

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

CALIFORNIA WATER BOARDS
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
KARUK TRIBE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
37960 HIGHWAY 96
ORLEANS, CALIFORNIA

. . .

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2019

TIME: 12:10 P.M.

PLACE: Karuk Tribe Council Chambers
37960 Highway 96
Orleans, CA 95556

REPORTER: CONNIE WEBB, CSR NO. 10811
COLEMAN REPORTERS
730 Fifth Street, Suite M
Eureka, CA 95501

SPEAKER INDEX1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25WITNESSPAGE

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Russell Attebery: | 3 |
| Kathy McCovey: | 22 |
| Josh Saxon: | 25 |
| David Eckert: | 26 |
| Dave Meurer: | 27 |
| Jessee Myers: | 30 |
| Marc Robbi: | 31 |
| Dana Colegrove: | 33 |
| Isaac Kinny: | 34 |
| David Eckert: | 39 |
| Stefan Dosch: | 40 |
| Craig Tucker: | 41 |
| Blythe Reis: | 44 |
| Barbara Short: | 45 |
| Regina Chichizola: | 49 |
| Leaf Hillman: | 51 |
| Sinead Talley: | 56 |

1 the people who live here.

2 I think that's really important. And I think
3 that the science shows the habitat of the Klamath River
4 and particularly all the salmon.

5 The people that live along the Klamath River
6 have depended on that since the time of memorial.
7 They've depended on that for a good source. And I really
8 believe that the time has come that we have done enough
9 work and, in combining those sciences, to move forward
10 with this project. I feel like we're moving in the right
11 direction and we are running out of time. If we waste
12 anymore time, then the salmon will die as the buffalo.
13 And we do not want to take that chance.

14 So we welcome everybody here. And -- and we
15 give our thanks to everybody here, for all their input,
16 all the scientists. We feel like we're moving in the
17 right direction, the Karuk Tribe does, and we hope we can
18 see this project through to fruition.

19 So thank you.

20 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you very much, Chairman.

21 So I'm going to go through a little bit of
22 logistics. Again, thank you very much for coming and
23 being here today.

24 My name's Erin Ragazzi. I'm with the State
25 Water Board Division of Water Rights. Folks with me here

1 today are Kristen Gangl. She works in the Division of
2 Water Rights as well. Over here, we have Mariana Alley
3 with the Water Boards Office of Chief Counsel; Parker
4 Thaler with the Division of Water Rights; Tim Moran with
5 our Office of Public Affairs.

6 And then our consultants are here today, as
7 well, that helped us in the development of the draft
8 environmental impact report. With Stillwater Science,
9 Maia Singer and Lauren McClure.

10 And not least -- last but not least is Connie.
11 Connie is our court reporter today. And I want to
12 emphasize, please, try and speak slowly enough that she
13 can capture what you're saying and clearly. If you start
14 talking too fast, she may throw up her hands or may say:
15 Hey, slow down.

16 Because we want to capture what's being said
17 here today, we do want to make sure we get all of that
18 information.

19 For folks that aren't familiar with the area,
20 if you go out that door and to the left, there's two
21 doors. One of them has a pink sticky on it. There's a
22 restroom right there. So step out.

23 There's also some snacks in the back of the
24 room if you want to grab something to eat. And I wanted
25 to just very clearly say the purpose of the meeting today

1 is, first and foremost, to get comments. So we really
2 want to hear feedback on what you think of the draft
3 environmental impact report.

4 We're going to have a very brief presentation
5 and then really open it up for comments. Seems like
6 we'll have plenty of time for comments today, given the
7 number of folks that we have here. But if you could
8 please fill out a speaker card, that would be great.
9 That way we know who wants to speak. And it allows me to
10 say your name.

11 So there's a bunch in the back of the room. So
12 please fill one out. Lauren will grab them, and she'll
13 bring them up to me.

14 There's also a couple of other documents back
15 there. One of them is the notice of availability. I
16 would say, if you're going to take one document with you
17 today, the notice of availability is a good one to do.
18 It has our website where you can get information about
19 the Lower Klamath Project. It also has where to submit
20 written comments and comment deadlines and how to sign up
21 for our email subscription list. So this is a, overall,
22 good piece of paper to leave here today with to make sure
23 that you can stay in contact with us.

24 Two other handouts that we haven't had at the
25 other meetings but we brought along in case folks want a

1 copy of the presentation. So a copy of the presentation
2 is posted on our website. But we also have copies in the
3 back of the room.

4 Additionally, we have a copy of the Executive
5 Summary from the draft environmental impact report. So
6 if people want to grab a copy of that as well, they can
7 get a copy of the overview of the project of our draft
8 environmental impact report.

9 A little bit of ground rules. If folks have
10 cell phones, if they can put them on silent now so that
11 they don't start buzzing in the middle of the
12 presentation or the public comment period, that would be
13 great.

14 I don't think it's going to be a problem. But
15 we always want to remind everyone that we want to respect
16 all speakers and all points of view.

17 Please use the microphone or a very loud voice
18 so that everyone in the room can hear you. Not everybody
19 has as great hearing as everybody else. I want to make
20 sure Connie, for sure, can hear you and the rest of the
21 room here.

22 And if I don't think we're going to have to
23 shorten the timeframe. I think we have plenty of time
24 for people to provide comments.

25 But, please, do fill out a speaker card and

1 hand it to Lauren.

2 With that, I'm going to hand it over to Kristen
3 to do the presentation.

4 MS. GANGL: So today, I'm just going to give a
5 quick background of the project and talk you through some
6 of the authorities related to licensing hydropower
7 projects, talk about why we're here even though Erin
8 covered that.

9 Then I'll walk you through the water quality
10 certification process and then the California
11 Environmental Quality Act process.

12 And then I'll hand it over to Parker. And
13 he'll give us an overview of the document itself.

14 So here we have a map of the project area,
15 Klamath River Renewal Corporation or KRRC proposes
16 decommission of four facilities, J.C. Boyle in Oregon; in
17 California, Copco 1 and 2, and Iron Gate. At this point,
18 they have filed a joint transfer application with the
19 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to transfer
20 ownership from PacifiCorp to the KRRC.

21 There are some other facilities associated with
22 the Klamath Hydroelectric Project: East Side and West
23 Side and Keno in Oregon and also Fall Creek in
24 California. And those will remain under PacifiCorp
25 ownership. But the three highlighted -- four highlighted

1 in red are proposed for decommissioning.

2 So in terms of authorities related to
3 hydroelectric power licensing projects, there's two big
4 entities at the federal level. We have the Federal
5 Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC. And they are the
6 federal agency that has broad authorities to control all
7 aspects of the project. That's energy production, flows,
8 design requirements, all that stuff is overseen by FERC.

9 And then, at the state level, you have the
10 State Water Resources Control Board or the State Water
11 Board. And they're the state agency that's responsible
12 to certify any proposed project for hydropower to make
13 sure that that project can meet water quality standards.
14 And we do that by imposing conditions to protect water
15 quality.

16 So like Erin said, we're here today to collect
17 public comments on our draft environmental impact report
18 or EIR. And that's because the Klamath River Renewal
19 Corporation submitted an application to the State Water
20 Board to get a water quality certification to remove the
21 dams. And in order for us to take an action on that
22 application, we have to comply with the California
23 Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

24 So this is the flow chart of the water quality
25 certification process. And it started off by the KRRC

1 submitting an application to the State Water Board in
2 late 2016 to get a water quality certification.

3 And then in June of 2018, so last summer, we
4 issued a draft water quality certification for public
5 review and comment and had a comment period from June 7th
6 to July 23rd.

7 So at this point, we're reviewing those
8 comments and considering those as we continue to work on
9 our draft water quality certification. And our next step
10 would be to make a final decision on the application for
11 water quality certification for the project.

