to the

1 mike.

2 MR. BECKER: Does that work now? Okay.

3 I have a letter for the Commission that I would
4 like to read to you and then at the end of that I have a
5 couple of questions.

6 My name is Mike Becker. I'm a long-time
7 businessman and commercial fisherman from here in Newport.
8 My testimony is as follows.

9 Commission Members, J.C. Boyle Dam was built on
10 the Klamath River in 1958 followed by Iron Gate Dam in 1962.
11 In 1982, the Klamath Fishery Management Zone, KFMZ, was
12 declared and in 1988 the last fishery four days was allowed
13 in the 400-mile coast covered by the KFMZ. Prior to the
14 closure of the zone, a tribal fishery in the Klamath River
15 and as many as 3000 commercial fishermen worked the waters
16 from Fort Bragg, California to Coos Bay, Oregon. The
17 combined fisheries did not pull the fish docks down.

18 With the advent of the last two dams, a fishery
19 disaster was declared within four generations of fish, 20
20 years. The Klamath River was once the third most productive
21 salmon river in the United States. To date, thanks to
22 habitat-blocking dams, poor water quality and too little
23 water left in the river, coho salmon stocks are now listed
24 under the Federal Endangered Species Act and chinook stocks
25 are up 4 percent of their historic level.

1 Salmon losses in the Klamath Basin had
2 devastating impacts on the tribal communities in the river
3 and coastal communities in Oregon and California. The brunt
4 of the economic impact commencing in 1982 has been felt on
5 the southern Oregon and northern California coast. The week
6 chinook salmon stock are resulted from the water diversion
7 of the Klamath River farmers in 2002 caused the Pacific
8 Fishery Management Council to broaden the zone to 700 miles
9 and to reduce the 2005 season on the Oregon coast by 50
10 percent and the 2006 season by 90 percent.

11 What is particularly troubling about the 2005
12 year is that fishermen were pulled off the largest projected
13 run of Sacramento River salmon in history. Sacramento
14 stocks make up 65 percent of our coastal catch, Klamath
15 stocks less than 5. The cost of the coastal counties of
16 Oregon was \$12 million approximately in 2005 and \$30 in
17 2006. While that may not seem like much along the I-5
18 corridor or in your California metropolitan areas, it is
19 huge along the coast that struggles to provide family-waged
20 jobs.

21 The Oregon/Washington congressional delegations
22 are working diligently to provide short-term financial
23 relief to the fishing communities, but when you consider the
24 importance of the sport and commercial fisheries to both our
25 coastal economy and our coastal way of life, it is vital

1 that we fix the Klamath River for the benefit of all user
2 groups.

3 To this end, I fully support the Pacific Fishery
4 Management Council and the National Marine Fishery Service
5 in their request that the four Klamath dams be removed.
6 Further, I request that FERC either amend its Environmental
7 Impact Statement to include dam removal or do a new EIS to
8 the same end. By that, I mean all four dams. The issues
9 involved with the Klamath dams have long-term and far-
10 reaching implications, not only for the basin but the entire
11 West Coast. If we get them wrong and lose the salmon, there
12 is no way back.

13 Now the thing I have not said yet, we've talked
14 about economics, but if you stop and think about it -- and I
15 don't know how much time you spent in Newport or the other
16 coastal ports -- but so much more of the business and the
17 cultural way of life depends on those. A couple of examples
18 I'll use we've got a couple little restaurants in town.
19 Mo's Chowder House you may have heard of. They've been know
20 virtually nationwide for a long time. We have a new one,
21 Local Ocean Seafood, which is right across from our port
22 docks. If you see the people who come to the coast to this
23 type of a business, they're looking at seeing our coastal
24 scenery. They're looking at the quality of seafood.
25 They're looking at watching the working boats in the port

1 come and go.

2 To that end, maintaining this fishing industry is
3 absolutely vital, not just in economic terms, but also to
4 our whole tourist industry and indeed our whole way of life.

5 One question I do have for FERC and it just
6 cropped this afternoon. That's why I asked my earlier
7 question. Pacific Fishery Management Council sent a letter
8 to FERC in April essentially outlining a lot of what I've
9 said here and asking very pointed at that time that FERC
10 include removal of all four dams on the Klamath River.
11 National Marine Fishery has also sent a similar letter.
12 It's become pretty obvious FERC has not responded. They
13 sent a letter back and said, yeah, we'll look at it. But
14 when you did the draft EIS, as I understand it, there were
15 only two dams looked at.

16 My question to FERC is this when you considered
17 the price that your coastal counties and your tribes along
18 the Klamath River are paying for these dams and it's pretty
19 obvious from their report that the actual economic value of
20 those dams is probably less than what it's costing the
21 coastal counties in loss business. Why has FERC not
22 responded to that?

23 MR. MUDRE: I can answer that and the answer is
24 that in the DEIS we did look at the removal of all of the
25 dams and we just didn't -- it wasn't in the shape "as a

1 full-blown alternative." But if you look in the document,
2 we do have an analysis of the removal of every one of the
3 dams.

