

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

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD STAFF PRESENTATION
SOLICITING COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

LOWER KLAMATH PROJECT LICENSE SURRENDER)
PUBLIC COMMENTS.)

~~~~~

Date: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2019

Time: 5:03 p.m.

Place: Best Western Miner's Inn  
122 East Miner Street  
Yreka, California 96097

Reporter: Carol J. Chase, CSR No. 13538  
COLEMAN REPORTERS  
P.O. Box 7  
Yreka, California 96097  
(707) 443-6465  
e-mail: office@colemanreporters.com

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 For State Water Resources Control Board:

- 4 PARKER THALER, Environmental Scientist, Lead Tech
- 5 ERIN RAGAZZI, Environmental Program Manager
- 6 MARIANNA AUE, Office of Chief Counsel, Legal Support
- 7 KRISTEN GANGL, Environmental Scientist
- 8 TIM MORAN, Office of Public Affairs

7

8 For Stillwater Sciences:

- 9 MAIA SINGER, Stillwater Sciences Senior Scientist/Water  
Quality Specialist, Consultant
- 10 LAUREN McCLURE, Stillwater Sciences, Consultant

---oOo---

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS INDEX:**

|    |                       | Page |
|----|-----------------------|------|
| 1  |                       |      |
| 2  |                       |      |
| 3  |                       |      |
| 4  | 1. Brandon Criss      | 30   |
| 5  | 2. Lisa Nixon         | 33   |
| 6  | 3. Bruce Ross         | 35   |
| 7  | 4. Stephen Fischer    | 37   |
| 8  | 5. Richard Marshall   | 38   |
| 9  | 6. Andrew Braugh      | 42   |
| 10 | 7. Robert J. Super    | 44   |
| 11 | 8. Betty Hall         | 45   |
| 12 | 9. Sheila Meamber     | 49   |
| 13 | 10. Monica Harle      | 52   |
| 14 | 11. Jenny Staats      | 54   |
| 15 | 12. Regina Chichicola | 56   |
| 16 | 13. Matt Cox          | 59   |
| 17 | 14. Chloe Utley       | 61   |
| 18 | 15. Don Mackintosh    | 63   |
| 19 | 16. James Corcoran    | 65   |
| 20 | 17. Nita Still        | 66   |
| 21 | 18. Marvin Gardner    | 67   |
| 22 | 19. Kevin Kiley       | 68   |
| 23 | 20. Esther Andrews    | 70   |
| 24 | 21. Rex Cozzalio      | 71   |
| 25 | 22. Bill Schmidt      | 75   |

**PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS INDEX (cont'd):**

|    |                        | Page |
|----|------------------------|------|
| 1  |                        |      |
| 2  |                        |      |
| 3  |                        |      |
| 4  |                        |      |
| 5  | 23. Don Meamber        | 76   |
| 6  | 24. John Foster        | 78   |
| 7  | 25. Ryck Kramer        | 79   |
| 8  | 26. Andy Marx          | 80   |
| 9  | 27. Thomas Joseph      | 83   |
| 10 | 28. Patricia Joseph    | 85   |
| 11 | 29. Devin Finegan      | 86   |
| 12 | 30. Marva Jones        | 88   |
| 13 | 31. Glen Spain         | 90   |
| 14 | 32. Jon Grunbaum       | 93   |
| 15 | 33. Francine Banzali   | 96   |
| 16 | 34. Allie Rosenbluth   | 98   |
| 17 | 35. Veronica Silva     | 100  |
| 18 | 36. Angelina Cook      | 101  |
| 19 | 37. Nicholas Hendricks | 102  |
| 20 | 38. Alex Watts-Tobin   | 104  |
| 21 | 39. Stefan Dosch       | 106  |
| 22 | 40. Vikki Preston      | 108  |
| 23 | 41. Isabella Tibbetts  | 110  |
| 24 | 42. Grace Warner       | 111  |
| 25 | 43. Wayne Hammar       | 111  |

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

**PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS INDEX (cont'd):**

|                        | Page |
|------------------------|------|
| 44. Taylor Tupper      | 113  |
| 45. Sammi Jo Goodwin   | 116  |
| 46. Malcolm Chichicola | 118  |
| 47. Al Khart           | 119  |
| 48. Chrissie Reynolds  | 120  |

**PUBLIC SPEAKER COMMENTS INDEX (cont'd):**

(filled out speaker card but did not speak)

- Susan Miller

- Jacob Reed

---oOo---



1 from the media here this evening.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's turned off.

3 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Okay. Can people hear  
4 that? Okay. I'll try again.

5 So the purpose of the meeting this evening is  
6 twofold. First, we're going to give a very brief  
7 presentation for an intro 101 of the Draft Environmental  
8 Impact Report so that when you look at it, you know  
9 where to find different pieces of information. Also, to  
10 let you know that I have to provide written comments.  
11 But what we're really here for this evening is to hear  
12 your comments. And so the focus of the evening is  
13 really, once we finish the presentation, we'll have you  
14 come up and provide public comments.

15 And we do have Carol here this evening. She's  
16 our court reporter and, to any extent possible when you  
17 come up, if you could state your name and spell it for  
18 her, that would be greatly appreciated. And if she  
19 motions to you to speak slower or repeat something, we  
20 do want to get your thoughts today and capture them  
21 appropriately.

22 I do you want to do a little bit of logistics.  
23 If you need to use the restroom, you go out this door,  
24 to the right is the women's and to the left is the mens.

25 And I want to emphasize that there are no

1 decisions being made here today. The purpose of this  
2 meeting is really to get public comments to inform the  
3 Environmental Impact Report, which is the environmental  
4 document for the water board's process.

5 So a little bit about the schedule, as I  
6 mentioned, we'll do a presentation and then focus on  
7 public comments. If you haven't done so already, we  
8 would appreciate it if you could sign it just so we know  
9 who is here today, how many folks showed up. That would  
10 be very much appreciated.

11 If you want to speak, grab one of these speaker  
12 cards right here and fill it out and you can hand it to  
13 Lauren McClure. Lauren is -- raise your hand.

14 MS. MARIANNA AUE: Lauren went to go call  
15 maintenance just in case --

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Oh, the microphone. She went --  
17 Lauren is right there. Lauren is raising her hand right  
18 now. You can hand your speaker cards to Lauren, and  
19 she'll make sure we get them. Now, we're going to  
20 figure out how much time each speaker has based upon the  
21 number of speaker cards we get.

22 So if you think you might want to speak, go  
23 ahead and put -- fill out a speaker card. If you're not  
24 positive, you can just say "if needed," and then when  
25 your name comes up, you can say "yes, I do want to



1 speak" or, "no," you don't at that time. But we want to  
2 make sure we have enough time for everybody. So if you  
3 can fill out a speaker card now or while staff are  
4 giving the presentation, that would allow us to time to  
5 figure out how many speakers we have.

6 A little bit on ground rules, make sure we have  
7 a successful meeting this evening, if everyone can turn  
8 off or silence their electronic devices, that would be  
9 greatly appreciated just so we have as few interruptions  
10 as possible and we can hear what folks have to say.

11 We want to make sure we respect all speakers  
12 and all points of view regardless of whether you -- you  
13 agree with the speaker or not. We want to make sure  
14 that only one person is speaking at a time. That's  
15 especially important because we want to make sure that  
16 Carol's able to capture all of the comments that are  
17 made this evening.

18 And we recognize that there's a short time  
19 frame potentially. So if you could, make sure that you  
20 respect the time frame for your public comments. That  
21 would be greatly appreciated. If we have extra time at  
22 the end, folks can come back up and provide additional  
23 supplemental comments as well.

24 And written comments are always an option as  
25 well. So if you don't -- if something pops into your

1 head after you leave here today or you want to  
2 supplement your public comments, we encourage you to  
3 make -- make those comments in a written format by the  
4 deadline which is February 26.

5 With that, I'm going to turn it over to  
6 Kristen Gangl.

7 MS. GANGL: Okay. So I'm just going to give a  
8 quick background on the project and then talk through  
9 the authorities related to the hydroelectric site  
10 inspection, why we're here today, although I think Erin  
11 covered that pretty well, and then I'll walk you through  
12 the Water Quality Certification process and then also  
13 the California Environmental Quality Act process. And  
14 then I'll hand it off to Parker, and he'll give you an  
15 overview of our Draft Environmental Impact Report.

16 So here we have a map of the project area. The  
17 three red squares in the upper right hand are the three  
18 locations. There's four dams. So the Klamath River  
19 Renewal Corporation or the KRRC, is what it's called,  
20 proposes to decommission and remove the four facilities  
21 shown here. Three in California, Iron Gate, Copco 1 and  
22 2 and one in Oregon, J.C. Boyle. All the facilities are  
23 currently owned by PacifiCorp but PacifiCorp, an  
24 applicant to KRRC, have filed a joint application with  
25 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to --

1 THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you speak louder,  
3 please?

4 MS. GANGL: Is this better?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's better.

6 MS. GANGL: Okay. So they filed a joint  
7 application with the Federal Energy Regulatory  
8 Commission to transfer the license to the KRRC and  
9 remove the facilities. The other facilities associated  
10 with the Klamath Hydroelectric Project will remain under  
11 PacifiCorp ownership.

12 If you want more specific details, there's a  
13 bunch in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and also  
14 in the definite plan that the KRRC released last June.

15 So when it comes to licensing hydroelectric  
16 projects, there's two main entities involved in  
17 California. One is that Federal Energy Regulatory  
18 Commission or FERC, and they're the federal agency that  
19 oversees other aspects of these projects: Operations,  
20 maintenance, everything.

21 At the state level in California, we have the  
22 State Water Resources Control Board or the State Water  
23 Board. And we're really looking at how the proposed  
24 project impacts water quality and associated beneficial  
25 uses. And so that's kind of a different -- FERC looks

1 at everything. We look at water quality.

2 So we are here today because the KRRC filed an  
3 application with the State Water Board for Water Quality  
4 Certification. And in order for the state water board  
5 to take action on that application, the State Water  
6 Board has to comply with the California Environmental  
7 Quality Act, CEQA.

8 And as we're working through the CEQA process,  
9 we released a Draft Environmental Impact Report or DEIR,  
10 and that's currently out for public review and comment  
11 and that's why we're here today.

12 So this is an image of the Water Quality  
13 Certification application process. In late 2016, the  
14 KRRC submitted an application for Water Quality  
15 Certification with the State Water Board. And so that  
16 kind of put in motion two processes: One, the FERC  
17 certification process; and one the CEQA process.

18 And in this case, we started working on the  
19 certification and the CEQA document at the same time.  
20 And we released the draft Water Quality Certification  
21 for public comment last June. And the comment period  
22 was open from June 7th to July 23rd of 2018.

23 We received a lot of great comments. We are in  
24 the process of reviewing those and incorporating those  
25 as appropriate into our certification. And so right

1 now, that's where we're at. We are considering all of  
2 those comments and updating our certification.

3 And then the last step, which we haven't  
4 reached yet, is we'll issue a final decision on that  
5 application for Water Quality Certification for the  
6 Lower Klamath Project.

7 So as I mentioned, there's two process --  
8 certification processes but also the CEQA process. CEQA  
9 requires an Environmental Impact Report or EIR in order  
10 to -- and that EIR will undertake a broad evaluation of  
11 the project potential significant environmental impacts,  
12 and it will identify ways to avoid, minimize, or  
13 mitigate those identified impacts where it's feasible.  
14 And it will also look at potential alternatives that are  
15 feasible and look at most of the project's goals.

16 And so these are our current processes with the  
17 Water Quality Certification. When we got the  
18 application in late 2016, we started working on the  
19 certification but, also, we started drafting an EIR.  
20 And that started with releasing a Notice of Preparation  
21 in December of 2016.

22 And we came up here and went to Arcata and had  
23 public meetings, took comments similar to today and also  
24 accepted written comments. We got over 1300 comments.  
25 And we compiled those into a scoping report that was

1 released in April of 2017 and is available online.

2 And then we drafted the EIR, and we released  
3 that in December of 2018. And so we're currently in the  
4 public comment period. That's why we're here today.

5 The next step after we close the comments will  
6 be to review it and consider all of those comments and  
7 issue a Final Environmental Impact Report.

8 So you can see how the two processes kind of  
9 work together and get us to where the State Water Board  
10 will take a final action on the KRRC's Water Quality  
11 Certification application.

12 And with that, I think I'll turn it over to  
13 Parker to talk specifically about the draft.

14 MR. THALER: I'm a little taller. Will it  
15 still work? Can everyone hear me okay? So I guess we  
16 kind of stand off to the side.

17 Well, thank you. For the second half of the  
18 presentation --

19 MULTIPLE UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Turn the mic  
20 on.

21 MR. THALER: Okay. I'll lean in a little bit.

22 MS. RAGAZZI: Or you can hold it.

23 MR. THALER: Okay. So for the second half of  
24 today's presentation, I'm going to be focussing on the  
25 Draft Environmental Impact Report or Draft EIR. And I

1 will be talking about its content and its organization.

2           And so on this slide, you can see that the  
3 Draft EIR was divided into two volumes. And volume 1  
4 has a section such as our executive summary, a  
5 description of the proposed project, environmental  
6 settings, impacts, and mitigation measures, as well as  
7 alternatives to the KRRC's proposed project and the  
8 other requirements of CEQA. And Volume 2 had 23  
9 appendixes that had detailed information to support the  
10 analysis in volume 1.

11           And what I plan to do is work through each of  
12 these sections describing a little bit about the  
13 contents of those sections and the first being the  
14 executive summary.