12 But before we do that, our certification has to
13 be informed by the California Environmental Quality Act
14 or CEQA. CEQA requires an environmental impact report to
15 undertake a broad evaluation of both a project's
16 potential for significant impact and also to identify
17 ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts where
18 feasible. So we looked at a lot of different resources
19 in the area and not just water quality because it's an
20 environmental review process.

21 So here's our flow chart of the CEQA process.
22 And when the KRRC submitted their application for water
23 quality certification, it also started the CEQA process
24 because, like I said, CEQA informs water quality
25 certification.

1 So in December of 2016 we issued our notice of
2 preparation and came up to northern California and did
3 more public meetings to collect public comments, reviewed
4 those, reviewed a lot of the documents that are already
5 out there and started developing our draft environmental
6 impact report.

7 We also developed scoping reports which kind of
8 consolidates all those comments we receive. And that's
9 available online. And we released that in April of 2017.

10 So at this point in the process, we released
11 our draft environmental impact report in late 2018,
12 December 2018. And so right now, we're in our public
13 comment period. That's why we're here today, to collect
14 those comments through February 26th of this month.

15 And the next step would be for us to respond to
16 those comments and finalize the environmental impact
17 report.

18 So you can see how those two processes move
19 together. Like I said, CEQA informs the certification.
20 So we can't take a final action on the application for
21 water quality certification until we finalize our
22 environmental impact report.

23 So with that, I'm going to hand it off to
24 Parker so he can talk more about the document.

25 MR. THALER: Thank you.

1 So as Kristen mentioned, I'll be discussing
2 some of the content and organization of our draft
3 environmental impact report or draft EIR. You can see on
4 the slide that the draft EIR was divided into two
5 volumes. Volume one had information such as introduction
6 and proposed project, environmental setting, impacts and
7 mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed
8 project.

9 And volume two contained 23 appendices that had
10 information that supported the determinations made in
11 volume 1. I'll be walking through each of these sections
12 today describing a little bit more about their content.

13 And the first is the executive summary. The
14 executive summary has information such as an overview of
15 those projects that identifies areas of controversy and
16 some details on our public involvement that we've done,
17 as well as our CEQA objectives.

18 And so when we evaluated the KRRC's proposed
19 project as well as alternatives to the proposed project,
20 which I'll be discussing later, these were the objectives
21 or summary of these objectives that we applied in looking
22 at the project as a whole.

23 And these objectives included improving
24 long-term water quality conditions associated with the
25 Lower Klamath Project, advancing long-term restoration of

1 natural fish populations in the Klamath Basin, restoring
2 volitional or unaided anadromous fish passage, and
3 reducing disease conditions for Klamath River salmonids.

4 And I wanted to note here that the KRRC has
5 project objectives. And the project objectives that we
6 have here are different from the KRRC's objectives.

7 The last item in the executive summary that I
8 wanted to highlight as a useful tool or resource to help
9 guide you through the document is Table ES-1. It's a
10 little lengthy. But what it is is it includes a list of
11 every single impact and impact determination that we
12 needed in our document, whether it be for the proposed
13 project or an alternative to the proposed project.

14 Our next section in the draft EIR was the
15 introduction section. And it included kind of an
16 overview, similar to what I'm providing today, of how the
17 document's structured as well as identification of some
18 of the key sources that we used to inform our decision.
19 And to walk through some of those key sources listed on
20 the slide, public comments on the notice of preparation.
21 As mentioned, we released the document back in December
22 of 2016, held public meetings, and received over 1300
23 comments that we've all reviewed and considered when we
24 developed our draft EIR. Tribal consultation. And
25 you'll note -- all note here that there were two types.

1 There was formal Assembly Bill 52,
2 government-to-government consultation that the State
3 Water Board engaged in with the Shasta Nation, the Shasta
4 Indian Nation, and the Yurok Tribe. Then we had informal
5 consultations with the Karuk and the Hoopa Valley Tribe.
6 We also used information from federal, local, and state
7 entities as well as scientific information and
8 information submitted by the KRRC such as their
9 application and additional filings.

10 The next section of our document was the
11 proposed project. The proposed project lists what the
12 KRRC was proposing and, you know, in summary, includes
13 the removal of four facilities being J.C. Boyle, Copco
14 number 1, Copco number 2, and Iron Gate. Details on that
15 such as drawdown rate and restoration activities are all
16 listed in section two of our document.

17 For section 3, the environmental setting,
18 impacts, and mitigation measures, you'll see it listed on
19 the slide, large number of resource areas and each of
20 these are the resource areas that we analyzed when
21 evaluating the proposed project as well as alternatives.
22 To list a few, we had water quality, aquatic resources,
23 phytoplankton and periphyton, water supply and water
24 rights, historical and tribal resources.

25 And when we evaluated these, we applied five

1 components when we were going through each of these
2 items. And those five components are listed on this
3 slide and lists items such as the area of analysis which
4 was identification or description of the physical limits
5 or geographic scope of the potential impact to a resource
6 area; the environmental setting or a baseline which
7 described existing conditions or what the system or area
8 looks like before implementation of a project;
9 significance criteria, which is the criteria we use to
10 compare a project action to the baseline of existing
11 conditions to determine the severity of a potential
12 impact.

13 And I'll be going through an example of how
14 these look in the next few slides.

15 We also have an impact analysis approach which
16 describes how the analysis of the potential effect was
17 undertaken for each environmental resource area as well
18 as potential impact and mitigation measures. And that
19 identified potential impacts associated with the proposed
20 action, analyzed the potential impacts, and described any
21 feasible mitigation for the impact that would reduce the
22 level of significance.

23 And to use the example of water quality, which
24 is kind of the core of the State Water Board water
25 quality certification process, you'll see on this slide

1 is a listing of the area of analysis for the water
2 quality section.

3 And so for the water quality section, the area
4 of analysis started on the Klamath River just above J.C.
5 Boyle and ran all the way through the other hydroelectric
6 facilities, Copco number 1, Copco number 2, and Iron Gate
7 with the entire 190 river miles below Iron Gate through
8 the Klamath River Estuary and included the Pacific
9 nearshore environments.

10 So, in summary, it began at the headwaters --
11 or at the top of J.C. Boyle and ran off the Pacific Ocean
12 which covered an area quite a distance away from where
13 the proposed action could be occurring. And for each
14 resource area, the area of analysis will vary. And the
15 water quality one is listed here. And they vary because
16 the way the project could impact the different resource
17 could direct the need for a different area of analysis.

18 So to discuss environmental setting or baseline
19 for water quality, that includes, like I said, existing
20 conditions or what the system looks like before the
21 undertaking of the project and includes actual data,
22 model data, as well as our understanding of processes in
23 the system.

24 And so listed on this slide is a general
25 reservoir stratification and turnover process that kind

1 of helps explain our understanding of how Iron Gate and
2 Copco is set up in the summer through a
3 reservoir stratification.

4 And then we have significance criteria and
5 impact analysis. And those are both summarized on this
6 slide. And, as I said, the significance criteria is the
7 criteria we apply when we look at a potential impact in
8 relation to a baseline or existing conditions to
9 determine the level of severity of an impact.

10 So the water quality ones, in summary,
11 included, you know, exceed or substantially contribute to
12 an existing exceedance of a water quality standard, cause
13 a change in water quality that would result in a failure
14 to meet existing beneficial uses of water or protect
15 existing water quality, or result in a substantial
16 adverse impact to human health or environmental
17 receptors.

18 In our impact analysis approach section in the
19 water quality area, defines short- and long-term periods.
20 It defined water quality parameters for items like
21 dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity. And we described models
22 used to inform our impact analysis. So what that looks
23 like when you walk through how an impact is evaluated.