4 MR. BECKER: Is that, in fact, being considered
5 now.

6 MR. MUDRE: Is what being considered?

7 MR. BECKER: The removal of all four dams in your
8 EIS.

9 MR. MUDRE: The four mainstem dams?

10 MR. BECKER: Yes.

11 MR. MUDRE: The lower four?

12 MR. BECKER: Yes.

13 MR. MUDRE: We are in the process of obtaining
14 comments on the DEIS. When we get back to D.C., we'll
15 review all the comments and decide what shape the FEIS, the
16 final EIS should take and your comments will be considered
17 in that decision.

18 MR. BECKER: Okay. Thank you for your time and
19 your response.

20 MR. HJORTH: The next speaker will be Wayne
21 Hoffman to be followed by Bob Kemp.

22 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you for coming to Newport.
23 For the record, I'm Wayne Hoffman and the coordinator of the
24 Mid-Coast Watersheds Council. We're in the business of
25 working for watershed house and improving salmon habitat in

1 our coastal streams.

2 I'd like to begin by commenting that the first
3 slide in your presentation, in my opinion, misrepresented
4 the job you're charged with. The heading on that slide was
5 "Relicensing the Klamath Project." As I understand it your
6 job begins with whether to license, relicense the Klamath
7 Project, not assuming that the Klamath Project will be
8 licensed and working from that assumption.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. HOFFMAN: As I understand your job, your job
11 is to, in essence, weigh the economic benefits of a project
12 such as this and compare those to the collateral damage
13 caused by such a project. And from our coastal perspective
14 here, the collateral damage looks a lot bigger than the
15 economic benefits. We see and we recognize that not all of
16 the problems of the Klamath River fish are a result of those
17 dams of this project, but it is very clear that this project
18 is a major contributor to the problems that are causing
19 economic dislocation up and down the Oregon coast and more
20 serious dislocations on the California coast than we're
21 experiencing.

22 Our perspective is that FERC really needs to take
23 seriously the portion of its mission which is to decide
24 which of the projects that it reviews for possible
25 relicensing are really worth relicensing. And an assumption

1 that all of them are going to get relicensing, one form or
2 another, is not the proper place to start your job. From
3 our perspective it looks like this one is where the amount
4 of power generated and the public benefits and the
5 recreational benefits simply do not add up when compared to
6 the widespread economic and resource damage that this
7 project is contributing to. Thank you.

8 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

9 The next speaker will be Bob Kemp to be followed
10 by Barry McPherson.

11 MR. KEMP: Thank you for bringing a meeting to
12 the north coast. It's a long hike over the mountain for us
13 to attend meetings. Also, I'm hear on the problems and not
14 on the panel.

15 My name is Bob Kemp. I'm an ocean harvester. A
16 large part of my business involves chinook salmon from ocean
17 mixed stocks. I work for the public. I'm homeported in
18 Newport, but permitted to fish coast-wide. The effects of
19 trying to protect Klamath River stocks by closing the ocean
20 where more than impressive this season especially. The
21 infrastructure didn't get much business from me and the town
22 that the dollars roll around through didn't see much either.
23 I represent just one harvester and I believe someone else
24 will be reading in the testimony of the economics and the
25 importance of the fleet to the coastal towns.

1 The importance of the Klamath River system in
2 this community and along the West Coast is huge. The point
3 I'm after is this, as the Klamath salmon system is the weak
4 stock of assessment currently for West Coast fisheries --
5 and my business is a large part of that -- my community is
6 where I spend my money, so that makes us major stakeholders
7 in the Klamath River watershed.

8 So as a stakeholder, here are my comments on dam
9 relicensing. This fall I drove and walked the Klamath River
10 system wherever I could. I watched hatchery returns
11 sometime around the peak of returns near fall flow levels.
12 I hiked and looked at the slack water in the reservoirs
13 behind the dams and back up of J.C. Boyle I hiked the
14 dewater stretch between the dam and the pump station
15 downstream. I saw conditions that I thought needed to be
16 addressed. As a fisherman here on the coast, I don't get
17 any of the details of relicensing because they are closed
18 door, but it's plain to see that there is something wrong in
19 the slack water behind the dams by the presence of the
20 public warning signs about avoiding human and animal water
21 contact. Those were just the ones around the campsites.

22 Removal -- dam removal. I don't understand why
23 removal of the four lower dams was not a consideration as an
24 option if their benefit is out of balance with the other
25 economies that they affect, but that's already been spoken

1 to, so I won't go with that.

2 The parasite. The parasite problems and the
3 conditions that are causing it to bloom are things that have
4 come to light more recently. If the host conditions for the
5 growth of the parasite are not already a consideration of
6 relicensing in view of the water conditions behind the dams,
7 then I would ask that that be written into the renewal for
8 consideration.