15           The executive summary provides a lot of useful  
16 information in our document such as an overview of the  
17 KRRC's proposed project, identification of areas of  
18 controversy, some details on our public involvement  
19 process and our CEQA objectives.

20           So when we evaluated in our EIR the proposed  
21 project as well as alternatives to the proposed project,  
22 we applied these objectives to the entire actions when  
23 we looked at them. And those objectives are listed in  
24 the executive summary of our EIR, but are summarized up  
25 here on the slide and include items like improving

1 long-term water quality conditions associated with the  
2 Lower Klamath Project, advancing long-term restoration  
3 of natural fish populations in the Klamath Basin,  
4 restoring volitional or unaided fish passage, and to  
5 reduce disease conditions to Klamath River salmonids.

6           And it's an important aspect to note here that  
7 the CEQA project objectives that are listed up on the --  
8 or summarized up here on the slide and listed in our  
9 environmental document differ from the KRRC's project  
10 objectives, which was to restore -- or remove sufficient  
11 portions of the Lower Klamath Project to create a  
12 free-flowing river and provide for volitional fish  
13 passage.

14           The next section -- or sorry. One last  
15 component of the executive summary that I wanted to  
16 highlight is Table ES-1. It's located at the back of  
17 the executive summary and includes a list of every  
18 single impact or mitigation measure or impact  
19 determination in our document. So it's a really useful  
20 tool if you're looking to tune into a certain portion of  
21 our document. And the portion of it is included on this  
22 slide.

23           The next session of your document is the  
24 introduction section. And, basically, it includes a  
25 summary of different sections of our document similar to



1 what I'm providing today, as well as some details of  
2 where information came from. And I wanted to highlight  
3 some of those key sources in our presentation. The  
4 first being public comments.

5 As Kristen mentioned, the State Water Board  
6 released a Notice of Preparation back in December of  
7 2016 and we held public meetings as well as public  
8 comment period. And during that process, we received  
9 over 1300 public comments of which we reviewed and  
10 considered when we developed our Draft EIR which we  
11 released in December of last year.

12 Another key component was tribal consultation  
13 and meetings. And we noted two different processes  
14 here: Formal Assembly Bill 52 Government to Government  
15 Tribal Consultation. And that did occur with the Shasta  
16 Indian Nation, the Shasta Nation, and the Yurok tribe as  
17 part of developing our document. Additionally, we had  
18 discussions with other Native American tribes such as  
19 the Yurok -- I'm sorry -- such as the Karuk and the  
20 Hoopa Valley tribe.

21 Other informational sources included  
22 information from federal, local, and state entities, as  
23 well as federal and state environmental documents, and  
24 a -- a large body of scientific information as well as  
25 information provided by the KRRC, which was included in

1 their application and additional filings, all of which  
2 we've posted on our Web site. And I'll have a link up  
3 to that site at the end -- near the end of the  
4 presentation.

5 Our next section in our document is section 2,  
6 the proposed project. And that section includes a  
7 description of the KRRC's proposed project, which  
8 essentially includes the removal of four hydroelectric  
9 facilities: JC Boyle, which is located in Oregon,  
10 Copco No. 1, Copco No. 2, and Iron Gate, which are all  
11 located in California, and details on their project such  
12 as their information on their drawdown rate and  
13 restoration are included in section 2.

14 And for what I believe is our largest section  
15 in volume 1, section 3 environmental studies, impacts,  
16 and mitigation measures, upon this slide, there's a  
17 large list of resource areas. And each of these  
18 resource areas are the areas that we analyzed in our  
19 document as part of section 3. And I won't go through  
20 the whole list but, to name a few, we have items such as  
21 water quality, aquatic resources, historical and tribal,  
22 public services, utilities and traffic and  
23 transportation.

24 And each -- for each resource area, we  
25 applied -- or organized them via five components. And

1 those are listed here, which was area of analysis. And  
2 the area of analysis is a description of the physical  
3 limits of the proposed project's potential effects to a  
4 different resource. And I would note here that an area  
5 of analysis for different resources can vary by that  
6 resource. And I'll -- as they go through, I will be  
7 providing examples of each of these to -- to better  
8 explain.

9           And then our next item is environmental setting  
10 or the baseline, which is the existing condition or  
11 condition that is currently there prior to the project  
12 occurring.

13           Our next item is significance criteria. And  
14 significance criteria is a criteria used to compare  
15 action to the baseline to determine the severity of an  
16 impact. So, essentially, it -- it sets kind of a  
17 benchmark; that you're looking at a project's effect to  
18 a baseline to determine if that effect would be  
19 significant.

20           Our next item is an impact analysis approach,  
21 which describes how the analysis of a potential effect  
22 was undertaken for each environmental resource. And the  
23 final category or the final component of each of those  
24 resource areas is potential impacts and mitigation.

25           And in that section, we identify potential

1 impacts associated with the proposed projects. We  
2 analyze those potential impacts, and we describe any  
3 feasible mitigation measures for the impact that would  
4 reduce the significance.

5           And so to run through an example of each of  
6 these for one of the actual sections in our document,  
7 the -- the water quality section, because water quality  
8 is one of the focuses of the State Water Board, up on  
9 this slide is an example of what an area of analysis  
10 looks like and -- or it's straight out of our document  
11 for the water quality area of analysis.

12           Essentially, our area of analysis for water  
13 quality included just above JC Boyle on the Klamath  
14 River running all the way through JC Boyle reservoir  
15 down river through Copco No. 1, Copco No. 2, and  
16 Iron Gate.

17           The lower 190 river miles of the Klamath River,  
18 including the Klamath River estuary and out into the  
19 Pacific near shore environment. So, essentially, the  
20 area of analysis for water quality was -- started just  
21 above JC Boyle continuously running out to the Pacific  
22 Ocean.

23           And in this case, the area of analysis looked  
24 at potential impacts quite a distance away from the  
25 proposed project. And I just note the different colors

1 just signify different areas of analysis so we could  
2 focus discussion for impact determination.

3           Our next section is the baseline. And as I  
4 said before is the environmental setting or current  
5 condition. And that includes information to inform  
6 current condition and can include items like our  
7 understanding of general processes. So that the figure  
8 I listed here is a standard, general reservoir  
9 stratification process where how the water column  
10 separates throughout to season and then remixes which  
11 does occur in -- in Iron Gate Reservoir.

12           And then for our significance criteria which  
13 was the benchmark or the -- the criteria we're setting  
14 to analyze potential impact in comparison to the  
15 baseline, those are summarized on this PowerPoint, on  
16 this slide as well as our impact analysis approach. And  
17 in summary, our significance criteria for water quality  
18 was in exceedance or substantially contribute to an  
19 existing exceedance of a water quality standard.

20           Positive change in water quality that would  
21 result in a failure to meet existing beneficial use of  
22 water or to protect existing water quality or result in  
23 substantial adverse impacts to human, health, or  
24 environmental receptors.

25           And for our impact analysis approach, we

1 discussed the different time frames that were  
2 established to look at these impacts in the short and  
3 long term. We defined water quality parameters for  
4 items such as dissolved oxygen, temperature, PH. And we  
5 describe the models used to help perform impact  
6 analysis.

7           And so for the final section of those five  
8 components that I was showing that -- how they're like  
9 for each resource area is potential impacts of  
10 mitigation measures. And a potential impact -- an  
11 impact analysis can vary wildly in the number of pages  
12 that it includes, and so I did my best to try and  
13 provide a summary of one up on the slide today.

14           And so taken from our document, one of our  
15 potential impacts that we analyzed was a short-term or a  
16 long-term alteration in water temperature due to  
17 conversion of reservoirs through a river condition. And  
18 part of the impact analysis approach that we did is  
19 looking at current temperatures or existing conditions  
20 and bottle temperatures of what the conditions would  
21 look like without dams, you can -- you can understand  
22 that water temperatures below Iron Gate Dam can be 4 to  
23 18 degrees Fahrenheit warmer with the dams in in the  
24 summer and the fall than with the dams out. But on the  
25 flip side, water temperatures below Iron Gate dam can be

1 found to be 2 to 5 degrees cooler in the spring.

2 And so as part of that analysis, you'll get  
3 implementation of the proposed project would remove  
4 those impacts that the dams currently have to  
5 temperature. And so our significance determination in  
6 this situation found it to be beneficial in the  
7 hydroelectric reach in middle Klamath River down to the  
8 Salmon River. And then for a second area, because our  
9 impact can be set up time scale or geographic.

10 We had a second area which was from the Salmon  
11 River to the Pacific Ocean, which we found that  
12 implementation of the proposed project would have no  
13 significant impact. And so for this example, no  
14 mitigation measures were necessary, because we weren't  
15 exceeding one of the significance criteria listed in our  
16 document.

17 So it kind of discussed a little bit about  
18 these leading up till now. But when you compare an  
19 impact to the baseline for the significance criteria,  
20 you can end up with one of these determinations. And  
21 they range from beneficial to a significant unavoidable  
22 as mitigation measures. And in the middle, you have a  
23 no significant impact, or you can have a no significant  
24 impact with mitigation. And in that situation, it's --  
25 it's mitigating an impact that would have been

1 significant to a level that is not.

2 And we just wanted to note, as they did  
3 earlier, that impact determination, there can be  
4 multiple determinations on an impact because impact can  
5 vary over time scale and it can vary geographically. So  
6 in that previous slide, we have two because of the  
7 different geographic regions in the lower Klamath River.

8 So taking us up out of the water quality  
9 section and looking at the broader section 3 of our  
10 document, these are all the resource areas that I listed  
11 prior. And using or looking at these potential impact  
12 types, looking at one end of the spectrum, the one that  
13 is listed as beneficial, for items listed in purple --  
14 resources areas listed in purple -- I apologize -- these  
15 are resource areas where at least one impact was  
16 determined to have a short- and long-term beneficial  
17 effects associated with the KRRC's proposed project.

18 And for items listed in blue are areas where at  
19 least one impact in that -- potential impact in that  
20 section had a long-term beneficial effect but not as  
21 necessarily a short-term. And that's not to say that  
22 the project's impacts to a resource area in general such  
23 as water quality is beneficial, but what this is  
24 explaining is that at least one impact of the multiple  
25 impacts that we know in that section was determined to



1 be beneficial.

2           And to move to the other end of the spectrum,  
3 the significant and unavoidable. Listed on this slide  
4 are a few colors as well. And then the orange are  
5 resource areas where there's at least one short-term  
6 significant unavoidable impact associated with  
7 implementation of the project.

8           And in green, our resource areas where there's  
9 at least one that is short-term and long-term. And for  
10 the one blue, flood hydrology, there is a long-term  
11 potential significant impacts but no short-term. And  
12 again, that isn't to say that the project's effects in  
13 general to something such this aesthetics is significant  
14 and unavoidable, but what it means is that at least one  
15 impact to aesthetics is significant and unavoidable, in  
16 this case, in the short and long term.

17           And to move on to section 4, section 4 includes  
18 alternatives to the KRRRC's proposed project. When we  
19 developed these alternatives, we considered all the  
20 public comments that we received on the Notice of  
21 Preparation as well as looking at some of the previous  
22 environmental documents and alternatives.

23           And our section -- in section 4, there's a  
24 portion called section 4.1 that talks about every single  
25 alternative that was submitted in a comment and whether

1 or not it was carried forward. And of the ones that we  
2 carried forward, they are listed on this slide and  
3 include items such as partial removal, which included  
4 removal enough of each facility to create a free-flowing  
5 river but leaving components of just perhaps the  
6 powerhouse or a penstock.

7 Continued operations with fish passage which  
8 envisioned dams remain in place and operate in some  
9 capacity under some ownership with fish facilities. A  
10 two dam removal alternative which envisioned Copco No. 2  
11 and JC Boyle remaining but Copco No. 1 and Iron Gate  
12 being removed.

13 A three dam removal, which would remove Copco  
14 No. 1, Copco No. 2, and Iron Gate but maintain JC Boyle.  
15 We also analyzed the impacts of potentially not having a  
16 hatchery, as well as a no project alternative.

17 So with that, comments on our comment period  
18 are due by noon of February 26. And there's an e-mail  
19 address listed on this slide, which is also included on  
20 the document at the back of the room known as the Notice  
21 of Availability, as well as a physical mailing address.  
22 And so please make comments if you have any.

23 I would also note that the Lower Klamath  
24 Project Web page, the State Water Board has one that  
25 they maintain and they post a lot of relevant

1 information related to their process. And it's a -- a  
2 good resource to check out and stay up to date on what's  
3 going on.

4           And for my last item of how to stay informed.  
5 I would refer to that document that I mentioned at the  
6 back of the room, the Notice of Availability because it  
7 has this information included in it, as well as how to  
8 sign up for the State Water Board's e-mail subscription  
9 list, which I think is one of the best ways to stay up  
10 to date of whenever we take a large action on this  
11 project. It goes out through our e-mail subscription  
12 list to everybody who subscribed. Instructions are  
13 listed here but also at the back, as well as the Web  
14 link and you can sign up specifically just for this  
15 project.

16           And with that, I'll turn it over to Erin.  
17 Thank you.

18           MS. RAGAZZI: Thanks, Parker.

19           So I just want to do a check. Has everybody  
20 who wants to speak this evening provided a card to  
21 Lauren in the back of the room? Is there anyone else  
22 that needs to fill out a speaker card at this time?  
23 Great.

24           I do want to take a moment to actually  
25 introduce Maia Singer. Maia is with Stillwater

1 Sciences. That was our -- Stillwater Sciences is our  
2 consultant for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.  