24 We have one example listed on the slide, but
25 there are many in our document. And taking from the

1 water quality section, to kind of walk through this, the
2 example is short- and long-term alterations in water
3 temperature due to conversion of reservoirs to river
4 conditions associated with the Klamath River Project.

5 And our impact analysis looked at: What are
6 water temperatures now below Iron Gate and what are
7 modeled water temperatures expected to look like without
8 Iron Gate or any of the Lower Klamath River project?

9 And it found that water temperatures below Iron
10 Gate are currently four to eighteen degrees Fahrenheit
11 warmer in the summer and fall with the -- with the
12 project in. But on the opposite side, it also found
13 water temperatures below Iron Gate are two to five
14 degrees cooler in the spring.

15 So the impact analysis determined that, with
16 implementation of the proposed project, the removal of
17 the facilities, these temperature effects associated with
18 the Lower Klamath Project are no longer there.

19 And then for the significant determination, it
20 found that that was a beneficial impact to the
21 Hydroelectric Reach in the Middle -- the Hydroelectric
22 Reach and the Middle Klamath River all the way down to
23 the Salmon River.

24 Then for the second geographic area in this
25 potential impact situation, it found that it was no

1 significant impact from the Salmon River down to the
2 Pacific Ocean. And because we didn't exceed the
3 significant criteria, no mitigation was required in this
4 particular impact.

5 So I kind of touched on this, but impact
6 determinations in our document range from those listed
7 here. And it varies from this side of being beneficial.
8 So beneficial impact associated with the -- with the
9 project or a project alternative and then moved across
10 the spectrum from beneficial to no significant impact, no
11 significant impact with mitigation, significant
12 unavoidable impact, and then significant unavoidable
13 impact with mitigation.

14 And we're noting here that, as you saw in this
15 example, impact determinations, there can be multiple
16 determinations on a potential impact due to time scale or
17 geographic region.

18 And so stepping out of the water quality
19 section and looking at the entire section going back to
20 all those resource areas that we had up before and to
21 discuss the beneficial side of the impact determinations,
22 for items listed in purple on this side are resource
23 areas where at least one potential impact associated with
24 the process was found to be beneficial in the short and
25 long-term. And for areas shown in the blue, there was at

1 least one potential impact with that resource area that
2 was found to be beneficial in the long term but not in
3 the short term.

4 And to clarify, that's not to say the KRRC
5 proposed project impact to water quality, as a whole, are
6 beneficial. But it's saying that for at least one impact
7 in the water quality section the impact to the -- from
8 the proposed project to water quality would be
9 beneficial.

10 And so to move to the opposite end of the
11 spectrum for a determination of significant and
12 unavoidable, for items shown on this graph, items listed
13 in orange are resource areas where at least one potential
14 impact in the short term was found to be significant and
15 unavoidable. And for those listed in green, there was at
16 least one potential impact associated with implementation
17 of the proposed project that was found to be significant
18 and unavoidable in the short- and long-term.

19 And for the one blue one, there was a long-term
20 significant and unavoidable impact but not a short-term
21 one.

22 And so for section four, this is the section
23 where we included alternatives to KRRC's proposed
24 project. And, at the beginning of this section, we
25 described a list of all of the alternatives we received

1 from public comments or by looking at previous
2 environmental documents as well as how we analyzed which
3 ones we decided to bring forward.

4 And the ones that we brought forward for
5 further analysis was partial removal; continuing
6 operations with fish passage; and a two-dam removal
7 alternative which meant that Copco number 2 and J.C.
8 Boyle would remain but Copco number 1 and Iron Gate would
9 be removed under this alternative; a three-dam removal in
10 which all of the California facilities are removed but
11 J.C. Boyle remains in place.

12 We analyzed the impact of a no hatchery as well
13 as the impact of not doing the project. So a no-project
14 alternative.

15 And so with that, comments are due by 12:00 on
16 February 26th. Listed up here is an email address and a
17 mailing address where comments can be submitted to as
18 well as the link to the Lower Klamath Project web page
19 that the State Water Board maintains. It's a really good
20 source to stay up to date on information that we're
21 providing such as this presentation which is currently
22 posted as well as our draft EIR.

23 And quickly, on how to stay informed, as
24 Kristen mentioned and Erin, there's a document at the
25 back of the room called notice of availability. And it

1 has instructions on how to sign up for the Lower Klamath
2 Project License Surrender email subscription system. And
3 I think that's the best way to stay updated. Anytime you
4 take a large action, an email goes out to everyone who's
5 subscribed to that list, letting them know where to find
6 the document or item.

7 And with that, I'll turn it over to Erin.

8 MS. RAGAZZI: So I know we have one person who
9 needs to leave by 12:40 and we have five minutes left.
10 So I want to invite Kathy McCovey to come up right now to
11 make a comment. Then we'll go through more logistics of
12 comments after she gets that comment made.

13 So if you could state and then spell your name
14 for Connie, that would be great.

15 MS. MCCOVEY: State and spell it?

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Yeah.

17 MS. MCCOVEY: My name is Kathy McCovey.

18 My name is Kathy McCovey, K-A-T-H-Y,
19 M-C-C-O-V-E-Y. I was born and raised on the Klamath
20 River, Happy Camp. But my people come from Somes Bar
21 Village of (*Inaudible*). I fished with my grandfather all
22 my life on the fall dip net fishing, remember eating many
23 salmon. My first memory is eating salmon.
24 And I'm currently taking a fire refresher class. So
25 thank you for letting me go first. I'll say this real

1 quick.

2 I'm a lifelong resident of the Klamath River
3 for 61 years. I own property in Happy Camp and -- in the
4 town of Happy Camp and on Indian Creek. And I also own
5 property at Johnson's 50 -- 50 acres through which the
6 Klamath River in its entirety flows.

7 I support the removal of the four dams on the
8 Klamath River. The Klamath River water quality has
9 deteriorated to the point that fish die yearly. And I
10 cannot go into the river from July to November. Then, I
11 hope the rains come to flush the river out so that I can
12 enter the river and the animals can enter the rivers.
13 Even my dogs, I keep my dogs out of the river that time
14 of year.

15 I just turned 61 years old. I got sick last
16 February. I went from weighing 155 pounds to weighing
17 117 pounds. My stomach hurt and I could not eat. I
18 learned I was getting sick from beef and beef by-products
19 from food from the store. I switched my diet. I learned
20 that salmon, with its omega and its oils, that it could
21 help cure me. I started eating it, and it did.

22 The elders say that's what happens. I got
23 older. I ate fish -- I mean, I ate beef. All my life, I
24 ate the white man's food. And now I can't eat it
25 anymore.

1 You know, our people said a long time ago, the
2 older people said when the white people came they brought
3 the white man's food. The younger boys -- the younger
4 boys and the younger people, they ate it and the
5 middle-aged people. But the old people wouldn't eat it.
6 They didn't like that white man's food. Then, after a
7 while, everybody started eating white man's food. And
8 the elder people said: They're going to get sick.
9 What's going to happen to our people? Oh, what will
10 happen to our people?

11 And it's coming true. It is really coming
12 true. When I switched to salmon, I started gaining
13 weight back. I could eat anything. Now, I'm 125 pounds.
14 I'm shooting for 135. That's my strongest weight. But
15 it's because of salmon.

16 I went downriver and I asked the Yuroks for
17 salmon because I was sick. And they gave me salmon. I
18 got salmon for eight months.

19 And what I mean to say, sometimes in this rural
20 area salmon is the only food that the older people who
21 are limited in income can get here on the river that is
22 fresh and nutritious. As Orleans, Happy Camp, Weitchpec,
23 Pecwan and Hoopa are considered food deserts. We live in
24 a land for thousands of years where our people excelled
25 and lived and were healthy. And we have one of the

1 strongest ceremonial centers on this earth.