9 Fish passage. I think it matters not if the
10 owner prefers to transport around dams. It could be with
11 camels and it wouldn't much matter. That is just one detail
12 on the list of fish passage. The fry don't get all on the
13 bus at the same time and travel down on the same day. The
14 whole passage concept is complicated and there are plenty of
15 examples of both failure and success in different water
16 systems from which to draw this knowledge.

17 Folks in my business from above the Columbia
18 River to the north and Morro Bay to the south and the public
19 we work for are anxiously awaiting the outcome of a plan
20 that corrects the conditions that are inhibiting the run of
21 chinook salmon that spawn in the mainstem of the Klamath
22 River. Out of necessity and the roles that determine our
23 harvest system, we have adopted this river system. As
24 fishermen we are used to being self-sufficient when things
25 don't go right at sea and we are nervous when we cannot help

1 in this case. If we can, please send instructions.

2 Thanks again for coming. It's become popular in
3 this country to say "Let's get her done." But please
4 exercise caution towards repairs unless there's
5 consideration that there are very long-term gains. Thank
6 you.

7 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

8 The next speaker will be Barry McPherson to be
9 followed by Steve Pedery.

10 MR. MCPHERSON: My name is Barry McPherson. I'm
11 a fishery biologist living here in Newport. I'm the
12 immediate past president of the Oregon Chapter of the
13 American Fishery Society, which is an organization of
14 professional fishery biologists. It's a national
15 organization. We have an Oregon chapter that was started in
16 1964 and there's over 450 fishery biologists here in Oregon
17 that are a part of that.

18 We are very much in support of the Management
19 Council and NMFS in their call for an examination and
20 analysis of the removal of the lower four dams. We have
21 submitted a letter last week to the Secretary and I won't
22 read it here. I've given it here again tonight to make sure
23 that it's in the record. But our main point is that the
24 final Environmental Impact Statement really needs to have
25 removal of all those dams as a full-blown alternative that

1 needs to be fully analyzed for all the economic pluses and
2 minuses, including all those here on the coast in order to
3 be fair to the public.

4 So thank you very much for coming and please take
5 a hard look at that letter and make sure that is in the
6 final EIS. Thank you.

7 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

8 The next speaker will be Steve Pedery to be
9 followed by Carl Finley.

10 MR. PEDERY: Hello. My name is Steve Pedery.
11 I'm the conservation director for an organization called
12 Oregon Wild. Formerly, we were known as Oregon Natural
13 Resources Council.

14 I'd like to start by thanking Senator Wyden,
15 Senator Smith, Congresswoman Hooley and Congressman DeFazio
16 for requesting the hearing in Newport tonight and a similar
17 hearing in Coos Bay last night.

18 Speaking for my organization, we were a little
19 puzzled why the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission didn't
20 schedule hearings on the Oregon coast to begin with as many
21 of these communities have been greatly impacted by the
22 Klamath salmon and by the Klamath River and by the
23 operations of the dams on Klamath River. I think going
24 forward it makes sense to include coastal communities of
25 Oregon in further public hearings and deliberations on the

1 future of these dams.

2 I think it's important to take a step back and
3 begin by looking at the history of the Klamath River.
4 Historically, this river was, as was sad before, the third
5 most productive salmon-bearing stream on the West Coast.
6 Today it has gone from being a salmon's cradle to a grave.
7 Certainly, the dams are not the only reason behind the
8 decline of the Klamath River fish, but they are a major
9 reason behind the decline of Klamath River fish.

10 I believe that is one of the reasons why the
11 draft Environmental Impact Statement that FERC has adopted
12 or is proposing to adopt is inadequate and should be
13 scrapped. I think you should start over. I think it falls
14 short in a number of areas. The first is fully consider
15 removal of the lower four dams. You set up the almost
16 automatic failure of any salmon recovery efforts in the
17 Klamath River. Removal of the lower four dams is the most
18 effective option for recovering fall chinook. Certainly,
19 the most effective option for recovering spring chinook
20 salmon, which often aren't talked about in the Klamath
21 Basin. This year we had just a few hundred wild spring
22 chinook return to the Klamath. Most of their historic
23 habitat is above the dams and nothing short of dam removal
24 really benefits those fish and gives us a chance to bring
25 them back.

1 It's important to note as well, for those of us
2 here in Oregon, that the spring chinook were the salmon that
3 spawned in the Oregon portion of the Klamath Basin for the
4 most part. They're a resource that's important should we
5 recover it, not only for the coastal communities in Oregon,
6 but also communities in the upper basin and Native American
7 tribes in the upper basin who still hold treaty rights to
8 fish for those salmon. They haven't been able to exercise
9 them since 1917, when the first dam went on the Klamath
10 River.