3 So Lauren and Maia are with Stillwater, and I wanted to  
4 make sure that I introduced Maia, because I overlooked  
5 her earlier so...

6 I do want to note that the PowerPoint  
7 presentation that we went over is posted on our Web  
8 site, so it's on that Lower Klamath Project Web page.  
9 So if you want to get a copy of it, the Notice of  
10 Availability has the Web page there, so you can grab  
11 that.

12 It looks like we have quite a lot of folks who  
13 are going to want to provide public comments this  
14 evening. I'm happy to hear that. We're happy to be  
15 here and facilitate that.

16 We're going to have three minutes per speaker.  
17 If we have additional time at the end, folks can come  
18 back and provide supplemental comments depending on, you  
19 know, the amount of time that we have left at that  
20 point.

21 So just to reiterate a couple of the ground  
22 rules and public comment items to help Carol out, when  
23 you come up here, please make sure you state your name  
24 and spell your first and last name for Carol, so she can  
25 get it correctly in the record. Please use the

1 microphone because everybody else wants to hear your  
2 comments today as well and respect the time limits. I  
3 also want to remind folks, please make sure only one  
4 person is speaking at a time so we don't make it more  
5 difficult than it already is to transcribe on many hours  
6 on end.

7           And with that, I'm going to go through the  
8 first five speakers. I'm going to take them in batches  
9 so people know when to come up. So first, we have the  
10 Chairman of Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors  
11 Brandon Criss, followed by Supervisor Nixon, followed by  
12 Bruce Ross with the office of member -- Assembly Member  
13 Brian Dahle.

14           I'm going to move the microphone here so you  
15 don't have to hold it.

16           MR. CRISS: All right.

17           MS. MARIANNA AUE: We can't have people --

18           MS. RAGAZZI: Stephen R. Fischer will be the  
19 fourth speaker and then followed by Richard Marshall.

20           Your name, first and last --

21           MR. CRISS: All right.

22           MS. RAGAZZI: -- and spelling.

23           MR. CRISS: All right.

24           Hi, my name is Brandon Criss. I'm current  
25 Chair of the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors.

1           Siskiyou County appreciates the opportunity to  
2 comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the  
3 Lower Klamath Project. Tonight, the county's comments  
4 will be limited to highlighting a few of the concerns.  
5 Our nat- -- our environmental consultants have  
6 identified in this initial review of the Draft EIR.  
7 These are only primary highlights and the county will be  
8 submitting its final written comments to the State Water  
9 Control Resources Board at a later date prior to  
10 February 26.

11           The county's first concern is that many  
12 sections of the Draft EIR rely on future surveys and  
13 studies to identify resources or habitats that are in  
14 the project area making the impact analysis unreliable.

15           An EIR must include a description of the  
16 physical environmental, environmental conditions in the  
17 vicinity of the project as they exist at the time of the  
18 Notice of Preparation or at the time of the commencement  
19 of an environmental analysis. This description  
20 generally constitutes the baseline physical conditions  
21 by which a lead agency determines whether impact is  
22 significant. Here, the EIR relies on future surveys and  
23 studies to identify wetlands, special status plants,  
24 culturally significant plants, special status wildlife,  
25 and groundwater wells among others.

1           This hinders realistic and accurate impact  
2 determinations which are evaluated by comparing expected  
3 environmental conditions after project implementation to  
4 the existing baseline conditions. It is also very  
5 concerning that much of the underlying data that is  
6 relied on in the EIR for impact determinations is  
7 primarily decades old data that no longer reflects  
8 existing conditions.

9           The county's second concern is that the Draft  
10 EIR considers a prop- -- proposed project that is not  
11 yet stably defined. The definite plan is still being  
12 reviewed for technical adequacy among other things by  
13 FERC and an independent board of consultants, and KRRC  
14 has recently agreed to submit an updated definite plan  
15 to FERC by April 29th, 2019.

16           Given the potential for changes to the proposed  
17 project by KRRC are changes that may result from the  
18 pending FERC review of the definite plan. The project  
19 is essentially in flux and the Water Board's failure to  
20 wait for FERC's input on the definite plan prior to  
21 forging ahead with the Draft EIR has set the stage for  
22 an environmental analysis that is inadequate.

23           The Water Board's failure to wait for the  
24 definite plan also create the potential for future  
25 amendments to the Draft EIR requiring recirculation,

1 which results in financial hardship to economically  
2 stress -- stress stakeholders and local agencies such as  
3 Siskiyou County.

4 Finally, the EIR prepares to use, "recommended  
5 measures" as a substitute for feasible mitigation  
6 measures. Under CEQA's guidelines, it is the policy of  
7 the state that public agencies should not approve  
8 projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives  
9 or feasible mitigation measures available which would  
10 substantially lessen the significant environmental  
11 effects of such projects. The recommended measures that  
12 are throughout to Draft EIR should be identified as  
13 mitigation measures to ensure the implementation.

14 I'm getting the hint here. Thank you for your  
15 time. And the county appreciates being able to speak on  
16 the subject. Here's my written comment.

17 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

18 MR. CRISS: Thank you.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

20 [Applause.]

21 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Supervisor Nixon followed  
22 by Bruce Ross followed by Stephen Fischer.

23 MS. NIXON: All right. Thank you.

24 My name is Lisa, L-I-S-A, Nixon, N-I-X-O-N.

25 I'm speaking to you this evening as a private



1 individual, a citizen of Yreka and Siskiyou County and  
2 as -- as an individual member of the county board of  
3 supervisors.

4 I echo our Board Chair Supervisor  
5 Brandon Criss' comments, because they -- they were  
6 provided on behalf of our entire board. I do feel  
7 compelled, however, to speak to you on one aspect and  
8 this is largely extemporaneous.

9 I -- I harken back to the comments of my  
10 grandfather and my father and my uncles about the  
11 pre-river conditions before the dams. And they -- they  
12 mirror largely Mr. Cozzalio's comments that he's made to  
13 you through the years. So sometimes it's hard for me to  
14 reconcile what is happening here today.

15 I want to touch on the very important point of  
16 the phraseology used in your very detailed report, and I  
17 thank you for your care and detail, the "recommended  
18 mitigation measures." Well, "recommended," I -- I do  
19 not understand the legal ramifications of this  
20 terminology. I don't know what the legal enforceability  
21 of that terminology is. There may be some. I just  
22 don't understand it at this point.

23 Siskiyou County has been advocating for  
24 years -- for many years before I came on the board  
25 against dam removal largely, not entirely, but largely

1 because no one has been able to give us definitive  
2 mitigation measures that would result in the citizens of  
3 your county not holding the bag for any insufficiently  
4 mitigated negative impacts. It seems like we're moving  
5 closer to that point, but recommended mitigation  
6 measures are not good enough for me.

7 We are looking to all of the players in this  
8 proposal, especially the project proponent KRRC and FERC  
9 and now to our Water Board to give us certainty on what  
10 mitigation measures will be taken. We need certainty,  
11 we need them to be enforceable so that our citizens  
12 are -- are not left with the adverse impact. So I thank  
13 you for your care.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Here, here.

15 [Applause.]

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

17 Bruce Ross.

18 MR. ROSS: Good evening.

19 Bruce Ross. That's B-R-U-C-E, R-O-S-S. And  
20 I'm the district director for Assemblyman Brian Dahle,  
21 and that's B-R-I-A-N, D-A-H-L-E.

22 The Assemblyman regrets that he wasn't able to  
23 be here tonight, but he did ask me to speak on his  
24 behalf. A lot of people are going to have a lot to say,  
25 so I will be brief. You know, this -- this debate and

1 discussion and analysis of this proposed dam removal --  
2 removal project has been going on for 10 to 15 years  
3 now, more like 15 at this point. And there's been a lot  
4 of reports and a lot studies and this is the latest  
5 analysis of it.

6           Given that really exhaustive background, one of  
7 the most recognized things in the EIR is a section about  
8 issues to be resolved. And there's one extraordinary  
9 sentence in it and it says, "The degree of environmental  
10 impacts and benefits for the proposed restoration  
11 project are issues to be resolved as is the potential  
12 for mitigation of impacts both within and outside of the  
13 Water Board's purview."

14           And I'll -- I'll be honest, it's striking to  
15 read an EIR -- I mean, the point of it is to resolve  
16 those impacts and to find mitigations for them. So if  
17 the Draft EIR doesn't have all that information done,  
18 it -- it seems that it's just not a finished product  
19 yet, so I don't know why it's being circulated. And I  
20 appreciate the candor of the report that it says that  
21 but, nonetheless, it doesn't seem like it's a completed  
22 report.

23           You know, people in Siskiyou County have long  
24 been saying that pulling the plugs on these dams and  
25 letting 15 million tons of sediment run downstream is

1 precisely what you not want to do in the habitat of  
2 protecting salmon in a river with existing water quality  
3 problems. So I think everyone appreciates that the  
4 water quality of the dam removal are being taken  
5 seriously. It just doesn't seem like it's been  
6 resolved.

7           And in that vein, you know, if after all of  
8 this work has been done and the state is coming out with  
9 a report that says, "Well, we don't really know what --  
10 we haven't resolved the benefits and the impacts yet, we  
11 don't have the mitigation resolved, those are issues  
12 we're working on," why are we here? If the state, after  
13 pushing this for 15 years, can't answer those questions  
14 in a straightforward way, why are we here?

15           Anyway, thank you.

16           [Applause.]

17           MS. RAGAZZI: Stephen Fischer followed by  
18 Richard Marshall followed by Andrew Braugh followed by  
19 Robert J. Super.

20           MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

21           Stephen, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, Fischer, F-I-S-C-H-E-R.

22           I'm a -- I'm a long time resident of the  
23 Klamath River and if you take the dams out, the water  
24 isn't going to get hotter -- or it's going to get  
25 hotter. It's not going to get cold. There's going to

1 be less water going down the river. And without any  
2 snowpack or any water and, during the winter, we aren't  
3 going to have enough water. That water is going to go  
4 down.

5 We used to walk across. I was down there  
6 before the dams were put in, we could walk across the  
7 Klamath River over the rocks and get our -- our socks  
8 wet and tennis shoes.

9 If you take them dams out, there's not going to  
10 be enough water for fish to come up there. All the fish  
11 are -- are going to stop. They're going to be beat up,  
12 tore up. And the salmon can't make it. The steelhead  
13 will be tore up so bad you can't get 'em up the creeks.

14 And there will be a -- an influx of eels and  
15 sucker fish on the bottoms of the river. And it's  
16 terrible. I've been swimming in it getting suckered by  
17 an eel. That's not a good thing.

18 If you take the dams out, all the agriculture  
19 is going to get on -- they can only use it certain  
20 amount per day, per week, a few days per week. It's  
21 going to ruin all the agriculture. You take the dams  
22 out, you're going to kill us all. It's bullshit.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. MARSHALL: Richard Marshall, R-I-C-H-A-R-D,  
25 M-A-R-S-H-A double L. I'm the president of the

1 Siskiyou County Water Users Association. Is there a  
2 director here from the Water Board? Actual director?  
3 No.

4 Thank you once again for taking care of us  
5 citizens here in Siskiyou County but making sure that  
6 people who make the decision don't get to come up here  
7 and hear us firsthand.

8 The last time we met was July 2018. Our group  
9 submitted comments at your request to assist in the  
10 Water Board's preparation of the EIR regarding Klamath  
11 dams. As part of that information, we provided a report  
12 on the PDO, Pacific Decadal Oscillation. And as usual,  
13 it seems comments that we make, whether from the county  
14 or our group or the citizens in general, we don't get  
15 appropriate consideration on the issues that we submit.

16 We are the group that's most impacted by the  
17 removal of the hydroelectric dams, not you in Sacramento  
18 or in other areas throughout the state who think this is  
19 a good thing to remove the dams.

20 A total of 1800 pages you've put together,  
21 amazingly regurgitates the outdated 2012 EIR done by  
22 DOI, a document which was questioned by Dr. Paul Hauzer,  
23 former quality control officer from the DOI. I object  
24 again to taxpayer funds being devoted to the effort to  
25 remove our dams that we have by popular vote indicated

1 that they should be kept. You don't listen to the  
2 citizens.

3 Now, one of the issues I would like to bring up  
4 in particular, because I think it's interesting when you  
5 read that entire report, you don't see much about  
6 historical context of the river prior to the dams. And  
7 many times, we talk about issues that have nothing to do  
8 with the history of the dams which I think is really  
9 important -- history of the river, I should say, before  
10 the dams.

11 In the 1850s, one gentleman was mentioning here  
12 there was an 1855 report by Commissioner Money Penny  
13 which basically said that there were problems back in  
14 1855 with the river producing fish and the -- and the  
15 Native Americans were restless and they had problems  
16 along the river because the fish were in short supply.  
17 So the fish aren't always there as some of the Native  
18 Americans would like to have you believe and they say  
19 "since time immemorial fish have been coming here."  
20 That's not true.

21 The historic conditions effect in the Klamath  
22 River prior to the construction of the dams includes the  
23 information I just read. There's another very reliable  
24 report from Glenn Briggs who's not here, I guess, with  
25 us this evening, maybe he is, a retired civil engineer

1 with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. His family history  
2 goes back to the 1860s along the Klamath River, which  
3 was his home -- family home was situated in the area of  
4 Happy Camp.

5 And I'll just read something briefly from  
6 there. We're going to include this in our written  
7 report when we get that done. I'll get to it here in a  
8 second.

9 So he describes in the late summer through the  
10 fall the dry conditions of the river, which is the issue  
11 that is very difficult to deal with if you don't have  
12 the dams to flush the river.