2 But now, we don't have food. We don't even
3 sell meat down in Orleans. Hoopa doesn't even have a
4 store. We need our salmon to come up our river to insure
5 that we will continue to survive as Karuk people as we
6 have for thousands of years.

7 Thank you for your time. I have to go to fire
8 training.

9 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you. I have Josh Saxon,
10 followed by David Eckert, followed by the Dave Meurer.

11 MR. SAXON: A little taller than Kathy.

12 J-O-S-H, S-A-X-O-N, executive director of the
13 Karuk Tribe. And I -- first of all, I know Kathy's gone
14 now. But that's a pretty powerful message. And I would
15 echo those comments as well.

16 But also I would like to point out that the
17 mitigation in particular, you know, from the tribe's
18 perspective, the single biggest mitigation for fish for
19 the Klamath River system is dam removal. And we can sure
20 try to do other things in the process of dam removal to
21 alleviate impacts. But in the greater scheme of things,
22 dam removal is the number one reason why we have the
23 degradation of water quality and the impacts to our
24 fishery on the Klamath River.

25 The other one I would like to make is in terms

1 of fisheries' restoration. I think a lot of our energy
2 moving in that direction has been largely impacted by,
3 not only funding, but there's a sense that we need to do
4 more and more in terms of pre-imposed dam removal. And
5 from our perspective the more involved the Karuk Tribe is
6 in that process, I think the better our data will be in
7 terms of how we can continue to monitor and alleviate
8 restoration concerns, both pre-dam removal, during dam
9 removal, and after dam removal.

10 MS. RAGAZZI: David Eckert.

11 MR. ECKERT: I'm David Eckert, E-C-K-E-R-T.
12 I'm in favor of the dam removals but I have some fears
13 about the mitigations involved in water quality control.

14 In 1969, they blew up Sweasey Dam on the Mad
15 River and they lost an entire run of salmon that year due
16 to the siltation of the lower Mad River and also all the
17 holes filling in with silt and sand. And also smothered
18 the fish because their gills filled up with the silt.

19 And on the Elwha River in the Olympic Peninsula
20 where they just removed a dam, it actually created a new
21 delta in the Puget Sound. And the amount of silt
22 involved was incredible. And I fear the loss of one or
23 two seasons of fish when we talk about the silt removal
24 from behind the dams. A cubic yard is three by three by
25 three. That's about a pickup load of silt.

1 Can you imagine your pickup couple feet deep in
2 silt?

3 Now picture 15 million pickup trucks of silt
4 being dumped into the Klamath River.

5 And what doesn't get washed out the bottom,
6 they propose using mining techniques of hydraulically
7 mining the silt into the river and some of the four
8 reaches. And I think it needs a closer look than
9 mechanical removal with excavators or hydraulic dredging
10 to remove as much silt from that reservoirs before the
11 dam removal so we don't lose two or three runs.

12 In the '64 flood, a great deal of the
13 hydrological aspects of the river were changed with the
14 movement of gravel parts. And it's taken over 50 years.
15 And the changes have just started to mediate where
16 there's bedrock showing again.

17 And I think we should keep in mind not to
18 sacrifice and potentially eliminate salmon with two or
19 three runs being eliminated because of the silt being
20 washed down the river as to the beneficial properties of
21 having the temperature and dams removed for the spawning.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. RAGAZZI: So Dave Meurer, followed by Jesse
24 Myers, followed by Marc Robbi.

25 MR. MEURER: Good afternoon. My name is Dave

1 Meurer. I'm the community liaison for the Klamath River
2 Renewal Corporation, speaking on their behalf today.

3 Klamath River Renewal Corporation is part of a
4 cooperative effort to reestablish the natural vitality of
5 the Klamath River to support all communities in the
6 basin.

7 KRRC's job is to take ownership of four
8 PacifiCorp dams and remove these dams, restore formerly
9 inundated lands and implement required mitigation
10 measures in compliance with all applicable federal,
11 state, and local laws.

12 KRRC is seeking regulatory permits to
13 accomplish this project including the water quality
14 certification by the State of California.

15 The DEIR is an impressive and thorough review
16 of the potential benefits and impacts of removal of the
17 Lower Klamath Project hydroelectric dams on the Klamath
18 River.

19 KRRC commends the water board staff and their
20 consultant for its work on this analysis. Think there's
21 quite a bit for community members and stakeholders to
22 learn from.

23 The DEIR shows the proposed project to be
24 environmentally superior compared to the six alternatives
25 to the project that the water board analyzed in both

1 terms of project benefits and negative impacts. The
2 report shows that most potential impacts from the project
3 are small and short term and can be reduced with
4 mitigation. It also shows many project effects are
5 beneficial in the short and long term which is an
6 important finding for those who are interested in the
7 long-term health of the Klamath River and the community
8 and to the ecosystems that depend on it.

9 The DEIR shows the proposed project protects
10 water quality by restoring the free-flowing condition of
11 the river and insures volitional fish passage and that
12 the project will be a boom to salmon and steelhead
13 populations. Many of the species expected to recover
14 following dam removal are tribal trust species that are
15 important to the culture and health of some tribes on the
16 Klamath River.

17 The DEIR also shows an expected increase in
18 recreational and commercial fishing industries.

19 KRRC is pleased with these findings in the DEIR
20 and looks forward to the final EIR in obtaining other
21 required permits and then implementing the project,
22 including mitigation measures to enhance benefits and
23 reduce adverse impacts.

24 KRRC will be submitting written comments
25 regarding the DEIR in the near future. We are encouraged

1 that this DEIR brings KRRC one step closer to project
2 approval.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. MYERS: Good afternoon. Jesse Myers,
5 M-Y-E-R-S, J-E-S-S-E.

6 I'm grateful and proud to call this my home
7 here in Orleans, the community. I operate a wood shop
8 utilizing the sustainable approach on resource materials
9 producing all kinds of wood stuff. Raising a family
10 utilizing cultural ideals to pry food for my children and
11 my community. And I feel this gives good connection to
12 the land. I also volunteer with the OVFD to further my
13 commitment to safety and the well being of people in this
14 town.

15 I come here today, taking off some time from
16 work -- to voice my support for the full removal of four
17 dams. Over the past 20 years, I've bonded with this
18 river and these people in this town and connected to this
19 river through fishing, swimming, boating, rafting,
20 playing, enjoying it. This gives me a sense of flowing
21 connection to live that I'm very grateful for.

22 Seeing the quality of the water and the health
23 of this river system deteriorate over the past 20 years,
24 it's sad. Fear of toxic algae affecting my children and
25 dogs separates me from this life-giving source at times

1 of the year.

2 So I ask: Keep dam removal on track; grant the
3 permits; draft the certificates of water quality; remove
4 the dams. And we will renew the health of the river
5 which will renew the health of the people.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: So we have Marc Robbi, Dana
8 Colegrove, and Isaac Kinny.

9 MR. ROBBI: Hi. I'm Marc Robbi, R-O-B-B-I.
10 I'm a long-time resident, property and business owner
11 here in Orleans. We have an organic farm and nursery
12 business.

13 I would like to thank you once again for coming
14 out to hear our comments on dam removal. I urge you to
15 okay the current permit proposal and keep the dam removal
16 process going as fast as possible.

17 As I've stated before in previous hearings over
18 the years, these dams are causing terrible damage to our
19 river's health and salmon and all of us who cherish and
20 depend on them.

21 Loss of salmon is particularly hard on the
22 health of our native community. The continued existence
23 of these salmon-killing dams is truly an act of genocide
24 and suppression of their culture.

25 The awful water quality exasperated by the dams

1 also has a direct negative impact on my family, not
2 allowing us to swim in the polluted waters that flow
3 right past our home. We haven't fished for salmon for
4 several years now due to the extremely low returns. The
5 joy of watching my son reel in a big salmon has been
6 taken away as well as the health and nutrition they used
7 to supply.