11 Additionally, I'd like to point out, as was
12 mentioned earlier, J.C. Boyle Dam particularly needs to be
13 looked at. It's the highest dam of the four in the system.
14 It's the one in Oregon. J.C. Boyle dewateres a 6-mile
15 stretch of the Klamath River, not only for future fish
16 passage for wild salmon, steelhead, but also for other
17 native fish, including redband trout. J.C. Boyle just has
18 too many problems with fish passage to be kept in. It's
19 hard to imagine how you operate that project and still have
20 healthy populations of native fish.

21 I'd also like to point out that the draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement falls short on the trap and
23 haul scheme recommended. Trap and haul hasn't worked well
24 on any dam system in the Pacific Northwest. It's not going
25 to work in the Klamath either and with the Klamath I think

1 it's a particularly troubling suggestion. To get fish
2 around the dams on the Klamath River, you would either have
3 to spend millions on a new road network because there isn't
4 a paved highway connecting Iron Gate Dam to the upper basin.
5 Or you'd have to take these fish on a 75 mile, three hour
6 road trip in the back of tractor trailer trucks.

7 Generally speaking, I don't think salmon would
8 fair very well on a three-hour road trip. So I think just
9 on the face of it that's not a system going in. We know
10 that's not going to work. By suggesting it, it seems we're
11 not really taking salmon recovery very seriously in this
12 draft Environmental Impact Statement.

13 I conclude by pointing out that, again, these
14 salmon are a resource equal in value to the dams. They're
15 important to the economy of coastal communities. They're
16 important to the economy historically of the Upper Klamath
17 Basin. As we go forward, I think it's important to note
18 that by restoring these fish, by bringing them back to the
19 Upper Basin, we stand to reap economic benefits that are
20 just as valuable as those dams and again would encourage you
21 to go back, start again, look at a draft Environmental
22 Impact Statement that fully considers removal of the lower
23 four dams and takes the option of recovering these fish,
24 restoring healthy runs seriously because I just don't think
25 the draft statement you're working on fully does that.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

3 The next speaker will be Carl Finley to be
4 followed by Henry deRondon.

5 MR. FINLEY: Okay. My name is Carl Finley.

6 NOAA Fisheries and the Fishery Management Council
7 both recommend the removal of the dams as the best option to
8 restoring Klamath River salmon runs and West Coast
9 fisheries. Trucking has its problems. I think trucking is
10 unacceptable, just as the previous testimony pointed out.
11 Now he talks about the actual problems -- stress on fish,
12 what not, road system I didn't even think of that one. But
13 the other question on trucking is you have to get the smolts
14 downstream to now.

15 Now admittedly, I don't know, perhaps they have a
16 plan. But you know, these dams -- smolts have trouble
17 getting over dams going downstream, particularly, if the
18 water is going through turbines. This would imply all sorts
19 of factors. Fish ladders have a spotty record. There are
20 all sorts of things going on like energy, dissipating the
21 energy budgets of the fish. Some fish ladders just aren't
22 effective.

23 Another thing about the dams, particularly, Iron
24 Gate has cut off gravel recruitment a little bit to spawning
25 areas below the dams. I think people talk -- the problem,

1 as I perceive it, the dams cause a lot of problems
2 downstream from Iron Gate. Heating of water in the pools
3 and that they're now seriously concerned with the linkage
4 between the proliferation of the parasite, Ceratomyxa
5 shasta.

6 Elimination of the dams could also possibly
7 ameliorate restrictions on the upstream water users in the
8 Klamath Basin. This might reduce negative social and
9 economic impact in the region. If the dams are not removed,
10 there must be more restrictions upstream leading to greater
11 societal conflict. This parallel what Wayne was talking
12 about with respect to collateral damage here. There may be
13 collateral damage upstream, too. Thank you.

14 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

15 The next speaker will be Henry deRonden-Pos to be
16 followed by Greg Harlow.

17 MR. deRONDEN-POS: Okay. My name is Henry
18 deRonden-Pos. I'm a lifetime third generation salmon
19 fisherman. I used to be able to apply my trade up and down
20 the entire West Coast from the Canadian border to southern
21 California. The federal government has held our feet to the
22 fire now with this whole Klamath issue and they've made it
23 our job to make you guys do your job and that's where we're
24 at.

25 The scientists, the American people are telling

1 you we want these salmon back. They're a product that can't
2 be replaced. You can't go to China and get these salmon
3 that we harvest out of the ocean. The health benefits are
4 unlimited. We're just now learning about how these salmon
5 are healthy for us. So this is a food product that means a
6 lot to everybody that has anything to do with their health.
7 I mean we all want good health and these salmon are a part
8 of that and we need to start treating them like that.

9 We can't afford business as usual. These coastal
10 communities that we've heard so much about have suffered
11 untold amount of hardships because of the Klamath River.
12 I've seen many, many businesses go under since this whole
13 Klamath raised its head. We used to have a fleet of boats
14 that fished out of here and now they've gone. The ports
15 have burned a lot of the boats. They've disappeared and
16 they'll never be replaced and the people you see in this
17 room are some of the last hold outs trying to struggle to
18 make this a livelihood that we love so much.