13 In George Gibbs Journal of Redick McKee's  
14 Expedition through Northwestern California in 1851,  
15 which was published in Archaeological Research Report  
16 from the Department of Anthropology -- I'm going to get  
17 the hook here. They indicate that the Klamath River  
18 contrasting with the Trinity River had a taint because  
19 of its origin; that means it's origin in Lower Klamath  
20 Lake because of the blue-green algae because of the lack  
21 of water, it is known as the stinky river --

22 You going to cut me short here?

23 MS. RAGAZZI: I want to make sure everybody has  
24 an opportunity to comment. You're welcome to come back  
25 later.



1 MR. MARSHALL: There's one more thing.

2 So this gentleman who is educated and worked  
3 for the Bureau of Reclamation talks about his family  
4 history going back then that the river was always a  
5 problem. I know Glenn Spain would like to think  
6 differently. Right, Glenn?

7 But in fact, it's not true. It was always bad.  
8 There was always a problem with fish in the late year.  
9 Taking the dams out, that's what we're talking about  
10 returning to, spend hundreds of millions of dollars to  
11 get back to a situation that was untenable to begin  
12 with.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Richard.

15 Andrew Braugh followed by Robert Super followed  
16 by Betty Hall followed by Sheila Meamber.

17 MR. BRAUGH: Good evening. My name is  
18 Andrew Braugh, A-N-D-R-E-W, B-R-A-U-G-H.

19 Thank you for your presentation. I appreciate  
20 your time tonight. I'm here on behalf of California  
21 Trout. We are a private 50- -- 501(c)(3) that solves  
22 complex natural resources issues by balancing the needs  
23 of water, people, and fish.

24 I believe that an abundance of wild fish  
25 indicates healthy waters, and that healthy waters mean a

1 better California. We strongly support this dam removal  
2 project and a free-flowing Klamath River.

3 We are pleased that the Draft EIR confirms that  
4 the proposed project will have long-term benefits  
5 associated with protecting water quality which, in turn,  
6 ensures a healthier aquatic habitat, greater spawning  
7 opportunities, and a reduction in the incidence of fish  
8 disease. Many species of fish are imperiled in  
9 California and my organization is committed --

10 THE COURT REPORTER: Can you -- I -- can you  
11 back up a little? I can't hear you clearly.

12 MR. BRAUGH: How's that?

13 THE COURT REPORTER: I think so. Back up just  
14 a bit, please.

15 MR. BRAUGH: How am I doing now?

16 THE COURT REPORTER: Back up on your wording or  
17 what you were reading.

18 MR. BRAUGH: Back up on my wording.

19 Many species? Right there?

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.

21 MR. BRAUGH: Many species of fish are imperiled  
22 in California and my organization is committed to  
23 restoring fisheries' vitality around the state. This  
24 project will remove the dams that now serve as barriers  
25 that block migration upstream to high quality habitat.

1 The removal of the Copco 1 and 2 and Iron Gate dams as  
2 well as the JC Boyle dam in Oregon is the best chance to  
3 once again give native salmon and steelhead access to  
4 the clean, cold water of their historic spawning  
5 riparian habitat.

6 We have extensively studied the issue of the  
7 Klamath River dam removal and support scientific  
8 evidence demonstrating that fish can and will return to  
9 the upper regions of the watershed even in areas that  
10 have been blocked for decades or more.

11 In addition, revival of the salmon-steelhead  
12 fisheries on this river system will provide economic  
13 benefits to the region by creating local jobs and  
14 boosting tourism and recreation in the area.

15 Cal Trout asks that our support for the project  
16 to remove Klamath River dams be answered in this public  
17 record.

18 Thank you.

19 (Phone interruption in proceedings.)

20 [Applause.]

21 MS. RAGAZZI: So Robert.

22 MR. SUPER: Robert J. Super, R-O-B-E-R-T, J,  
23 S-U-P-E-R.

24 I would like to say that the -- the reports  
25 that you were given are -- we have a division of natural

1 resources that have comments about there being algae  
2 and -- and to back up what you were saying. And we  
3 believe that if you take the dams out that the dams that  
4 are in there, they are -- the water that goes through  
5 them has -- it doesn't go to agriculture.

6           And this last -- last year, we only gathered  
7 salmon for our ceremonies. We didn't gather like we  
8 usually do. So we were trying to help our salmon get  
9 through and so we were letting them go, the Yuroks, the  
10 Karuks, and the Hoopas.

11           And that sediment that we talked about, you  
12 know, it will -- it will affect for a little while, but  
13 our salmon will come back and they talk about when  
14 they're taking out the dams that they will be taking 'em  
15 out during the off season when the salmon aren't coming  
16 up, so we won't -- the salmon won't be able to come  
17 through.

18           And that's all I got to say. Thank you.

19           [Applause.]

20           MS. RAGAZZI: So Betty Hall followed by  
21 Sheila Meamber followed by Monica Harle followed by  
22 Jenny Staats.

23           MS. HALL: Hello. I'm Betty Hall, B-E-T-T-Y,  
24 H-A-L-L. I am a liaison for the Shasta Nation.

25           Well, I've been trying to get through that big,

1 big report. But when I got, you know, as I think you  
2 already know, there's a lot I don't agree with. And all  
3 week I went over and over it and I still -- still see  
4 some of the same things still there. But when I got to  
5 the section of the Quartz Valley Reservation, I was  
6 absolutely -- almost terrified. That whole section  
7 needs to be deleted completely, totally.

8           When you recommend -- well, they said there's  
9 Shasta and Karok Indians were on that reservation --

10           THE COURT REPORTER: Shasta and which Indian?

11           MS. HALL: Shasta and Karok Indian. And you  
12 state that if you want to know about the culture and  
13 history of the Shasta Indians, read what we have written  
14 about the Karok tribe. That is so wrong. That is so  
15 different. We are so different people.

16           I grew up on that reservation. My father  
17 started that reservation all by himself. He got in his  
18 little car and headed down to Sacramento and started  
19 wheels turning and then the reservation came about.

20           We moved there when I was four years old from  
21 Mugginsville, which is three miles on up the road. I  
22 grew up on that reservation. And what I observed is  
23 differences between the Wicks family that was Shasta.  
24 That's my family. My maiden name is Wicks.

25           And there was also Mark Purcell [phonetic]

1 there. He was Shasta and some Karok, but he did not get  
2 along with the Karok people there very often. He was  
3 calling the police on them a lot a -- a number of times.

4 But I represent what I saw, the children on  
5 that reservation, most of them my playmates, they  
6 suffered terribly. They were terribly neglected. They  
7 almost starved.

8 One couple would leave their little kids for  
9 two weeks or more. My father would go check on 'em.  
10 Here's a little one sitting on the floor trying to eat  
11 flour, only thing in the house, putting it in his mouth.  
12 He brought 'em all home, bed 'em down in our living  
13 room, mother would take care of 'em till the parents  
14 finally came back to get their kids. They knew where to  
15 come find their children, because my parents had 'em.  
16 My mother and father used to take care of 'em, or they'd  
17 come by hungry. It -- it was hard to watch.

18 And then the school. I went to school with 'em  
19 at Quartz Valley School. One little boy was about maybe  
20 first, second grade and, all of a sudden in the  
21 classroom, he just bursted out sobbing so hard. The  
22 teacher ran up to him and said "What's the matter? Are  
23 you hurt? Are you sick?" Finally, he says, "I'm  
24 hungry."

25 They were starving. Most of those children and

1 almost every one of those Karok families were always  
2 hungry. It's hard to watch.

3 And it -- I grew up with this. I saw it. I  
4 watched it. It's hard -- then one day cars came in --  
5 white cars came in. I don't know if it was from the  
6 welfare department or whatever and picked up all the  
7 kids and they went to Chemawa to go to school. I think  
8 possibly the teacher may have recommended that, because  
9 she saw that they were hungry and they didn't have food,  
10 and they needed to be cared for better.

11 And then to compare -- to make the statement  
12 like that -- I'm writing it. I've been working on it  
13 until about 2:00 in the morning on what I saw, what I  
14 observed when I grew up with on that reservation. Like  
15 a lot of those kids -- a lot of them were my playmates,  
16 you know, I missed them.

17 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Betty.

18 MS. HALL: And it -- it's hard to see. But  
19 that really needs to be changed. That's not correct.  
20 It refers to the Karok culture and custom is so  
21 different, their belief systems are different. They  
22 have a putawan. There's some here they know what the  
23 putawan is, the Indian devil.

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Betty.

25 MS. HALL: Their windows are covered at night

1 ter- -- terr- -- terrified of that. I used to have to  
2 walk my little friend home because she was so afraid of  
3 Indian devil.

4 MS. RAGAZZI: Hey, Betty?

5 THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, I could go on all  
6 night, I know, but that needs to be changed and then I  
7 still -- we still would prefer no project. And you  
8 understand why because of all our graves that could be  
9 damaged, the Civil War veterans that are buried up there  
10 that could be damaged, there's burials underneath those  
11 reservoirs. I mean, come on, think about 'em.

12 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 MS. MEAMBER: My name is Sheila Meamber,  
15 S-H-E-I-L-A, M, as in Mary, E-A-M-B, as in boy, E-R.  
16 Good evening.

17 My husband Don and I own and operate a ranch in  
18 the Montague area that has been in our family for  
19 generations. My husband's family has a long history  
20 here in Siskiyou County. In 1886, his ancestors donated  
21 a half section of land to form the town of Montague.  
22 The Shasta River runs through our property, and we have  
23 an exquisite view of Mount Shasta.

24 I want to disclose that my husband's great  
25 uncle was John C. Boyle who was the engineer who built



1 the four Klamath dams that are now under consideration  
2 for being taken out.

3 At this time, I would like to share two letters  
4 written by my son and my daughter that were submitted to  
5 FERC in October of 2017. They were pertinent then and  
6 they are pertinent now.

7 From my son, he writes: "As someone who was  
8 raised on a ranch in the Shasta Valley area but now  
9 reside on the Rogue River in Gold Hill, I think I can  
10 speak to the issues more than some who have never lived  
11 in the area. I've hiked, hunted, and fished in the  
12 Marble Mountains, the Russian Wilderness, Trinity Alps,  
13 Willow Creek Mountain, and Butte Creek, climbed  
14 Mount Shasta more than once and experienced the beauty  
15 that this area has to offer.

16 I used to fish on the Shasta River until the  
17 state closed it for coho spawning and riparian habitat  
18 on my family ranch. We restored the riparian natural  
19 conditions for the salmon on our stretch of the Shasta  
20 River. My father received awards for his efforts from  
21 the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board in  
22 2007 and the Klamath River Basin Fishery Task Force in  
23 1996.

24 The point I'm making is that we believe in  
25 conservation efforts for the fish and the streams. My

1 great, great uncle, John C. Boyle was the engineer  
2 responsible for building the four Klamath dams targeted  
3 for removal. They are still producing clean energy  
4 inexpensively and the dams are still in good condition.

5 The dams are storing the pollution from the  
6 Upper Basin and making the Klamath River cleaner than it  
7 was before the dams were built. It makes no sense to  
8 remove the dams not knowing the final outcome of turning  
9 loose all the sediment that is stored behind the dams,  
10 20 million yards.

11 Historically, the fish rarely went past  
12 JC Boyle dam, formerly known as the Salt Caves/Big Bend  
13 anyway. Most seem to agree that the cost of such a  
14 project would be considerable and one of the biggest dam  
15 removal projects in the country, if not in the world.  
16 If the dams are taken out, the river will still have  
17 algae and excessive nutrients to feed the algae which is  
18 why the Regional Water Quality Control Board would not  
19 issue a 401 permit to relicense the dams.

20 If this dam removal project doesn't work out,  
21 who's going to be liable? Not the KRRC, a Shell  
22 Corporation. No amount of money will restore people's  
23 livelihoods. Increase -- increase of electricity rates  
24 will occur, people's wells will dry up, homes and  
25 businesses will be prone to flooding, potential loss of

1 water source for fire protection, property devaluation  
2 and all of the property owners, farmers, and ranchers  
3 affected will be forced to make up for the loss if this  
4 experiment fails.

5 And this is to nidify [sic] Brett Meamber,  
6 Gold Hill, Oregon.

7 I have a second letter, but I will save that  
8 for later.

9 MS. RAGAZZI: Do you want to provide it to us  
10 today in writing?

11 MS. MEAMBER: Yes, it is in writing.

12 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Thank you, Sheila.

13 MS. MEAMBER: Okay.

14 [Applause.]

15 MS. RAGAZZI: Monica Harle, Jenny Staats --  
16 Staats, Regina Chichicola, Jake Reed and Matt Cox.

17 MS. HARLE: Hi. My name -- my name is  
18 Monica Harle. I don't usually speak in public. I'll  
19 just go like this.

20 Okay. So --

21 THE COURT REPORTER: How do you spell your  
22 name, please?

23 MS. HARLE: M-O-N-I-C-A, H-A-R-L-E.

24 I did not know that I would be speaking tonight  
25 but I -- I'm going to.

1 I'm a citizen advisory -- I'm not from  
2 California. I'm from Washington State.

3 I'm a citizen advisory committee member for the  
4 Hood Canal Region for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.  
5 And so I was so interested in -- in this topic. I've  
6 been reading about it in the papers.

7 I just wanted to say the Hood Canal Region is  
8 three counties and two tribes. And so there's millions  
9 and millions of dollars coming in each year for salmon  
10 recovery.

11 I wanted to say Washington State supports all  
12 salmon recovery efforts, including dam removal if  
13 necessary.