8 These are big takings from us. They impact the
9 quality of our life, our property values, our freedom to
10 life and liberty as given to us under the constitution.

11 We want the dams removed quickly so these
12 (*Inaudible.*) Further, I would like to talk about the
13 other positive impacts dam removal will have on the
14 entire community of the Klamath basin.

15 Removing the dams will create jobs and have a
16 very positive impact on the region's economy, both in the
17 actual dam removal and also in the many remediation
18 efforts that are and will take place. Already members of
19 this community have been employed to secure seed sources
20 for revegetating the removal area.

21 As the owners of a native plant nursery, we
22 rarely grow and sell plants for reclamation projects. We
23 see this as a large economic opportunity this project
24 will bring.

25 The future of mankind is dependent on

1 reclaiming and repairing the damage we have done to our
2 only home, the earth. Our economy is now dependent on
3 the emerging restoration economy. We must repair the
4 damage done, restore our natural system before it is too
5 late and give jobs to our rural people when doing this
6 important work.

7 Please, do everything in your power to insure
8 this dam removal project continues and moves forward at
9 top speed.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. COLEGROVE: Hi. Dana Colegrove, D-A-N-A,
12 C-O-L-E-G-R-O-V-E.

13 I'm here to say we need to remove the dams.
14 Please do the permitting process as fast as you can
15 because time is running out. You guys, the first time
16 they said dam removal: Oh, yeah, 2012.

17 Oh, yea, 2012.

18 Now, it's 2020. And now, it's 2021. Now is it
19 even going to be dam removal?

20 I see you guys have a list: Well, maybe we'll
21 take out one, maybe we'll take out two, maybe we'll take
22 out none. That's not acceptable.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Is there anybody else that wants
25 to speak? If so, could you fill out a speaker card right

1 now?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a large group of
3 youth coming from Klamath that should be here in, like, a
4 half hour. I don't know if we can wait to hold on for
5 that?

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Well, we'll let Isaac go.

7 MR. KINNY: Isaac Kinny. I want to say thank
8 you to the Karuk people and the Karuk Tribe Council for
9 cultivating this relationship to have this comment period
10 here today.

11 Again, I'm Isaac Kinny. I live in the village
12 of Weitchpec. I'm from the village of Weitchpec
13 (*Inaudible.*) I want to really echo a lot of what the
14 previous speakers have said. Complex issues need to be
15 dealt with. And, again, understanding that indigenous
16 people have the best solutions to a lot of the issues
17 we're dealing with. Not just keeping us at the table but
18 actually empowering indigenous communities to be the
19 decision makers. That's a big part of our thinking. The
20 opportunity's here. There are many challenges.

21 Again, we're talking about -- I think that's --
22 the silt comment is really important to take into effect
23 of the safety of not just the people implementing this
24 transfer and of this taking down of the dam but the
25 safety of the fish and the other ecosystem that these

1 dams have really impacted and detrimented for years.

2 So again, to understand, there's regional
3 solutions that have to happen, making sure the
4 investments of economic development are also in the
5 communities making sure that we're not creating systems
6 of dependency for maintenance and the work after the dams
7 are done.

8 Ownership of the land once the dams are coming
9 down and the maintenance agreements have to go to the
10 indigenous people of that land. It cannot stay in the US
11 government's ownership anymore unless its under that
12 tribal trust jurisdiction. That has to be key, I think,
13 to the long-term planning of what we're talking about.

14 The big opportunity is to have that capital,
15 especially from the other private sectors, right?
16 PacifiCorp, our main stakeholders, right, in this whole
17 project. We all need to make sure that we take that
18 responsibility and not let anyone just walk away and say:
19 Okay. I'm good. Ya'll take care of it now.

20 Because that is happening far too much. It's
21 happening far too much. The agreements are being
22 trampled on and tread on far too much. The urgency is
23 now. Everybody sees it. We're all voting for it.

24 As the federal agency, you have a stake as
25 well. Just like us as the community to voice what we

1 need, the government and the agencies have the
2 responsibility to respond. We have to make sure that
3 these -- our relatives that cannot speak are continued to
4 be on our minds when we're implementing all of our
5 projects. Let's not create this climate change BS where
6 we're just researching and we're not implementing.
7 That's unacceptable as well.

8 We have to make sure that, if we're really
9 going to look at the next generation -- my kids have
10 three kids that, right now, again, have many challenges
11 that we have to -- they're going to have to come up with.
12 Let's make sure to give them the proper foundation to
13 work from it.

14 And what does that mean?

15 It means changing who owns the land, the rights
16 to this freshwater, right? We're only using -- one
17 percent of the world's water is only freshwater. That's
18 why it's so valuable. That's why it's worth more than
19 gold. We need to protect these systems that have been in
20 place for millions of years. Let's protect the
21 regenerative systems that have been here, for we cannot
22 dominate them with things like dams.

23 And that's a big, big reason why I'm here today
24 is to talk for the youth because I feel I'm still working
25 on what we need to really do, for myself, right?

1 For me, I've made sure to prioritize. These
2 are the things that we need to prioritize are the
3 regenerative systems. Because systems will set us free.
4 But, as we see, under the capitalistic system, we are not
5 free. We're having to come and beg for land that was
6 taken, water that was taken. This is freshwater.

7 Our rate of desalinating saltwater is not
8 sustainable for the population that lives on this earth.
9 So we must protect this freshwater. And we must all do
10 what we can. We have no other choice for the urgency to
11 be done fast and be done -- I shouldn't say fast -- in
12 the best way that's fast and being able to be done in a
13 safe way for the people and for the species that live
14 within this ecosystem.

15 We have to be -- think relative here and take
16 all of our resources, all of our ideas have to come to
17 the top. It's going to be not just public sector, but
18 the private sector. And that investment has to happen.
19 Because the ways that things have been managed so far are
20 not working. We have to throw that book out.

21 We need to make sure that any of the
22 frameworks, again, are not just used to suppress
23 indigenous people and people who do not have that capital
24 right now, but to lift them up and create equity in the
25 human beings. Because the type of money that we're

1 seeing is not going to be the type of money we're going
2 to see in 15 years, in 20 years. It's going to be a lot
3 more relational economics. And water's one of the
4 biggest things people are going to try and commodify.
5 But you can't do it.

6 You've been trying to commodify the land, the
7 water, and the air for far too long. Those are not
8 regenerative systems.

9 So that's why I want to really make sure to
10 understand, too, how this goes into the other public
11 comments that I've done because this is too much. Let's
12 get to work. We have to do this. And again show us the
13 whole timeline, not just your perspective. Again, the
14 federal agencies are just one piece of this whole thing.
15 Traditional, ecological knowledge has to be protected as
16 well. Do not just take the knowledge and use it for your
17 own betterment. Make sure the indigenous people that
18 have taught us all these things, to where governments are
19 made from, that they're paid back.

20 How do you do that?

21 Starts with land ownership. Starts with actual
22 sovereignty and nation building between the U.S.
23 government and the federally recognized tribes and the
24 state recognized tribes and the locally recognized
25 tribes. For these are the communities that have

1 continued to be pushed down.

2 We have to continue to work together. And so
3 that's what I want to say.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. RAGAZZI: So David asked for one more
6 minute. So I'm going to let him have one more minute.

7 If you can state and spell your name again?

8 Then Craig Tucker.

9 If anyone else wants to speak, if they can fill
10 out a card?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I filled it out but
12 didn't circle that I wanted to speak.

13 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Let me find it.