19 I mean it's hard to put all the blame on the
20 Klamath, but it's a fact. The Klamath River has caused all
21 of our problems pretty much up and down the coast. Until
22 the Klamath River is fixed, we're just going to be facing
23 this year after year, generation after generation. I think
24 we have to start looking forward. These dams are old,
25 antiquated antiques that need to go away. We've got new

1 science now and I think we need to start listening to what
2 they have to say on this sick river. It's obviously a sick
3 river and we need to listen and take our medicine and make
4 it right. So hopefully, you people will do your job and get
5 the Klamath River back on its feet again and if that means
6 taking down the dams, then so be it. Hopefully, that will
7 solve the problem. Thank you very much.

8 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

9 The next speaker will be Greg Harlow to be
10 followed by Onno Husing.

11 MR. HARLOW: Good evening. My name is Greg
12 Harlow. I'm the director of development for the Association
13 of Northwest Steelheaders. I'm standing in on behalf of our
14 chief scientist and resource director who couldn't be here.
15 The Association of Northwest Steelheaders is the largest
16 recreational anadromous fishing and conservation non-profit
17 in the Pacific Northwest with members in the thousands. We
18 are also the Oregon affiliate of the National Wildlife
19 Federation.

20 Our fish passage policy has been submitted to
21 your office along with comments and questions. It remains
22 unwaivered. We encourage you to review the science,
23 economics and environmental needs of the Klamath River
24 Basin. Deny renewal of the dams in question and return it
25 to its natural state.

1 As a side note, we're really looking forward to
2 your response to the National Marine Fishery and the PFMC.
3 thank you for your time.

4 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

5 The next speaker is Onno Husing to be followed by
6 Walter Chuck.

7 MR. HUSING: Thank you again for being here
8 tonight. My name is Onno Husing. I am the director of the
9 Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association. It is a non-
10 profit that represents counties, ports, soil and water
11 conservation, district, cities and the Coquille Tribe on the
12 Oregon coast. What I've given you tonight is a recently
13 completed economic analysis from last season, the curtailed
14 salmon season. We contract with a top flight firm called
15 the Research Group out of Corvallis. One of the most
16 respected economist firms in the Northwest that analysis
17 fishery impacts. And now that the season is over we have
18 determined conclusively that what had normally been a \$10
19 million ex-vessel value fishery went down to \$2.5 million
20 this year. So the economic hit is, of course, disastrous
21 for many of the people in the coastal communities.

22 I would just like to say for the record that's
23 just ex-vessel value. That is the actual money that goes
24 into a fisherman's pocket after he delivers that product to
25 the plant. Our economist estimate that if you start talking

1 about the ripple effects as that money circulates the
2 community lost, that money could be somewhere around 20 to
3 \$30 million. So it is a substantial hit. Again, that
4 evidence that we've provided to the congressional delegation
5 and many others is firm proof of what, in fact, is happened
6 in full documentation.

7 You know, I look and I'm trying to understand as
8 much as I can about the FERC process. Ann Miles knows that
9 a number of us with Wave Energy are getting to know more and
10 more about FERC. But it's my understanding, from what I
11 know about FERC, is that just because there had been dams
12 there in the past that when relicensing happens it's really
13 a fresh look at those facilities. And just because they've
14 been there in the past, I don't think the burden of proof
15 should be on us, but necessarily you need to find a way to
16 make those facilities stay there.

17 Other people tonight have talked about it. These
18 dams were built in the 1950s. We're not passing blame on
19 anyone who placed those facilities there at the time. I'm
20 sure it was considered to be the right thing to do, but we
21 have enough information now that clearly shows the impacts
22 on the fall chinook and other slamonid species in that
23 basin. Oregon State Sea Grant has done some outstanding
24 work in last few years about the parasite shows clearly that
25 it's not just an issue of volitional passage or trucking the

1 fish around or somehow getting the fish upstream. It's the
2 flows in that river that's creating an unnatural situation
3 which creates the parasites. It's a cascading series of
4 events that's creating the kind of hardship that we're
5 experiencing here on the Oregon coast so that really enough
6 evidence is in to start making these kinds of judgments and
7 I'd like to associate myself with the remarks made last
8 night in Coos Bay, North Bend with Scott Boley. He's done a
9 lot of outstanding work to connect the dots here.

10 What a number of us fear -- and we met with
11 Senator Smith and Secretary Sampson and the head of the
12 National Marine Fishery Service not long ago -- and what we
13 are concerned about is, if the normal process of having all
14 of this evidence finally meet all these tests within the
15 federal government, that we're not going to move in time to
16 make the changes necessary. That's why many of us thought
17 it was almost an act of God that these facilities came up
18 for FERC relicensing when they did. Finding the fish in the
19 Klamath Basin caught a good break.