14 Dam removal such as the Elwha River dam removal  
15 has been extremely successful. Documented.

16 Number 4. Healthy salmon populations and  
17 present in our lives and rivers, water bodies is  
18 essential, basically, to all Americans. I think it's a  
19 very American thing. Culturally, it's important, not  
20 just to tribes but to all people.

21 And the fifth thing I was going to say: I've  
22 seen the statistics, and healthy salmon in fisheries is  
23 a huge economic driver, recreational and commercial.

24 Thank you.

25 [Applause.]

1 MS. RAGAZZI: Jenny followed by Regina followed  
2 by Jake Reed.

3 MS. STAATS: Hi. My name is Jenny Staats,  
4 J-E-N-N-Y, S-T-A-A-T-S.

5 And I just wanted to talk about some of the  
6 potential impacts to dam removal that I see and some  
7 impacts that I'm already seeing.

8 I've been a part of the fight to remove dams  
9 for the last 15 years. I was like a kid then. I think  
10 some of the folks here would think maybe I still look  
11 like a kid now which is awesome. It also means that I  
12 have, you know -- I have maybe, like, 60 years left to  
13 keep on doing this. But I'm not going to need to  
14 because I feel like this is a moment where I can be here  
15 to celebrate the work that people have done thus far to  
16 get us to where we are now.

17 When I first started this, I was an educator.  
18 I'm still an educator now. And one of the impacts that  
19 I've seen with the youth I work with is just a really  
20 positive self-identity and really positive self-esteem  
21 when it comes to issues about the river, when it comes  
22 to fighting for the river and fighting for water  
23 quality. And that's something that I think is going to  
24 happen or continue to happen when these dams come down.

25 You know, we talk about the impacts to the

1 environment but also the -- the social impacts of this  
2 have already been so great and -- and will be when the  
3 dams come down so --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you not listening to  
5 what's going on?

6 MS. STAATS: So, you know, people try to say  
7 that this is like a fish versus farmers issue or like  
8 conservative or lefties with progressives, but that's  
9 never been what's it about. There's deeper root issues  
10 here.

11 And, you know, having -- working with kids and  
12 being able to see within their eyes their understandings  
13 of what these things really are about. And it's that  
14 difference between, like, a paradigm of fear of scarcity  
15 and fear in general, an exploitation and power over  
16 people versus, like, mutual aide and sharing and a  
17 holistic way of looking at community health.

18 And I live in -- I'm a settler in the Karuk  
19 tribe and central [phonetic] territory. I'm an EMT with  
20 the volunteer fire department. I see people on their  
21 worst days in their worst emergencies. I'm who shows up  
22 when people are having physical crisis, mental crisis.  
23 And from that perspective, I think the impacts are going  
24 to be just so far-reaching when we see healthy water and  
25 healthy people due to dam removal. This isn't going to

1 kill us all. This is going to -- it's going to be  
2 saving lives.

3           And there was a -- you know, people speaking  
4 about things that were written from the 1850s, and I  
5 think it's important to look at who was writing those  
6 things at that time and kind of the history that's been  
7 expressed was in 1850 when the State of California was  
8 being created. That was also when the Act for the  
9 Protection of Indians which was for -- basically, for  
10 slavery was happening. And so at this point in time as  
11 a settler on the river, I feel really honored to have  
12 this opportunity to be a part of making things right  
13 again, making things right and healthy for all the  
14 people on this river.

15           So thank you for being here and continuing this  
16 work going forward.

17           MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Jenny.

18           [Applause.]

19           MS. RAGAZZI: Regina followed by Jake Reed  
20 followed by Matt Cox followed by Chloe Utley.

21           MS. CHICHICOLA: Hi. My name is  
22 Regina Chichicola, C-H-I-C-H-I again, C-O-L-A.

23           I'm here today with a group of Save California  
24 Salmon and also as a resident of the town of Orleans,  
25 California.

1           As a resident of Orleans, I've seen what the  
2 loss of fisheries has done to the community. I've seen  
3 what it means to people when there's no fish for  
4 ceremonies. And I've seen what it does to people when  
5 the river turns green when ceremonies are going on and  
6 when fishing is happening. I've heard a lot of people  
7 talking about when people get sick from the water  
8 quality in the river. And I've also seen what it means  
9 to people when there's no fish coming back because  
10 90 percent of the fish die from fish diseases because of  
11 these dams.

12           These dams have caused massive water quality  
13 issues: The blue-green algae which is a liver toxin, as  
14 I'm sure you guys know; and it also causes fish diseases  
15 that kill a lot of the fish in the river.

16           Furthermore, these dams are not used in any way  
17 for flood control. The dams are not used in any way for  
18 irrigation supply. And therefore, they can be taken  
19 out. And the company that owns them, PacifiCorp, as  
20 their private property wants to remove them. And  
21 therefore, it's a win-win for everyone.

22           Dam removal will create a lot of jobs within  
23 this county, and it will create a lot of short-term jobs  
24 for taking the dams down, but it will also create a lot  
25 of long-term jobs through restoring of the fishing



1 industry. And that's going to be here locally through  
2 recreational jobs but also throughout the West Coast  
3 through jobs for fisherman.

4 As we know the fishing industry on the coast  
5 has really been suffering and that's looks like everyone  
6 on the coast. There's been widespread unemployment and  
7 depression and food insecurity because of the lack of  
8 salmon on the reservations and also in coastal  
9 communities.

10 I also work for a group called Pacific Coast  
11 Federation of Fishermen's Association. And to see the  
12 pain of dumping fourth-fifths of the fishing fleet for  
13 the people is intense. You know, knowing people cannot  
14 afford to feed their families and have to give up on  
15 their -- on their dreams and their -- and on what their  
16 fathers have done for work, too, is pretty intense.

17 And it's also intense to see what it means to  
18 the tribal communities to not have fish, because it  
19 means everything to people to have fish on the table.  
20 And to see the depression and the disease issues and the  
21 high, high heart disease and the -- just the way that it  
22 affects people's health and mental states.

23 I mean, my area has 12 times the suicide rate  
24 of the -- the nation because people don't have -- feel  
25 hopeless and you can help bring their hope back. So

1 this is a chance for jobs, for communities to be healthy  
2 again and to bring hope back to an area that's really  
3 suffering. So please do the right thing and remove the  
4 dams and help restore our salmon.

5 And thank you for coming to Yreka also.

6 [Applause.]

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Jake Reed. Okay. And we'll do  
8 that later. Matt Cox, Chloe, Don Mackintosh --  
9 Dan McIntosh, and James Corcoran.

10 MR. COX: Hi. My name is Matt Cox, M-A-T-T,  
11 C-O-X.

12 I'm the communications director for Klamath  
13 River Renewal Corporation, and I'm speaking tonight on  
14 KRRC's behalf.

15 KRRC is part of a cooperative effort to  
16 reestablish the natural vitality of the Klamath River to  
17 support all communities in the Basin.

18 Our job is to take ownership of the four  
19 PacifiCorp dams, remove these dams, restore -- inundated  
20 lands and implement entire mitigation measures --

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please. I'm  
22 having a hard time hearing you.

23 MR. COX: No problem.

24 And implement required mitigation measure in  
25 compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local

1 laws. KRRC is seeking regulatory permits to accomplish  
2 this project, including Water Quality Certification by  
3 the State of California.

4 The DEIR is an impressive and thorough review  
5 of potential benefits and impacts of removal of the  
6 Lower Klamath Project hydroelectric dams. KRRC commends  
7 the Water Board, staff and the consultants for its work  
8 on this analysis, and we think there's quite a bit for  
9 community members and stakeholders to learn from it.

10 The DEI- -- excuse me -- the DEI [sic]  
11 showed -- the DEIR showed the proposed project to be  
12 environmentally superior compared to the six  
13 alternatives to the project that the board analyzed in  
14 terms of both project benefits and the negative impacts.  
15 The report shows that most potential impacts from the  
16 project are small and short term and can be reduced with  
17 mitigation. It also shows many project effects are  
18 beneficial in the short and long term, which is an  
19 important finding for those who are interested in the  
20 long-term health of the Klamath River and the  
21 communities and ecosystems that depend on it.

22 The DEIR also shows the proposed project  
23 protects water quality by restoring the free-flowing  
24 condition of the river and ensures volitional fish  
25 passage and that the project would be a boom to salmon

1 and steelhead populations. Many of the species is  
2 expected to recover following dam removal are tribal  
3 trust species that are important to the culture and  
4 health of some tribes on the Klamath River.

5 The DEIR also shows an expected increase in  
6 recreational and commercial fishing industries. KRRC is  
7 pleased with these findings in the DEIR and look forward  
8 to continue work with regulators in the community to  
9 finalize the EIR and other permits and then implement  
10 the project, including mitigation measures to enhance  
11 benefits and reduce adverse impacts.

12 KRRC will be submitting written comments  
13 regarding this DEIR in the near future. We are  
14 encouraged that this DEIR brings KRRC one step closer to  
15 project approval.

16 Thank you.

17 [Applause.]

18 MS. RAGAZZI: Chloe.

19 MS. UTLEY: My name is a Chloe Utley. That's  
20 C-H-L-O-E, U-T-L-E-Y.

21 And I am an individual community member living  
22 in the Orleans area, and I came here to offer my  
23 wholehearted support in the removal of the dams and  
24 gratitude for all of the people that worked so hard for  
25 so many years. There's the 15 years of the campaign,

1 but then there's the generations and generations of  
2 people before that that have lived their lives committed  
3 to the health of the rivers.

4           And I support the removal of the dams and we've  
5 come so far that I just want the process to continue.  
6 And I also support tribal sovereignty and the efforts of  
7 the local tribes to the commitment to restore and  
8 maintain the health of the river and their people and  
9 the salmon.

10           And this dam removal is about this community  
11 and this place, but it's also about the planet. And  
12 this is an action that the rest of the world can look to  
13 and really gain inspiration from. So this, I think,  
14 ultimately is something that our communities can be so  
15 proud to be a part of as our entire planet faces really  
16 transformative crisis and change, making a move to  
17 remove dams that should never have been built and honor  
18 tribal sovereignty on their land is something that is  
19 crucial to the survival and the thriving of our species  
20 and our planet, so I support it.

21           And thank you.

22           [Applause.]

23           MS. RAGAZZI: Don Mackintosh followed by James  
24 Corcoran followed by Nita Still followed by Marvin  
25 Gardner.

1 MR. MACKINTOSH: Yes, I'm Don M. Mackintosh,  
2 it's M-A-C-K-I-N-T-O-S-H, and we have a ranch in Weed.

3 But I am a retired PG&E and my -- I worked  
4 in -- let's see -- a power grid operations and my job  
5 was to control generation, transmission and distribution  
6 of, you know, of parts of a -- of the grid. And I did  
7 that for 28 years.

8 And this is -- this is a sick thing to take out  
9 these dams. You know, because I -- over the years, you  
10 know, we communicated with and operated and controlled,  
11 you know, the -- these same stations, these same hydro,  
12 ah, generation.

13 And so I did write up a -- a report how this  
14 is -- that I want to turn in -- how this is electrically  
15 wrong to take out these dams. So it's basically -- I  
16 have all the -- basically, what we're going to -- the  
17 dam's hydro is the cheapest, cleanest power that there  
18 is. It's -- it's -- the fuel is water. It goes in and  
19 it comes out. It turns the turbines and it comes out  
20 clean. It's usable. It's -- there is -- it's -- it's a  
21 very simple, basic way to make power. It's -- it's a  
22 power that is produced is 169 megawatts. It's actually  
23 lighting these -- the lights in this room.

24 It's -- there's so many benefits here. I mean,  
25 it's -- when the grid goes down, you know, it cannot be

1 started unless you have power as hydro power to start --  
2 start the grid up again. So that -- this is what's  
3 important here.

4 Another thing about this -- these -- this hydro  
5 is that this community is unique because it's -- it's  
6 able to be isolated in the case of a grid collapse,  
7 which is -- it could happen easily these days. And when  
8 the grid goes down, it can't be restored for a long  
9 time, possibly a year, more actually. But -- but  
10 this -- this Siskiyou County can be electrically  
11 isolated, and we can -- we can generate our own power  
12 here, so it's a -- it's a beautiful thing.

13 And so there's many -- but the most about this,  
14 you know, this dam removal is that, you know, they don't  
15 talk about when you take these dams out, there's  
16 169 megawatts comes out of the grid, so it's got to be  
17 reported. It's got to be replaced. That means you have  
18 to build another dam to replace what you're taking out  
19 here and that's -- that can be \$4.5 billion right there,  
20 then you -- and then I've been told -- hold on.

21 I've been told that this removal can be  
22 \$7 billion just to remove, you know, the dams. So,  
23 basically, I'm going to end. So what -- the important  
24 part of this thing is that this should be part of this  
25 impact report, the -- the electrical damage that is

1 taking place when you take 'em out. And so that has to  
2 be studied, so I'm going to put this in. I'm qualified  
3 to do this, you know. So then --

4 MS. RAGAZZI: Not that one?

5 MR. MACKINTOSH: This one here. And then I'll  
6 follow up with something even more detailed but this  
7 is --

8 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

9 MR. MACKINTOSH: Yeah. Go ahead and take it.

10 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

11 MR. MACKINTOSH: Yeah.

12 MS. RAGAZZI: I'll take this, too.

13 MR. MACKINTOSH: So there's one other thing --

14 MS. RAGAZZI: Don, there's a lot of people to  
15 talk tonight.

16 MR. MACKINTOSH: Okay. All right.

17 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you very much.