14 MR. ECKERT: David Eckert, E-C-K-E-R-T.

15 Sorry. I'm not a very good public speaker. I
16 don't follow my notes enough, and I left one thing out.

17 Another concern under the mitigation process is
18 the drawdown rates. You're speaking about one to two
19 feet per day on the drawdown. And many of those
20 geological areas are hydrologically connected to the lake
21 itself. And you've got to be very careful to drawdown
22 slow enough so that the ground water around the lake and
23 the soils that are supported by the lake have a chance to
24 drain out. Otherwise, you're going to have some very
25 large landslides and kick up that number of dirt and silt

1 ending up having to be dealt with at a later date.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. DOSCH: Hi. My name's Stefan Dosch,
4 S-T-E-F-A-N, D-O-S-C-H. And I wasn't going to speak
5 today. But I just wanted to speak to the comments that
6 have been brought up about silt. And a fisheries
7 biologist at the Yreka hearings -- I'm kind of using this
8 as a moment to speak to everybody, not just the board
9 things about that.

10 And it was pointed out that EIR describes that
11 the amount of silt that's going to be released in this
12 project is actually within the accepted fluctuation in
13 silt. This is an incredibly silt moving river.

14 So the fish survived a period of unregulated
15 hydraulic mining where people were just washing mountains
16 into the river. And the fish survived that. And so I
17 think that this is the point that I think you guys can
18 take away is that you should have a good timeline that
19 really shows that the plan is for it all to happen in
20 winter months and in January and times when the high flow
21 is going to take care of that.

22 So I think that's been -- I don't know. It's
23 been considered a lot in the process. But I do
24 understand that it hasn't gotten across to everybody, you
25 know, the right way because maybe there's a better way to

1 talk about things which show timelines and this and that
2 or comparisons and stuff.

3 Other than that, I just want to say that I
4 support the --

5 I talked at the Yreka hearing. So I didn't
6 know if I was supposed to use time twice.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: You're welcome to do that.

8 MR. DOSCH: All right. Well, then yeah. I go
9 out on the Klamath and Salmon Rivers counting salmon
10 carcasses with the kids. And they're really hopeful that
11 this will happen. That's what gives them hope for the
12 future.

13 So thanks. And keep doing it for them and for
14 everybody who's alive here and -- yeah. Especially the
15 fish that can't come in here and tell you what they're
16 experiencing because they're the ones who know. And we
17 just get to see and think we know this and that.

18 So just share. I don't know. I'll talk for
19 them.

20 So thanks.

21 MR. TUCKER: My name's Craig Tucker, C-R-A-I-G,
22 T-U-C-K-E-R, a consultant for the Karuk. I just --
23 couple things. I want to really thank the staff from
24 the -- from the water board.

25 Think you guys are given this really enormous

1 task to put these documents together as quickly as
2 possible. I'm really impressed that you guys were able
3 to do this. And I think, for the most part, you really
4 nailed it.

5 The Karuk Tribe agrees with the fundamental
6 conclusions that the watter board makes, that full
7 project removal is the best way to improve water quality
8 and fisheries on the Klamath. And that's what this
9 document concludes. And so we support that and
10 appreciate the hard work that went in from you guys and
11 the folks that work with you for you to get there.

12 And I want people here to know that, you know,
13 a lot of folks here have been to this -- feel like you've
14 been to this same meeting all over again. We've had
15 these same kinds of meetings around PacifiCorp's attempts
16 to get any license and negotiated a settlement that was
17 going to go through congress. So we had another round of
18 EIR, EISs from that. So this is like round three on the
19 EIR, EIS process for dam removal. And, you know, there's
20 going to be another round because once we get through
21 this with the state, I presume we'll have an EIS from
22 FERC that will also have hearings.

23 So I know it feels like you've been getting up
24 and getting down and issuing these same emotional
25 heartfelt talking points again and again and again,

1 folks.

2 But we're going to do it until these dams are
3 out, right?

4 So I just want to say thanks.

5 We will have comments that we'll file in
6 writing. I think most of the concerns we have are more
7 cosmetic than anything else. For example, we don't think
8 we own rights to foremost expert on Karuk (*Inaudible.*).
9 We'll provide some other sources for that.

10 But for the most part, we really are proud of
11 the document that you guys produced. And we stand behind
12 it.

13 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. I think Regina said that
14 we're going to have some school kids come.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not school kids.

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. We're going to have some
17 more speakers come in a little bit. So I'm going to say
18 let's propose we're going to take probably a 15-minute
19 break now. Maybe they'll be here by then; maybe they
20 won't. But we'll check in at that point and see where
21 we're at.

22 Thanks.

23 (*Pause in proceedings.*)

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Looks like the other group
25 of people is still about a half hour out, maybe. So I'm

1 going to let Blythe Reis come up and provide comment, and
2 then we'll pause again.

3 And anyone who wants to stay can stay, but
4 please don't feel compelled to wait another half hour if
5 folks are able to make it here or not. It's up to you
6 guys.

7 MS. REIS: Hi. My name is Blythe Reis. I am
8 the owner of a fishing and recreation business here on
9 the Klamath River in Orleans. I've spoken at a few other
10 removal hearings, but I wanted to go on the record as
11 saying that, as a business owner for the last 26 years,
12 I've seen a lot of changes. When I came into the
13 fishing -- the cabin business, the fishing was fair, not
14 great. It had already gone into decline. But then I saw
15 it go into really serious decline over the years. And I
16 lost a bunch my business that way. Where now they're all
17 going to Alaska and British Columbia.

18 So we decided to embark on trying to focus on a
19 summer recreational business. And we're very successful
20 at that actually. But recently the algae in the river
21 has begun to affect that business as our alternative.
22 And so I feel hit by -- from both sides. And I think
23 that dam removal is a really good option for the future.
24 I don't think the status quo is going to work, period, in
25 the long run and even now.

1 And even though I feel that it might hurt my
2 business in the short term, maybe the first year or two,
3 I feel like our generation needs to take some hits to
4 secure the long-term future of both the fishery and the
5 Klamath River as a living, breathing being.

6 I guess that's it. All right.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

8 And we're paused.

9 *(Pause in proceedings.)*

10 MS. SHORT: Hi. My name is Barbara Short,
11 S-H-O-R-T. I'm the principal at the school here. I
12 apologize for not being able to come over earlier, but I
13 was subbing for a teacher and so I had a lot of students.

14 In 1979, I worked for California Department of
15 Fish and Game upriver -- the Klamath all the way up to
16 Iron Gate. I did rotations at the dam site. At that
17 time, which was 40 years ago, the professionals in the
18 field were discussing already the decline in the Klamath
19 fisheries as related to lack of access for fish passage
20 and water quality, 40 years ago.

21 In the time since then, I personally witnessed
22 the steady decline of water quality and decrease in fish
23 with a spike around 20 years ago and then another spike
24 around 15 years ago and then another spike around ten
25 years ago. And the decline has been measured repeatedly.

1 The fish run, I don't believe we can call the fish run
2 declining. It's pretty much gone. So anything from here
3 forward is recovery.

4 The run of my youth was minimal compared to the
5 run of my elders. And that run is gone. There's almost
6 no evidence of fish in our rivers. It's heartbreaking.

7 I have been writing letters and testifying at
8 these hearings for probably 20 years. Fifteen years ago
9 I had a junior high class here. I was a teacher at that
10 time. And, you know, we had the big fish kill. But we
11 were still seeing these recurring juvenile kills. We
12 have juvenile kills every year. And the kids notice it
13 because they play by the river.

14 So we devoted a whole half year project-based
15 learning to studying the health of our river system. And
16 this involved examining different species, including
17 indicator species. This involved writing to Siskiyou
18 County and the -- oh, the county in Oregon just over the
19 line is -- I'm failing on the name.

20 But we got crop records. We got water records.
21 And these kids tracked across reports. And we created a
22 picture of increasing extraction of water from the river
23 system co-occurring with spikes in alfalfa and things
24 that 30 years before had not been grown or were grown in
25 minute levels compared to that time when we examined the

1 records and looking at the growth of algae and whatnot in
2 the river.