20 Again, this is an enormous opportunity for you,
21 as FERC, to do the right thing here. I mean you have to ask
22 yourself, if those dams didn't exist here today, would you
23 ever permit them to be there and I would submit to you the
24 answer is no. We are in a different era now. This is a
25 defining moment. How we handle and start managing water in

1 the West is really something that generations looking down
2 at us are going to say, come on, you knew better. Do the
3 right thing. I'm begging you to do the right thing.

4 We support the letter from the National Marine
5 Fishery Service and the Pacific Fishery Management Council.
6 It's cleared that they've weighed on what you need to do and
7 you don't live here and we really appreciate you coming out
8 here and your listening to us and it's outstanding. A
9 number of the people behind me tonight, you know, they all
10 belong to different groups. But I can tell you that we
11 rarely are all on the same page as firmly as we are tonight.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. HUSING: And if you knew us, you're realize
14 that's a really amazing deal. So I would submit that as the
15 last profound piece of evidence that you should weigh in
16 your considerations. Thank you very much.

17 MR. HJORTH: Thank you very much.

18 The next speaker will be Walter Chuck to be
19 followed by John Curry.

20 MR. CHUCK: Hi. My name is Walter Chuck. I'm a
21 Newport resident and I'm also the Ocean Rep co-chair for the
22 Recreational Fishers Alliance, which is a sport fishers
23 organization. I just want to thank you for the time to
24 speak.

25 I just want you to know the hardship of

1 uncertainty caused by the low number of returning salmon and
2 its effects on the West Coast has been great. I know as a
3 sport fisherman we have not suffered at all like our
4 commercial brothers have, but the fact that they are
5 suffering also means that we are suffering. It has been
6 recommended by the PFMC and NMFS that the decommission and
7 subsequent removal of the Klamath dams be followed and we
8 would suggest that you consider those quite seriously.

9 The impact on the coastal economies and people
10 far outweigh the power and recreation returns of these four
11 dams. The fact that one river's returns can have the effect
12 of closing down 700 miles of coast and cripple a
13 multimillion industry and the dollars of this industry bring
14 to my town seems pretty ridiculous. Revitalizing this run
15 of salmon and the healing of the river would be a good step
16 to making sure that the negative effects that the low
17 returns have had on our salmon fishery and our local
18 economy. The damage to the river and fisheries are far
19 greater than the benefits of these dams. Thank you for the
20 chance to speak.

21 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

22 MR. CURRY: I pass but these comments are just
23 wonderful and I don't have anything to add.

24 MR. HJORTH: Okay. Thank you.

25 The next speaker that will be Stephen Webster to

1 be followed by Jen Wimpres.

2 MR. WEBSTER: My name is Stephen Webster. I have
3 a small marine construction and service business in Newport.
4 I didn't have any prepared statement this evening. I read
5 about this meeting in my local paper. I've heard on the
6 street that it was belated that you people came here. I am
7 not here to thank you for being here, although it's great
8 that these people can be heard. My questions are
9 transparency is a buzz term now.

10 Your presentation about this hearing, the process
11 that you're in and where our comments go was obscure and
12 opaque. And you gave us no sense of where these comments
13 go, who is going to hear them, how they were going to hear
14 them, who's going to sort through them and in what manner
15 the Commission -- that they're presented to the Commission
16 and I put that back to you. I want to know.

17 MS. MILES: Let me explain to you what happens.
18 All of your comments get into the record. Now what's a
19 record? A record is the compilation of everything that's
20 been said, both orally and in writing, in commenting on this
21 draft EIS. There is a staff of biologists and other
22 resource people who are going to look at every comment that
23 is made. That consists of John Mudre is one of those on
24 that. He is a fishery biologist. There's a person who is
25 an expert in wildlife and terrestrial resources, someone in

1 cultural resources, someone in recreational resources and an
2 engineer. That team of people read everything that -- oh,
3 and the socioeconomic. Am I missing anyone? What's your
4 specialty Marcelle? Fisheries. Fisheries -- two more
5 fisheries people here. So we are a combination of FERC
6 staff in Washington and our contractor, Louis Berger, who
7 are resource specialists and have quite a lot of experience
8 reviewing technical information.

9 People also on that team look at what is said
10 about the recreation, what is said about the economics. You
11 all are bringing up a lot of things that have to do with
12 economic effects of what's going on there. So it is our
13 staff's job at FERC to give a very thorough analysis. The
14 comments that come in will be addressed in our Environmental
15 Impact Statement. When you get to the final Environmental
16 Impact Statement, a big part of that is responding to each
17 of the comments we get. I can tell you we have volumes of
18 comments on this project. Honestly, I have to tell you this
19 is a really big deal. You all know it. We know it. It's
20 been tremendously more people at all these meetings than is
21 typical for us, a huge number of comments. So just the
22 volume we are hearing what you say.

23 MR. WEBSTER: If that's the case, why didn't the
24 Commission come here?

25 MS. MILES: Well, let me tell you, we will

1 compile this information and then present it to the
2 commissioners. The information that is compiled into the
3 final environmental document will be used by the Commission
4 to make their decision.