18 [Applause.]

19 MR. CORCORAN: My name is James --

20 THE COURT REPORTER: What is it?

21 MR. CORCORAN: James, J-A-M-E-S, Corcoran,  
22 C-O-R-C-O-R-A-N. I'm a resident of Siskiyou County.

23 I would like to point out that the proposed  
24 removal of these four dams on the Klamath River is not  
25 in the public interest. We need the water storage. We



1 need the flood protection in the spring, and we need the  
2 hydroelectric power which is the most cost effective and  
3 greenest power that there is. If we remove these dams,  
4 they would have to be replaced by a gas-fired plant.  
5 That's not exactly green energy.

6 So who would benefit if the dams are removed?  
7 Well, there are investors and there are contractors that  
8 would make money on the removal of the dams and the  
9 building of a gas-fired power plant. So those are most  
10 important considerations. Would the public benefit if  
11 these dams were removed? It seems to me they would not.

12 [Applause.]

13 MS. RAGAZZI: So Nita. And then we have  
14 Marvin Gardner, Kevin Kiley with the California State  
15 Assemblymen, Esther Andrews.

16 MS. STILL: I talk loud.

17 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Well, Carol will let you  
18 know if she can't hear you.

19 MS. STILL: Okay.

20 My name is Nita Still, N-I-T-A, S-T-I-L-L.

21 And I'm just a person that would like to see  
22 the dams stay there because it would make the rivers  
23 beautiful. Our father-mother principal created earth as  
24 well as we, the people, and told us to take dominion  
25 over the earth and all thereon. Yet, you and all of the

1 thousands of agencies which have been created by our  
2 government have put us on the bottom of the list and  
3 made fish, animals, bugs, birds, and the environment  
4 more important than we, the people.

5           You have taken our liberty, rights, freedoms,  
6 rights, liberties, properties, and water as well our  
7 happy nation, trashed them by using and creating laws,  
8 which remove all that we cherish and with which we also  
9 function.

10           The Endangered Species Act is what -- you need  
11 to wake up and see what you have done and are doing. We  
12 voted over 79 percent to keep the dams. We do not want  
13 the beauty or usefulness of the Klamath River destroyed.  
14 Keep the dams in place. They give us clean air, cleaner  
15 water, and the reservoirs to fight all of the fires.  
16 The KRRC was not voted on to do anything, yet they seem  
17 to be part of an unauthorized group usurping, without  
18 legal authority, our rights.

19           Thank you.

20           [Applause.]

21           MR. GARDNER: Yes, I'm Marvin Gardner, and I  
22 would like to relinquish my time to Rex Cozzalio if  
23 that's possible.

24           MS. RAGAZZI: He'll have his standard time.

25           And if there's extra time at the end, he can take extra

1 time.

2 So Kevin Kiley.

3 MR. KILEY: Kiley. Thank you.

4 Good evening. I'm Kevin Kiley. I'm a member  
5 of the State Assembly representing California's 6th  
6 Assembly District.

7 You know, I came to tonight's meeting with an  
8 open mind but with deep concerns about this proposed  
9 project. I'm concerned about the absence of local  
10 control. Residents of the Klamath Dam Basin have been  
11 disenfranchised. They are overwhelmingly against the  
12 dams but, instead, misguided environmentalists and  
13 bureaucrats in Sacramento and Washington are making the  
14 decision to remove them.

15 I'm concerned that there are no good  
16 replacements. There's no plan for finding replacement  
17 water. New reservoirs on feeder streams north of  
18 Klamath Lake would cost an estimated \$8 billion.

19 And yes, I'm concerned about environmental  
20 damage. Removing the dams would result in a significant  
21 release of sediments down the river up to an estimated  
22 20 million cubic yards of silt. There is a risk that  
23 sediment release will cause significant environmental  
24 damage to the area south of Iron Gate dam. It could  
25 also be harmful to the salmon, a species the supporter

1 of the removal project supposedly wants to protect.

2 I'm concerned about economic damage. There's  
3 been inadequate analysis of the consequences of removing  
4 the dams to the economy of Siskiyou and Modoc Counties,  
5 particularly to the farmers and ranchers that rely on  
6 its water.

7 Over the last few decades, we've seen how  
8 misguided policies related to logging have decimated  
9 communities in this area. Removing the dams would be  
10 another blow to the region. Removing the four clean  
11 power hydroelectric facilities could also cause energy  
12 prices to rise hurting rate payers.

13 But after tonight I have an even bigger  
14 concern, and that's that I see the State Water Resources  
15 Control Board which has been a source of so much misery  
16 to so many people in this state using the public comment  
17 period as a statutory box to check rather than an  
18 opportunity to meaningfully engage with the public, to  
19 listen and to learn.

20 [Applause.]

21 MR. KILEY: It's a perfect example of why so  
22 many people feel that the state only cares about our  
23 North State communities to the extent that there are tax  
24 dollars to collect or resources to purloin or lives to  
25 control. But I do want the folks that came here tonight

1 to know that I'm fighting for you. There are a few of  
2 us that are with the State, and I'll be fighting to make  
3 sure that the fate of this project is up to the citizens  
4 of Siskiyou County.

5 Thank you.

6 THE COURT REPORTER: Sir, can you spell your  
7 last name? Spell your name.

8 MR. KILEY: K-I-L-E-Y. Kevin Kiley.

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

10 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Kevin.

11 Next is Esther Andrews followed by Rex --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Cozzalio.

13 MS. RAGAZZI: -- Cozzalio followed by, I  
14 think -- oh, Bill Schmidt followed by Don Meamber.

15 MS. ANDREWS: Hello. My name is  
16 Esther Andrews. That's E-S-T-H-E-R, Andrews,  
17 A-N-D-R-E-W-S.

18 I traveled here from Orleans to say that, every  
19 year I've lived there, I've seen a strong negative  
20 impact that the dams have on the environment there.

21 As far as power is concerned, it's not clean  
22 energy and it's not significant.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 70,000 homes --

24 MS. RAGAZZI: Please don't speak while she's  
25 speaking.

1 MS. ANDREWS: So much in this area depends on  
2 the river and has developed on an undammed river,  
3 especially the fish but also the flora and every single  
4 animal up and down the food chain have developed with a  
5 symbiotic relationship to the beautiful Klamath,  
6 including us.

7 This is a very important step for habitat  
8 restoration. I work in fisheries. And I see so much of  
9 the streams and rivers, and I see how much the fish are  
10 struggling. And this is very important to me. It's  
11 very important for all of us that these dams come down.  
12 It's very exciting to see that moving forward.

13 Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 70,000 homes powered.  
16 Really?

17 MR. COZZALIO: Hi. My name is Rex Cozzalio,  
18 R-E-X, C-O-Z-Z-A-L-I-O.

19 Recent data and research supports positions of  
20 the region most sup- -- most affected supermajorities in  
21 opposition.

22 The Upper Klamath Lake core drills; sediment  
23 studies of historic nutrient loads and algae; water  
24 quality monitoring --

25 THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please.

1 MR. THALER: I've cut it four times to the  
2 point of virtual insignificance.

3 MS. RAGAZZI: We'll take the whole thing if  
4 you're not able to make it through it.

5 MR. COZZALIO: You can't even read this, not  
6 with -- not with my notes.

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay.

8 MR. COZZALIO: Experimental water treatment  
9 attempts; discovered biological lake and instream  
10 characteristics of microcystis aeruginosa, including the  
11 production, breakdown and effects of microcystin toxins;  
12 downstream microcystis outbreak monitoring; sentinel  
13 fish studies regarding manayunkia speciose polychaete,  
14 parvicapsula minibicornus --

15 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Wait. Slow down.

16 MR. COZZALIO: All of the testing that has been  
17 done in the last few years actually supports the  
18 supermajority against the dams. None of this  
19 information is included. All of that -- all of that  
20 paragraph lists those -- those studies.

21 In addition to already known massive  
22 environmental resident, economic, and health and safety  
23 benefits, the dams and deep water lakes provide --  
24 recent science also confirms they provide not only --  
25 the only cost-effective enhancement to naturally endemic

1 Klamath environmental conditions. They provide habitat  
2 and protections to some of the most viable life stage  
3 populations of sucker fish, trout, wildlife, and other  
4 listed species based upon the recent data.

5           Destruction of the only deep water lakes and  
6 dams will infect resident Upper Basin polychaete with  
7 lethal -- lethal ceratomyxa genotypes in a habitat  
8 historically nonconducive to salmon, compounding disease  
9 for all affected resident species throughout the entire  
10 downstream Klamath. Higher nutrient loads delivered  
11 downstream will engender higher instream competitive  
12 microcystis outbreaks producing far higher instream  
13 toxic impacts to all resident species, including human.

14           Those instream nutrients will support  
15 historically experienced increase of instream macrophyte  
16 and peri- -- periphyton disease conducive growth,  
17 particularly during the lowest flows and highest  
18 temperature time of year coinciding with salmon  
19 migration.

20           The State Water Resources Control Board is  
21 appointed and serves at the pleasure of the governor,  
22 empowered to carry out the environmental policies of the  
23 governor. The legislature has the right to review and  
24 comment on those policies but not to amend them. The  
25 governor has directed agencies within the water



1 management plan to facilitate Klamath Agenda Project  
2 destruction.

3           Within their current Draft EIS, Water Resources  
4 limited their review to outdated theoretical and amended  
5 altered premise science supplied by the KHSA/KRRC to  
6 support their acknowledged single objective of project  
7 destruction. In Water Resources' EIS budget request,  
8 not a single dollar was allocated to investigation and  
9 assessment of current science refuting agenda premise.

10           In their cut-and-paste report, Water Resources  
11 marginalizes acknowledged water quality, environmental,  
12 species, health, safety, economic, and property impacts.  
13 Admitting that retention of the project would eliminate  
14 those unmitigated impacts and degraded water quality,  
15 that option is dismissed as not supportive of applicant  
16 objectives, somehow leaving the unavoidable damages to a  
17 nonexistent third party good neighbor agreement.

18           The mere fact of performing a Draft Water  
19 Quality Certification before completion of the EIS  
20 demonstrates Water Resources' agenda bias. In ignoring  
21 the above recent data to appease agenda policy and  
22 produce a document facilitating FERC bypass of the new  
23 holistic EIS, Water Resources abrogates any intent of  
24 responsible regional and environmental accountability.  
25 In doing so, they guarantee irreversible evidenced

1 devastation and loss to the region.

2 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Rex.

3 Bill Schmidt followed by Don Meamber followed  
4 by John Foster followed by Rychard -- maybe Ryck Kramer.

5 MR. SCHMIDT: I'm Bill Schmidt. B-I-L-L,  
6 S-C-H-M-I-D-T. I live on the Klamath River.

7 One of my main things is, okay, the dams were  
8 built. Your science says that the water quality above  
9 the dams is worse than below the dams because it's  
10 natural. Okay. You said you -- you reviewed that  
11 there's a couple times a year that it wasn't -- it  
12 wasn't good. Okay. You can put a snorkel in -- in  
13 Iron Gate and cool your water and aerate it.

14 As far as fish habitat, historically, you have  
15 some archaeological finds up in the Upper Klamath. They  
16 found fish bones, but they didn't find any fish heads.  
17 What does that say? It says it carried the fish for a  
18 long ways. They -- they probably caught 'em down about  
19 the Shasta River, maybe up to where the Iron Gate is,  
20 because Iron Gate had -- has a natural reef to start  
21 with and, above that, the canyon gets narrow, deep, hot  
22 and on.

23 So I -- if you remove the dams with the  
24 sediment, you're going to kill the river for decades.  
25 And if you kill it for over three years, then you don't

1 have any salmon that runs at all.

2 [Applause.]

3 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, Bill.

4 Don.

5 MR. MEAMBER: My name is Don Meamber, D-O-N,  
6 M-E-A-M-B-E-R.

7 I have a -- I have a respect for the dams,  
8 because my uncle was John Boyle, and he -- he designed  
9 all the dams and was in charge of construction of all of  
10 'em. The first two were built before I was born, the  
11 next two while I was in college.

12 What I have is some comments about the -- about  
13 the EIR Executive Summary.

14 One concern is Pacific- -- the PacifiCorp land  
15 disposition on page 1 and page 8 concerned that -- that  
16 they might be turned over to California or Oregon State,  
17 or the document states "a third party for public  
18 interest purposes." The county -- the county receives  
19 property taxes from the power company now. And if  
20 either of those things happen, it will be lost.

21 Page -- page 4, No. 1. Improve the long-term  
22 water quality conditions/levels of biostimulatory. How  
23 will that be accomplished when those -- when the  
24 nutrients are coming down the river from Oregon? Shut  
25 down all farming in Oregon? But the nutrients are

1 naturally high in the Upper Basin from the area,  
2 geology, and soil and also enormous flocks of waterfowl  
3 spent time for centuries there.

4 Page 4, No. 2. Advance the long-term  
5 restoration of natural fish populations in the Klamath  
6 Basin. The polychaete worm continue to spread spores of  
7 ceratomyxa shasta and parvicapsula which attack and kill  
8 the smolts. Continued nonnatural high flows in the  
9 summer enhance worm populations.

10 Page 4, No. 3. Restore anadromous fish passage  
11 in the Klamath Basin made accessible -- inaccessible by  
12 Lower Klamath Project dams. Many local long-timers,  
13 especially decedents of the Shasta tribe feel the  
14 nat- -- natural reef located at JC Boyle or Big Bend  
15 prevents salmon entry into the Upper Basin. Will the  
16 project blast out the reef to change that?