3 They wrote letters to fisheries' biologists at
4 OSU to discuss this problem. The internet was still not
5 really functional here. We had to be old school. And we
6 were the group that broke the news locally around
7 (*Inaudible.*) Shasta which they adjusted that name.

8 And all of the research the kids did really
9 pointed to how this cycle was supported by the poor water
10 quality related to the dams. And it was very empowering
11 and powerful for them to feel like: We understand the
12 problem; now this is something we can address.

13 They all wrote letters to the hearing boards.
14 Many of them are professionals who testified today
15 because they are grown up now and have been motivated to
16 work in natural resources.

17 I am disheartened that conversations of concern
18 from 40 years ago and at least two decades of data
19 gathering, specific to the issues surrounding the dams,
20 which are twofold -- I mean, water quality, fish passage.
21 And the decline here of our water and other dependent
22 species beyond the salmon has only steepened. It's
23 heartbreaking.

24 And I work in this system. I understand
25 regulations and due diligence very well. I believe you

1 all and who you represent have spent inordinate amounts
2 of time making sure everybody was heard examining and
3 cross-examining all of the scientific evidence, taking
4 into account the economic impacts on the people above the
5 dams. And we need to stop now and make the correct
6 decision which is to bring down the dams because the
7 ultimate responsibility is to the health of the river
8 system.

9 I understand the pain of the people above the
10 dams with their perceived economic loss. When I worked
11 for Fish and Game and even for a few years beyond that,
12 we had numerous fishing lodges in Orleans. There were,
13 like, six of them. There were two or three in Somes Bar.
14 There were many in Happy Camp, Syad (*phon.*).

15 This river would be choked with drift boats
16 during tourist season. You couldn't find a turnout to
17 pull over because every turnout had a Winnebago with
18 people who stayed for a few weeks or a month. And that
19 brought a lot of economy in here. It created a sense of
20 health, there was some flow.

21 As far as native families, everybody's smoke
22 house was full all the time. Rotation after rotation.
23 We ate salmon a lot. We had salmon burgers. We had
24 salmon steaks. We had, you know, barbecued salmon. We
25 had dried salmon, smoked salmon.

1 The loss of the fish and the water quality, we
2 can't have dogs and kids in the river at certain periods
3 in the summer. This is unconscionable. And I find this
4 absolutely heartbreaking that this has been allowed to go
5 on when the evidence has been here for almost four
6 decades.

7 So thank you for coming here and listening to
8 everybody once again. Because I've been doing -- I've
9 done this many times. And I hope that we can finally
10 move forward. I have had 2020 in my brain for a long
11 time. I will be very disappointed if we aren't
12 physically moving ahead. And that's one year from now.
13 We need to physically move ahead now.

14 So thank you very much for all of the due
15 diligence. And let's go get those dams down.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. CHICHIZOLA: Well, there's a story that I
18 haven't told yet that I thought that I should.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: So state your name.

20 MS. CHICHIZOLA: Regina Chichizola,
21 C-H-I-C-H-I-Z-O-L-A.

22 Last summer, because the river was in such bad
23 shape and there were no spring salmon, we actually had to
24 go -- to beg tribal members from the Yurok tribe to catch
25 fish from the ocean to donate them to the first salmon

1 ceremonies for the Karuk Tribe. And no one was able to
2 catch any.

3 So then we had to beg fishermen to donate some
4 salmon for the first salmon ceremonies (*Inaudible.*). And
5 people were going to charge a bunch of money because they
6 couldn't find any free salmon either. Finally they were
7 able to catch them. But it took, like, three separate
8 people driving to the coast and putting four salmon from
9 one cooler to another to get salmon to the first salmon
10 ceremonies for the Karuk Tribe this year, which I just
11 think is something that is really intense and hard.

12 And it was a lot of drama for people to even,
13 like, ask each other and to, like, face the fact that
14 they had to ask commercial fishermen. I mean, these are
15 salmon fishermen that were begging commercial fishermen
16 to get salmon to the first salmon ceremonies. And it was
17 just really a lot of work and really heartbreaking. And
18 it was so that four salmon could be cooked for ceremonies
19 and everyone could get like a bite, a couple bites of
20 fish.

21 So anyway, I have talked a lot at these
22 hearings. It's just something I hope never happens again
23 once you get these dams down. And I hope that the
24 permits can be issued quickly so that they can start to
25 recover fast.

1 But we're also buying time for these guys.

2 And I have wanted to tell that story for a
3 while so you guys just really understood how much work it
4 is to just even try to do the most basic things because
5 you can't have a first salmon ceremony without any
6 salmon.

7 So anyway -- so please take the dams down, and
8 that is it. And I still think you guys should leave if
9 they're not here, since they're taking so long.

10 *(Pause in proceedings.)*

11 MR. HILLMAN: My name is Leaf Hillman, L-E-A-F,
12 H-I-L-L-M-A-N.

13 I'm the director of natural resources and
14 environmental policy for Karuk Tribe and a resident of
15 this valley. And I will speak both in my professional
16 capacity as well as my personal capacity.

17 Well, I have been involved in this project
18 for -- since before it became a project, for many years
19 now. I understand the process of where we're at now and
20 the draft EIR. And I encourage folks to move forward
21 expeditiously to, at long last, accomplish what many of
22 us believe is the most important work of our lifetimes in
23 terms of reversing the many impacts and degradations that
24 this basin has suffered over the years from any number of
25 sources.

1 Dam removal is the single most important thing
2 that we can do in our lifetimes to promote the cause of
3 healing and restoration in this basin. I encourage folks
4 to say this is about the -- continue to hear some of the
5 same things that have been repeated over the years about
6 we need to do more studies. I would propose that the
7 time for studying has past and the time to remove the
8 dams is upon us and that we need to stay focused on the
9 task at hand which is removing dams on the Klamath River.

10 There will be those who want to create issues
11 with -- for the sake of dragging the process out. I
12 don't know. This is probably -- I'm not sure what year
13 it was now. But somewhere in -- around 2006 or
14 something like that, it doesn't seem that long ago. But
15 it's been a couple of years ago. And at that time, we
16 had a -- a hearing similar to this over across the river
17 over at the tribal office over there. And we had -- a
18 lot of our elders were there at that time and a lot of
19 folks who have since -- are no longer with us today. And
20 I was a much younger man at that time.

21 And my auntie said, "I want to go to this
22 meeting because I want to tell the government what they
23 have to do to do the right thing." And she couldn't hear
24 very good. And she was blind. And at that time, she had
25 broken her hip and she couldn't walk. But she still

1 wanted to go to the hearing. And she wanted to look at
2 the people who were there from FERC who were there
3 conducting this hearing.

4 And there was a table like this seated. And
5 because she's blind and she couldn't hear very good, she
6 asked me to sit her down in front of the table so she
7 could kind of see shadows because she wanted to be able
8 to hear them and kind of see what she could see.

9 It was frequently uncomfortable. I packed her
10 into the building and I put a chair right in front of the
11 table and set her in front of the FERC people that were
12 there conducting this hearing.

13 I asked her if she wanted to speak. And you
14 know how people who can't hear kind of speak a little
15 loud at times. And so I whispered in her ear. I said,
16 "Do you want to speak?"

17 And she said, "You damn right I want to speak."

18 I said, "What do you want to tell them?"

19 And she said, I want to tell them to go to
20 hell.

21 Of course, the whole room heard her. And so --
22 but she insisted on speaking and giving testimony. And
23 when she gave her formal testimony she said, "I'm 86
24 years old. And if someone would give me some dynamite, I
25 would float into that dam and blow it up. Because I've

1 lived my life."