5 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you for your explanation.

6 MS. MILES: I would like you to understand the
7 process of how these things go, so I want to make sure that
8 -- do you have any more questions about that?

9 MR. WEBSTER: Let me go on a little further then.
10 Since you process this information, how do you present it to
11 the Commissioners -- in a written form or is there an
12 advocate that stands before the Commission and argues one
13 side of it? Who's the proponent of this community to that
14 Commission other than you people digesting it and then
15 offering them some written form?

16 MS. MILES: Your comments, your individual
17 comments are there before the Commissioners.

18 Yes, but could you come up and identify yourself
19 so we can be sure we get it in the record.

20 MR. PEDERSEN: Sure. Hello. Larry Pedersen.
21 I'm a salmon troller.

22 Here's the way the process was last time. 2002,
23 our senator, Senator Gordon, came to the Klamath Valley.
24 Karl Rove came with him and the flood gates we opened to the
25 farmers even though we had a drought. Karl Rove came back,

1 talked to Gale Norton, the Secretary of the Interior and
2 that was okay. That's a shortcut. By actual account, there
3 were 36,000 salmon along the Klamath that were killed. So
4 if there was a shortcut this time and in that the four dams
5 benefit no one, what can you do to support a shortcut this
6 time?

7 MR. HJORTH: Thank you for your comments.

8 The next speaker will be Jen Wimpres to be
9 followed by Jeff Feldner.

10 MS. WIMPRESS: Jen Wimpres. I'm the port
11 outreach specialist with the Oregon Salmon Commission in
12 Newport and Dewport Bay. I also didn't have anything
13 prepared tonight, but I just wanted to mention that you
14 spoke in your introduction about the consideration of
15 relicensing being finding a balance between the
16 environmental state, economic state and the availability of
17 power. Power, of course, is an issue for our entire nation
18 and has been for years. It was also mentioned earlier about
19 the huge strives in science and I would hate to think that a
20 project like this, which is so controversial because of the
21 effects that it's had on coastal communities would be
22 relicensed for a time from 30 to 50 years when, by the time
23 that happens, we'll have affordable solar power or wave
24 power or any number of other energy sources that are kinder
25 to our environment. Having relicensed a dam, which is

1 obviously hurting other parts of our environment, seems
2 silly to me when it could kill off an entire community, an
3 entire coast. When in that amount of time it will be a moot
4 point because dam power will no longer be necessary. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. HJORTH: The next speaker is Jeff Feldner.

7 MR. FELDNER: Good evening. I'm Jeff Feldner.
8 I've been a commercial fisherman here for over 30 years.

9 I'm not only surprised that this many of my peers
10 agree on something, but also I am surprised at how eloquent
11 they are.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. FELDNER: I'm not going to take a lot of your
14 time basically saying ditto to what you've heard already. I
15 want to support the intent and the language of the letters
16 that you got from the Pacific Fishery Management Council
17 concerning at least having in the draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement an option that includes removal of the four lower
19 dams. I'm particularly concerned about what we don't know
20 about the effects of the hydro system on the life cycle and
21 the impacts on salmon of those parasites. It seems to me
22 that an analysis that doesn't at least include an option for
23 dam removal as the one sure way to restore that system to
24 the way that it was when those parasites were in balance
25 with nature is procrastination at best. So I think we

1 should get that in that Environmental Impact Statement and
2 recommend it and I do.

3 MR. HJORTH: That's the last of the people who
4 signed up to speak tonight. So we're now going to see if
5 anybody who didn't originally sign up that hasn't had a
6 chance to speak would like an opportunity to speak at this
7 time.

8 Again, same rules apply. If you could come to
9 the mike, clearly state your name for the court reporter and
10 if it's difficult to speak or if you could spell it out that
11 would be appreciated.

12 MR. THOMPSON: My name is Jerry Thompson and I'm
13 and a Lakey county commissioners and also was one of the
14 original authors of the Oregon Salmon Plan when it was in
15 the legislature. I think we've done a good job with the
16 salmon development in this state if you look at what's gone
17 on. The runs are improving. We've done a lot in that area,
18 but we've got a problem. It's the Klamath Basin. We can
19 keep improving the rest of the environment, but what good
20 does it do us unless the Klamath gets fixed. The only way
21 it can be fixed is for the Federal Energy Regulatory
22 Commission to come up with a reasonable plan for recovering
23 that run.

24 I think that almost everybody in this room, from
25 what I heard, was united on the one voice that probably the

1 only logical way to do that is not by trucking or any of
2 these other plans that have failed over and over again.
3 It's the final removal of those dams.

4 I've been around this group all of my life and I
5 can't think of another time, like Jeff said, where I saw 100
6 percent, unanimous agreement by this group and then to have
7 the sport fishermen agree to the same thing. You guys
8 aren't from this coast. You don't realize what that means
9 and to have what I believe is probably 100 percent agreement
10 by a community that we need to fix that river is amazing.