17 Page 5. Reservoir drawdown. Copco No. 1  
18 Reservoir would be drawn down first in year one. Copco  
19 No. 2 in May of dam removal year number two.

20 Won't the moving mass of sediment from No. 1  
21 over top dam No. 2 -- Copco No. 2 by the time the  
22 demonstration works? And it's only three-tenths of a  
23 mile downstream. Are -- will that make it more  
24 difficult to remove it?

25 Page 8. Downstream flood control. I'm

1 wondering what is meant by "maintain existing flood  
2 production." What besides our hydro dams has any value  
3 for flood protection?

4 Historical resources and tribal cultural  
5 resources. Again, early explorers and tribal decendents  
6 tell of a very poor water quality of a summer -- Klamath  
7 flows. This project will not restore the wonderful  
8 water quality of historic conditions.

9 One final quote I want to make. I borrowed a  
10 tool from the local USDA to measure particles in the  
11 water of -- on my property and other streams. And in  
12 the Klamath River at Klamathon Bridge was 65. Crystal  
13 Geyser bottled water is 52. Montague drinking water was  
14 150. Yreka drinking water was 60.

15 And Bill Schmidt just mentioned earlier about  
16 the water being cleaner down- -- downstream of the dams.  
17 Well, that measurement kind of confirms it's cleaner  
18 downstream than it is above it -- above the dams.

19 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

20 [Applause.]

21 MR. FOSTER: John Foster, J-O-H-N, F-O-S-T-E-R.

22 I don't see how it's -- I've been speaking at  
23 all these things the last 15 years. It don't seem like  
24 your agenda's changed. It still -- you just want to  
25 take the dams out, and you're going to make your thing

1 match that. So what we, the people, here say or what  
2 science says, it doesn't seem to matter.

3           Because starting out at poor quality coming out  
4 of that shallow lake in -- in Oregon, how can it not get  
5 better going to deep lakes? And taking out dams where  
6 there's nothing to improve it, how's it going to get  
7 better? There's a couple springs in there, but not  
8 enough to -- this river's always been backwards and it's  
9 going to stay backwards. It doesn't start cold and end  
10 warm. It starts warm and gets colder as it goes. So I  
11 just don't agree with this.

12           [Applause.]

13           MS. RAGAZZI: Rycharde -- is it -- Kramer,  
14 Andy Marx, Thomas Joseph, Patty Joseph.

15           MR. KRAMER: Evening. I'm Ryck Kramer,  
16 R-Y-C-K, K-R-A-M-E-R.

17           And this was brought up at one of our POW  
18 meetings. Nobody's really addressed it, but it's  
19 something that kind of concerns me.

20           I have no particular expertise in this. I'm an  
21 observer. I've lived here for a little over 80 years.  
22 I was here during the '55 and the '64 floods. The water  
23 at the mouth of the river took out the bridge down  
24 there, and I think the water lying there was 70 feet  
25 above the bridge.

1           We have the I-5 artery running directly below  
2 these dams. The -- and I -- and I really think that  
3 they are a flood control issue here. If those dams were  
4 not there, the possibility of that -- the bridge, which  
5 is only about 20 feet above the river level right now,  
6 it could be taken out and the main artery on the West  
7 Coast would be gone.

8           It would -- and I think that would -- that's  
9 something that I don't think the board or any of the  
10 other EIRs have addressed. I think that's something  
11 that should be looked at.

12           And just a comment. As a native here, third  
13 generation, it's incongruous to me that people from the  
14 outside come in and tell us how to live our lives,  
15 what's good for us, what's bad for us. The government  
16 has a real bad habit of making a one-size-fits-all  
17 agenda, and I think that's just not the thing to do.

18           Thank you so much.

19           [Applause.]

20           MS. RAGAZZI: Andrew Marx, Thomas Joseph,  
21 Patty Joseph, Devin Finegan.

22           MR. MARX: Hi. I'm Andy Marx, it's A-N-D-Y,  
23 M-A-R-X.

24           So I'm been fly-fishing the Klamath since 1996.  
25 For the last five years, I've been a part-time fly

1 guide. I have a full-time job as well, but during the  
2 Klamath steelhead season that's what I do with my spare  
3 time. I've also recently become a member of the Klamath  
4 River Keeper.

5 My first steelhead trip on the Klamath more  
6 than 20 years ago, I really didn't get it. It was a  
7 bust. We didn't catch any fish. I went down there with  
8 an old-timer local who had fished it for years. And I  
9 asked him, "Why did we come down here?" And he kind of  
10 shrugged his shoulders and said, "Well, you should have  
11 been here 20 years ago. You just couldn't beat it."  
12 Since that first trip, there's been great years and  
13 there's been terrible years.

14 On more than one trip, we've had to leave the  
15 river. It was pea-soup green. It wasn't fit to stand  
16 in, to fish, swim in or even really look at.

17 There is a book that I picked up not long after  
18 I started fishing the Klamath called California  
19 Steelhead by a guy named Jim Freeman. It was written in  
20 1971 and he described a stretch of river down Beaver  
21 Creek that I fished year and in and year out, and he  
22 described it as the finest steelhead water in the world.  
23 And there have been years like that and there have been  
24 years when there were no fish in that run.

25 Dam removal will allow the Klamath salmon and



1 steelhead access to clean, cool water above the dams.  
2 I've been up there and fished, caught trout -- trout all  
3 day long until your arm's sore. And there's a reason,  
4 the water quality is there. Below Iron Gate, you  
5 couldn't buy a trout to save your life.

6 Sure. In October, there's some steelhead  
7 around; November, steelhead around. But for most of the  
8 year, it's uninhabitable.

9 The Draft EIR's conclusion is right on. The  
10 environmental cost of dam removal is outweighed by the  
11 benefits to all the beings that depend on a healthy  
12 river.

13 I understand the sediment issues and I -- I  
14 understand that that they will impact the fly-fishing  
15 guiding business for a couple of years. I work for an  
16 outfit with a number of guides that are full-time, and  
17 it's going to impact them as well. And we're all in  
18 favor of dam removal, because we know what it's going to  
19 do to the fishing runs we depend on for economic  
20 reasons.

21 There used to be a vibrant economy along the  
22 river. If you drive the river, you see these closed up  
23 trailer parks, like Fishers or the Rainbow Resort,  
24 stores, Happy Camp with a faded sign that says  
25 "steelhead capital of the world." It's possible, if

1 it's restored, the people will come back. And I think  
2 in the end, we owe it not only to ourselves but our  
3 children and all the beings that in the future are going  
4 to depend on the free-flowing vibrant river.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

7 [Applause.]

8 MS. RAGAZZI: Thomas Joseph followed by  
9 Patty Joseph followed by Devin Finegan followed by  
10 Marva Jones.

11 MR. JOSEPH: Good evening. My name is Thomas,  
12 T-H-O-M-A-S, last name Joseph, J-O-S-E-P-H.

13 I'm a member of the Hoopa Valley tribe, and the  
14 Trinity River which is a major contributory to the  
15 Klamath River, and I'm here to say that I support dam  
16 removal.

17 Sitting in this room, it's really hard to not  
18 bite back at a lot of the ignorant comments that were  
19 made, especially when people decide to speak on behalf  
20 of indigenous people and they themselves aren't even  
21 indigenous. But I really feel it's more vital and  
22 important that we build bridges in this moment and not  
23 walls.

24 There's more things that are threatened this  
25 Klamath River besides these dams. There's a pipeline

1 that's also coming in. And this pipeline is going to  
2 threaten the -- the safety of this river as well. And  
3 the people in this community are going to also be  
4 threatened. And so I know that their lands are -- are  
5 valued in their hearts and they're also going to have to  
6 defend their lands against this pipeline. So I think  
7 it's more important that we build bridges in this  
8 moment.

9           But the rhetoric, I -- I do -- I do want to  
10 state to the facts since I'm running down here on time.  
11 For the record, the hostile environment that is being  
12 played out here in Yreka can let it be a testament to  
13 this board of how they come up here and they go over  
14 their time to exclude the amount of time for other  
15 people to speak, other people that may be in favor of  
16 dam removal.

17           And that type of hostility is a going-on  
18 hostility of environment that Yreka citizens have  
19 continued to play for decades. They don't give a rats  
20 ass about the people downriver. And them continuing to  
21 talk above and beyond their time is perfect evidence of  
22 that.

23           And for us to continue to live in a society  
24 plagued by their -- by their balbaric [sic] teachings to  
25 keep us in the dark. You know, these teachings of

1 stripping our land and destroying Mother Nature and  
2 taking everything and just take, take, take, take, built  
3 on their balbaric teaching of traditions, that needs to  
4 go as well.

5           So for the record, I have a minute left. I  
6 wanted to state that Fox News said that -- that Yreka is  
7 99 percent don't believe in climate change. And so here  
8 you have all these people testifying to you to keep  
9 these dams, but they don't even understand the  
10 predicament of the world that we're living in today,  
11 then that climate change is real, that we have caused  
12 that, that these rivers can be restored, that it has  
13 proven with other dams -- or other rivers -- other dams  
14 that have been removed in Washington and other places.  
15 And so we're saying stick to the science, understand the  
16 community that they're in. And we've been dealing with  
17 'em for a long time.

18           Thank you.

19           [Applause.]

20           MS. RAGAZZI: Patty Joseph. Devin Finegan,  
21 Marva Jones and Glen Spain.

22           MS. JOSEPH: Patricia Joseph, P-A-T-R-I-C-I-A,  
23 J-O-S-E-P-H. I am a Hoopa tribal member, and I come  
24 here to let everyone know that I stand with the  
25 decisions of our tribe for dam removal.

1 Thank you.

2 [Applause.]

3 MS. RAGAZZI: Devin?

4 MR. FINEGAN: My name is Devin Finegan, that's  
5 D-E-V-I-N, F-I-N-E-G-A-N.

6 Thank you for this opportunity to speak. Thank  
7 you for all the work that you guys have been doing in  
8 making sure these dams come out in a responsible way.  
9 And I appreciate and invite comments about how we feel  
10 about how that should be happening.

11 I am a fisheries technician with the Mid  
12 Klamath Watershed Council, so I've been on a majority of  
13 the fish-bearing streams for Weitchpec to Hornbrook. We  
14 just finished with coho surveys last week, and the  
15 numbers do not look good this year and they did not look  
16 good last year.

17 People are wondering if what some of this empty  
18 perfect spawning ground looks like is what extinction  
19 might look like. That is what the people on the ground  
20 are asking right now.

21 So the environmental impact of this dam has  
22 happened and is happening. And I hope that we can  
23 mitigate, which it sounds like there is some money and  
24 plans on how to mitigate the dam removal to mitigate the  
25 impact that has come from these dams.

1           It really feels like we are in a threshold  
2 right now where, if we don't make this change, it will  
3 be the extinction of the fish. And this isn't the only  
4 thing threatening the fish. Coho, who are a  
5 particular -- they are on the endangered species list in  
6 a very particular kind of stream to spawn in, which is a  
7 low gradient stream that lends itself to human use.

8           So a lot of these streams that this endangered  
9 coho used to spawn in also have cows on them, they have  
10 logging going on in them, they have irrigation for  
11 fields. There's just -- you know, there's a list of  
12 impacts that are happening. And this dam removal is  
13 something we do have power over to give them more  
14 habitat to continue living.

15           Hearing that the river was trashed before the  
16 dams came in is confusing to me. You know, it sounds  
17 like the river -- this river and the fish in it and  
18 everybody in there has grown together over the years.  
19 And it was managed by people, the native people before  
20 the dams were in here.

21           And the stories I've heard of the past is that  
22 there were enough fish in there to feed tens of  
23 thousands or however many people were here without  
24 having to go to a grocery store. And the stories that  
25 I'm hearing now that there were no fish in here before

1 the dams do not line up with my understanding of how  
2 that was.

3           You know, we see that PacifiCorp doesn't find  
4 us an efficient way to bring electricity in here, and  
5 that is why they are selling. And I think that that  
6 speaks to the argument of it being a reasonable way to  
7 generate electricity.

8           Thanks for your time.

9           MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

10           [Applause.]

11           MS. RAGAZZI: Marva Jones, followed by  
12 Jon Grunbaum, Francine Banzali.

13           MS. JONES: [Speaking in native language.]

14           My name is Marva, M-A-R-V-A, Jones, J-O-N-E-S.  
15 I come from the village of --

16           THE COURT REPORTER: Can you slow down, please?  
17 I'm having a hard time understanding you. Please start  
18 over.

19           MS. JONES: [Speaking in native language.]

20           My name is Marva Jones, M-A-R-V-A, J-O-N-E-S.

21           I come from the village of Vilichanden,  
22 Mashymet, Watzek, and Wopum on the Klamath River and  
23 along the Smith River. And I'm Tolowa, Yurok, Karuk,  
24 and Wintu. And I come here to support the removal of  
25 the four Klamath dams.

1           Can I use my language? That's what I want to  
2 do.

3           THE COURT REPORTER: I can't take it down.

4           MS. RAGAZZI: Yeah, you can.

5           MS. JONES: [Speaking in native language.]

6           I come in a good way and I'm honored to be here  
7 from the country. I respect that.

8           I've been passed down responsibilities to  
9 protect our homelands and this is one of the areas that  
10 I've been taught and committed to be a part of in the  
11 effort to restore and balance this world. A lot of  
12 teachings going on on this river.

13           We don't just use it for food, but it's also a  
14 spiritual place for balancing this whole entire world.  