2 And that would be a fitting thing to do because
3 she felt like she would be contributing and her life
4 would have been worthwhile if she could blow up the dams.

5 Turns out -- and I tell you that story because,
6 of course, she's no longer with us today. But a lot of
7 people who testified at that hearing with a great deal of
8 passion and have seen a lot of things on this river over
9 the years felt as strongly as she did.

10 We have a new generation now. Younger people
11 who -- who have never known really. You know, it's
12 like -- I've only been alive for 50 some odd years. And
13 in my lifetime, a lot of younger people here today can't
14 remember the things that I've seen in my lifetime on this
15 river. Each generation, we lose more.

16 And each generation likes to say we want to
17 leave things better than we found it for the next
18 generation. We all aspire this for our children, that we
19 leave them something that may be better than the way we
20 found it. We want to provide them with a better life and
21 more opportunities than we've had. And I fear that we're
22 going the opposite way at this point. And I think the
23 last couple of generations of people have suffered under
24 the burden of wanting to provide better opportunities and
25 a better life for our people, for our kids, and not being

1 able to do that. Not for the lack of trying.

2 But the dams on the Klamath River are a scourge
3 to our communities. And short of removing these dams, we
4 can't fix the problems that are -- we have on the
5 Klamath. But with removing dams on the Klamath River, we
6 have an opportunity, for the first time in a couple
7 generations, to leave a better world than we came into.

8 I was born right across the river from this
9 place, a few years ago. And I've never left this
10 community. This is the community that I was born and
11 raised in and am connected to. And I am in the process
12 of -- I won't say I'm ever done raising my kids. But I
13 have children in the range -- my youngest one is 14.
14 Oldest one is 39, something like that.

15 And every one of those kids in between, each of
16 those kids have a little different experience with the
17 Klamath River than the one before them. And that
18 experience is common and that's -- each successive kid
19 knows a little bit less about the Klamath River because
20 they have -- there's less of it to enjoy and to help
21 sustain in a physical sense and a spiritual sense.

22 We are salmon people. We're connected to this
23 place, this river, the fish. Spring Chinook Salmon
24 listing, we've petitioned for that listing, not because
25 we think that there's a law of Endangered Species Act

1 that's going to save them. We think the last ditch
2 effort to try to do something. It's not a silver bullet.
3 But if we don't do something, it's the cascading effects
4 of these dams, it's cumulating rapidly. And so I
5 encourage folks to keep your eye on the ball and let's
6 remove the dams on the Klamath River. And let's restore
7 the Klamath River to some semblance -- let's give it a
8 chance.

9 If we do nothing to restore the Klamath Basin
10 besides remove dams, well, that's something. Because
11 giving the fish and the system an opportunity to heal
12 itself, which -- turns out it's better equipped to heal
13 itself than we'll ever be to restore it.

14 So just allowing it to recover, it will do
15 that. Fish will recolonize the upper basin whether we do
16 anything or not. All we've got to do is get these dams
17 out of the way and let the fish figure it out.

18 So thank you for this opportunity.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

20 Did you -- do you want to speak?

21 MS. TALLEY: Hi. I wasn't planning on speaking
22 today. And I just feel that it's important to --

23 MS. RAGAZZI: Can you state your full name and
24 spell it?

25 MS. TALLEY: Sorry. I forgot the instructions.

1 My name is Sinead Talley, S-I-N-E-A-D, last
2 name, T-A-L-L-E-Y. I'm an Orleans community member;
3 lived here for most of my life. I'm of the generation
4 that Leaf was speaking about that has never seen a time
5 without dams on the Klamath River. And I guess I hadn't
6 thought about preparing any remarks for what I was going
7 to say. But I can only speak to my own experience. And
8 that's as a person who entered the work force here. And
9 I grew up in the community.

10 My first job was at the Mid Klamath Watershed
11 Council here in town as a stewardship intern which
12 quickly fell into interest in becoming a fisheries
13 technician a couple years later. So I did seasonal work
14 for six summers along the Klamath before entering my
15 current job now as grants agreements coordinator at the
16 Department of Natural Resources.

17 So I've been working in and along the river in
18 some capacity for most of my life for the last decade.
19 And I guess all I can really say is that I've seen
20 grown-ups seeing the work that people have been doing to
21 get dams removed. And that's been really impactful not
22 only on my development but in the work I have done in and
23 along the river where, especially during the years that I
24 was a fisheries technician with some of the worst years
25 of California droughts that -- you know, going -- we were

1 taking crews out, not only with, you know, air quality
2 masks on for some of -- or to get rid of some of the
3 smoke impacts but also going down into the river basin
4 and trying to count fish where there are no fish, trying
5 to -- I can remember there were times where we couldn't
6 even make our crews get into the water because the
7 quality was so poor. It smelled like propane in and
8 around any time you got near the water and that's been
9 more and more routine each year.

10 The fact that there's still opposition to dam
11 removal after so much evidence has clearly delineated the
12 very real impacts this is having, not only on the salmon
13 that we rely on -- I'm standing here today with fish
14 underneath my nails and my breath probably smells
15 terrible because I am, fortunately, still able to eat
16 fish and salmon here along the river. I don't know
17 that's going to continue.

18 Last year -- in 2018, I believe, was the second
19 lowest count ever recorded of Spring Chinook in the
20 Salmon River during the Salmon River dives. If I'm not
21 mistaken it was somewhere around 115 fish returning from
22 what used to be a run of hundreds of thousands. And
23 we're a primary source of food for a cut of people.

24 So like I said, I have -- I don't know where
25 I'm going with this except to say that this is absolutely

1 imperative that this not be postponed any longer.
2 Because as -- I've been grateful to work and learn from
3 many people in this room who have taught me a lot about
4 living along the river and what that means and how to
5 engage and contribute in a meaningful way.

6 So that's what I'm trying to do right now, as
7 much as my voice is shaking. And I'm not sure what I'm
8 exactly trying to say, but -- yeah. If -- I can't
9 understand why this would be delayed any longer. And, as
10 much as it's humanly possible to continue to push for a
11 dam removal, I think that's what we all have a
12 responsibility as human beings to do, especially in light
13 of the fact that climate change is increasingly impacting
14 our populations of all fish and wildlife and beings that
15 live along this river already.

16 So yeah, I don't have a lot more to say than
17 that. And I hope that some of the people that we were
18 waiting on to hear from today are also able to speak to
19 this because I know there's people who have dedicated
20 their lives to this work. And that's not for nothing.
21 Or it shouldn't be at least, because even -- I remember
22 when I was working for the Mid Klamath Watershed Council,
23 we would actually survey, not only from -- not only mid
24 Klamath tributaries. But we actually traveled, at least
25 a couple times a season, all the way to Iron Gate.

1 And to see how impactful that is, even just to
2 see this huge unnatural structure blocking this entire
3 river system and to know downstream, being someone who
4 lives downstream of that, what kind of impact that's
5 having on our people.

6 I mean, to see -- even just to see -- going out
7 into the field and have that -- come back not seeing fish
8 day after day, even though you're going a thousand feet
9 up every week that you're expected to go, that's
10 demoralizing. It's absolutely devastating. It was to
11 myself in my own mental health when I worked there. I
12 can't tell you how impactful that was on my depression
13 and anxiety about the state of the world that we live in
14 which seems to be increasingly worse by the day.

15 But -- so yeah. Anything that we can do to
16 mitigate those impacts is absolutely essential. And I
17 would -- I would urge anyone who is in a position to do
18 something about that to take a step forward and to make
19 that a priority.

20 Thank you.

21 *(Proceedings concluded at 2:49 p.m.)*

22
23
24
25

. . .

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CONNIE WEBB, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 61, are a true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes take on February 7, 2019.

Dated this 22nd day of February, 2019.

CONNIE WEBB, CSR NO. 10811