11 We're going to face some problems in wave action
12 power, but it's basically the same problem. FERC has to
13 make the decision on how to handle the problem that faces
14 them of trying to develop a power source and balance that
15 against the renewable food source. Your background is in
16 power. I'm hopeful that somebody on your FERC energy board
17 understands the renewable food source issue and can relate
18 to what the community is saying.

19 I think everything has been well said by the
20 fleet that was here in front of me. I want to stand here
21 and tell you that, as a county commissioner, we support
22 every word that they've said to you.

23 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

24 Are there any other folks who would like to make
25 an oral statement tonight. Again, please clearly state your

1 name and spell it if it's a confusing one.

2 MR. ENGELMEYER: For the record, my name is Paul
3 Engelmeier. I've been dealing with salmon recovery issues,
4 protection, restoration strategies for over 15 years, mostly
5 on the Oregon coast. But I dealt with the Pacific Fishery
6 Management Council and the Habitat Committee in the past as
7 well.

8 Again, we are 100 percent supportive of the
9 decommissioning of those dams. It's time to get rid of
10 them. I've got a written statement I'll submit into the
11 record. And of course, from my perspective, it's really
12 nice to see National Marine Fishery Service and the Pacific
13 Fishery Management Council giving you clear direction. It's
14 time for you to listen to what they're saying. They gave
15 you clear direction in 2002 and it was ignored. Folks up
16 and down the coast are paying the piper for that and it was
17 mistake. That was a political decision that was made. We
18 know that that's what happened. And so, you know, it's time
19 for you to act. I have copies for you. Thank you.

20 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

21 Anybody else? Okay.

22 MR. ALEXANDER: I'm Paul Alexander and I'm fairly
23 new to having my own boat, but I've been in the fisheries up
24 and down the coast for many, many years. I grew up in the
25 town of Ewako and that's the salmon capital of the world,

1 right at the mouth of the Columbia on the Washington coast.
2 And when I was a child -- I was telling my friend today on
3 the phone -- I used to cry when I saw them putting so many
4 dams in the Columbia River and I was serious about that. I
5 did. I cried. By the time I got to high school, I wanted
6 to do some major destruction to the dams because I watched
7 what they did to my friends and families friends. So that's
8 pretty much where I got my start. But I heard a couple of
9 comments tonight and I just wanted to clarify it for the
10 record.

11 From what I know, Sara Masterson is sitting right
12 here. She represents Representative Darlene Hooley. She
13 was at some of our meetings earlier this summer and some of
14 the meetings we weren't able to get to that were set up by
15 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife because they had the
16 meetings right in the middle of these short little seasons
17 that we have and we can't leave the fishing grounds and come
18 to meetings because we don't have enough time to do it. But
19 we're really thankful that you're hear for a meeting and
20 think she's done an environmental or an economic impact and
21 was part of the paper and done a lot of research in this and
22 Hooley mentioned that there was a 75 percent down in the
23 income for the commercial fisherman and he mentioned
24 something about 20 to \$25 million, but for the record, I
25 believe the trickle effect, the ripple effect income to the

1 Oregon economy is \$150 million to the 10 to \$11 million of
2 salmon, we get the 10 to \$15 million and we spend 80 to 90
3 percent or all of it back in the commune taxes.

4 But anyway, the loss wasn't \$20 million. I don't
5 think that we lost \$20 million. The fishery actually made
6 the \$25 million or 25 percent of \$150 million. You can
7 figure that out pretty easily. So it's well over \$100
8 million to the Oregon economy that was lost. So just to
9 clarify that just this year alone and it really hurt all of
10 us. Thank you.

11 MR. HJORTH: Are there any other people who would
12 like to make an oral statement tonight?

13 (Pause.)

14 MR. BRYSON: My name is Henry Bryson and I'm a
15 commercial fisherman out of Newport.

16 You've heard all the bad about it, but I just
17 picked up some facts and I don't quite understand why
18 holding onto the dams is a big issue. The dams are owned by
19 PacifiCorp. They're very small dams. They're nearly
20 obsolete. They provide no irrigation, no flood control, no
21 transportation benefits. They represent less than 2 percent
22 of the PacifiCorp power production is what I've read and
23 just 2 percent for these four dams and you're talking about
24 two dams, but I guess said 2 percent and they employ 18
25 people. Being obsolete, I can't understand why it would be

1 a big decision not to get rid of them. Thank you.

2 MR. HJORTH: Thank you.

3 Anybody else that would like to make an oral
4 statement tonight?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. MUDRE: If there's no one else that would
7 like to say anything, I'd like to thank you all for coming
8 and we'll go ahead and end this meeting. But as Ann said,
9 all of the comments will be taken into consideration and
10 addressed in our final Environmental Impact Statement.

11 Thank you again for coming.

12 (Whereupon, at 8:30 p.m., the above-referenced
13 matter was concluded.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25