15 We do ceremony along the river that restores and  
16 bounties for all of us, not just us locals but everybody  
17 on this whole entire earth. And so those thing is --  
18 the teachings are very powerful and they need to  
19 continue. And we know the earth -- I mean, that the  
20 river is sick right now. And we know that this is the  
21 best method in restoring the life of the river. And  
22 it's urgent and -- I don't know.

23           I just wanted to share with you how important  
24 it is to, not only me, but the healing of all of our  
25 people. I'm not just talking about our native people



1 but all of us. And we're in a dire time right now with  
2 climate change and the effects of that. And we can't --  
3 we can't turn a blind eye and ignore this. There's got  
4 to be a -- there's got to be a solution.

5 Thank you.

6 [Speaking in native language.]

7 [Applause.]

8 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Glen Spain followed by  
9 Jon Grunbaum followed by Francine Banzali followed by  
10 Allie Rosenbluth.

11 MR. SPAIN: Thank you.

12 My name is Glen Spain, S- -- excuse me.  
13 G-L-E-N, one N, last name, Spain like the country,  
14 S-P-A-I-N.

15 I'm the northwest regional director for the  
16 PacifiCorp Federation of Fishermen's Association. We  
17 are the largest trade association of commercial family  
18 fisherman on the West Coast representing something like  
19 a thousand different business operations up and down the  
20 coast, many of them salmon dependent. And many of them  
21 have been closed down repeatedly in the past few years  
22 because of the very simple problems in the Klamath Basin  
23 on the reduction of populations in the Klamath Basin.  
24 That triggers coastwide closures because of weak stock  
25 management, problems that we have to deal with on a

1 daily basis.

2 We're very gratified to see that the EIR  
3 confirmed what science has been saying all along and  
4 that is that dam removal will completely benefit the  
5 river, decrease water temperatures, greatly reduce  
6 c. shasta and other fish diseases, protect water quality  
7 and very much improve the populations of not only coho,  
8 spring run chinook, fall run chinook and every other  
9 species in -- in the Basin.

10 We're also very gratified to see a -- a context  
11 for the whole issue of sediment. You know, big numbers  
12 like 15 million cubic yards sound like a lot of  
13 sediment. In fact, this is a major river. It carries  
14 between 4- and 6,000 -- or between 4 and 6 million cubic  
15 yards of sediment in a normal year. What we're talking  
16 about in terms of additional sediment is, as you point  
17 out in the DEIR rightfully, within the range of normal  
18 variability that the river can handle and would  
19 typically wash out in about two years. So that makes it  
20 very much a doable issue.

21 And also it debunks a lot of the sediment fears  
22 that are there. There are no toxins in the sediment,  
23 nothing to speak of. The EPA's confirmed that over and  
24 over.

25 Another myth is that there's flood protections

1 here. There's no flood protections. These were not  
2 flood protection dams. They're not designed to do flood  
3 protection. They provide little or no flood protection,  
4 never have. In fact, the worst floods in the Basin were  
5 two and three years after the last dam, Iron Gate was  
6 completed. They have provided very little.

7 Another problem that I hear often repeated is  
8 the fear that there will be irrigation impacts. So  
9 these dams are below the irrigation system. They're  
10 hydrologically below, and there are no irrigation  
11 outflows from any of the lower dams to anywhere. So  
12 there is no irrigation impact. In fact, removing the  
13 dams and eliminating the pressure on the Upper Basin  
14 farmers to put more water in the river because of the  
15 c. shasta, which they're now under court order to do  
16 50,000 feet, that c. shasta problem will probably  
17 disappear and that push for irrigation restrictions will  
18 disappear.

19 One last thing on replacement power, the dams  
20 were misquoted. They produce 82 megawatts for power on  
21 average. No dam systems over the last -- this is FERC's  
22 numbers. Over the last years, no dam system can run  
23 24/7 particularly in the summer when water levels are  
24 low.

25 The power has already been replaced. When

1 PacifiCorp has purchased by Berkshire Hathaway a few  
2 years ago, Berkshire Hathaway promised to put in  
3 1400 megawatts of renewable power, 17 times more than  
4 the 82 megawatts of the dams. They've already replaced  
5 the power 17 times over and total power is only  
6 1.7 percent of their total capacity in generation.

7 Thank you.

8 [Applause.]

9 MS. RAGAZZI: You're Jon?

10 MR. GRUNBAUM: Yeah.

11 MS. RAGAZZI: Francine Banzali and  
12 Allie Rosenbluth.

13 MR. GRUNBAUM: Good evening. And thank you for  
14 coming here to hear our comments.

15 My name is Jon Grunbaum, J-O-N, last name is  
16 G-R-U-N-B-A-U-M.

17 And I've been a full-time fishery biologist on  
18 the Klamath River for 25 years. My territory is  
19 basically 120 miles downstream from the dams to the  
20 Salmon River. And I've -- of course I've read a lot of  
21 science and the studies and the EIR, and I really  
22 commend all the great science that has gone into this  
23 and your work on this project.

24 So I'm here on behalf of the fish to talk for  
25 the fish because they can't talk. And I would like to

1 see the salmon restored in the Klamath Basin. This was  
2 the third largest run on the West Coast before the dams  
3 were put in. So, you know, I don't believe that the  
4 dams saved our water quality and saved -- is saving our  
5 fish right now.

6 So I see many benefits of dam removal, and  
7 that's to restore the salmon/steelhead populations, the  
8 third largest fish run on the West Coast, improve the  
9 economy of river communities by improving river-related  
10 recreation opportunities, such as fishing, swimming,  
11 rafting, and sightseeing. It would benefit everybody in  
12 Siskiyou County economically.

13 So I've seen firsthand how the dams -- and read  
14 scientific papers how the dams are impacting the salmon.  
15 And the most obvious one is that the dams prevent fish  
16 access to 300 miles of habitat for steelhead, over 300  
17 miles, several hundred miles of habitat for chinook  
18 salmon, the spring run, which are extremely important  
19 which are nearly extinct right now in the Klamath Basin,  
20 and 80 miles of habitat for silver salmon, which would  
21 be restored by removing the dams.

22 One of the worst possible things that I think  
23 are happening to our salmon population and leading to  
24 extinction is fish disease. And it's mainly caused by  
25 the dams. A lot of algae's moved underneath the dams,

1 has grown in there because the river doesn't flush every  
2 year. And this algae has moved in and it is habitat for  
3 the polychaete worm that is intermediate host for the  
4 two disease organisms that are just decimating our  
5 salmon.

6 Over 90 percent of our salmon are infected with  
7 these diseases. And we -- on some years greater than  
8 50 percent, we think, of the juvenile salmon that  
9 migrate down and perish because of these two diseases.

10 Also, dams are adversely affecting the water  
11 quality. People have already spoke about this and due  
12 to the thermal lag which the dams cause, the water is  
13 warmer in the fall which stresses the adult fish coming  
14 in to spawn, and they're more susceptible to these  
15 diseases. We've had fish kills.

16 Creates a lot of biological -- which is hard on  
17 the fish.

18 THE COURT REPORTER: Biological what?

19 MR. GRUNBAUM: Biological oxygen demand.

20 Depletes the oxygen in the water.

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Oh, oxygen. Thank you.

22 MR. GRUNBAUM: And it's just bad for a healthy  
23 economy.

24 And I don't see the downside to dam removal as  
25 being very serious, because not much power is generated.

1 These dams are not flood control dams. And they're --  
2 they wouldn't affect water supply for agriculture in the  
3 Upper Basin.

4 MS. RAGAZZI: Finish up, please.

5 MR. GRUNBAUM: Okay. One more comment.

6 And also, I'm a strong advocate of private  
7 property rights, and I know a lot of people in this room  
8 are, too. So I think we ought to respect PacifiCorp and  
9 Warren Buffett's desire to remove the dams because  
10 that's their property.

11 Thank you.

12 [Applause.]

13 MS. RAGAZZI: Francine Banzali,  
14 Allie Rosenbluth, Veronica Silva, Angela Cook --  
15 Angelina Cook.

16 MS. BANZALI: My name is Francine Banzali.  
17 That's B, as in boy, A-N-Z-A-L-I.

18 I'm relatively new to Siskiyou County. I've  
19 been coming up here for about 15 years, and I'm a  
20 resident only three years. I live in Happy Camp  
21 California.

22 And driving down the river, you can't ignore  
23 that there's a lot of problems socially and  
24 economically. There's a lot of poverty. Driving down  
25 the river, it's very obvious to me.

1           And it looks like this was a thriving area.  
2 There was a lot of fishing and people were making their  
3 living off the river with people coming here for -- as  
4 tourists.

5           And I also wanted to comment: Two years ago, I  
6 went to the Salmon River Fish Dive. It was really  
7 fabulous. I was enthralled. I saw a huge fish. I had  
8 never seen anything like that.

9           I came out of the water -- we were counting  
10 fish if anybody's never gone there. So I counted eleven  
11 fish in our group. We swam four miles and I was  
12 excited. I got out of the water, and I was like, "I saw  
13 eleven fish." And everyone there bowed their heads.  
14 They said, "There's usually thousands of fish. If you  
15 look down and you can't see, there's so many fish."

16           And it's really quite frightening when you hear  
17 about these stories. And these are people who were  
18 younger than me. I'm 50 and, in their lifetime, they've  
19 seen a huge decline in fish. So I think this is like  
20 the canary in the coal mine.

21           And I think everyone should come down. Come  
22 down, we'll show you. And please invite us up to see  
23 what your issues are, why you're afraid of giving --  
24 taking down the dams, because I'm not really sure why  
25 you would be afraid of this because it's obvious that



1 whatever the price is, we need to take out these dams  
2 and -- and fix the problems that are on the river.

3 So anyone please come down, and we'd be happy  
4 to show you the river and show you the fish. And that's  
5 all I have to say.

6 Thank you.

7 [Applause.]

8 MS. RAGAZZI: Allie.

9 MS. ROSENBLUTH: Hello.

10 So first I would like to thank the California  
11 Water Board for the opportunity --

12 MS. RAGAZZI: Can you introduce your name  
13 and --

14 MS. ROSENBLUTH: -- to testify on this dam  
15 removal permit site.

16 My name is Allie Rosenbluth, it's spelled  
17 A-L-L-I-E, Rosenbluth, R-O-S-E-N-B-L-U-T-H. And I live  
18 in Jackson County, Oregon.

19 I am the campaign's director for Rogue Climate,  
20 a Medford based nonprofit with over 6,000 supporters in  
21 Southern -- Southern Oregon region.

22 Today, we are here to testify in support of the  
23 removal of all four Klamath dams. This Friday, the  
24 Oregon Climate Change Research Institute released their  
25 2019 climate assessment which declared Southern Oregon,

1 including parts of the Klamath River Basin, has  
2 experienced the worst impacts of climate change  
3 throughout the state.

4 At Rogue Climate, we believe that it is  
5 critical to reduce emission and transmission to clean  
6 energy while our communities prepare and mitigate the  
7 climate change but impact the climate change that we are  
8 already experiencing.

9 River water temperatures are impacting the  
10 health of the Klamath River and it's salmon population.  
11 It's clear that the dams are compounding these impacts.

12 In the summer, the dams/reservoirs host massive  
13 blooms of toxic algae each year posing health risks to  
14 people who are using the river.

15 In recent years, there have been extremely few  
16 or no salmon available for these communities. Dam  
17 removal is coupled with restoration and greenhouse gas  
18 reduction is a key to a healthy Klamath River that can  
19 support varieties of salmon populations that is critical  
20 for the Klamath, Yurok, Karuk and Hoopa Valley tribes,  
21 and as it creates jobs in fishing and tourism, that our  
22 communities in Southern Oregon and Northern California  
23 rely on.

24 Additionally, removing the dams would also  
25 support California's goals as they relate to

1 environmental justice and tribal consultation. For  
2 these reasons and more, we urge the California Water  
3 Board to approve permits for the removal of the four  
4 Klamath dams.

5 Thank you.

6 [Applause.]

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Veronica Silva if needed. So if  
8 it's needed, come on up. Angelina Cook,  
9 Nicholas Hendricks, Alex Watts-Tobin.

10 MS. SILVA: Great. Can you hear me?

11 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.

12 MS. SILVA: Okay. Hi. My name is  
13 Veronica Silva. That's V-E-R-O-N-I-C-A, S-I-L-V-A.

14 So the decisions being made in this room  
15 tonight do not only stay in Siskiyou County. The  
16 Klamath River weaves so many communities inextric- --  
17 inextricably together. This is something we know and we  
18 see.

19 In agreement with the findings of the Draft  
20 EIR, I am urging California to issue the dam removal  
21 permit. The narrative -- the myth that we're hearing  
22 even in this room that agriculture is pitted against dam  
23 removal is simply not true. It's dangerous and it's  
24 divisive. Dam removal will not impact irrigation  
25 delivery or agriculture. In fact, it benefits the

1 systems that we all rely on.

2 Removal of the dams would not only improve  
3 water quality but would also restore critical native  
4 fish populations on which fisheries, tribal communities,  
5 all communities and their local economies rely.

6 Please remove the dams. That is all I have to  
7 say.

8 [Applause.]

9 MS. RAGAZZI: Angela -- Angelina. I'm sorry.

10 MS. COOK: That's okay.

11 Good evening. My name is Angelina Cook,  
12 A-N-G-E-L-I-N-A.

13 I have been living in and working towards water  
14 conservation and ecosystem restoration in Siskiyou  
15 County for over 13 years. I'm speaking tonight on  
16 behalf of the McCloud Watershed Council.

17 We appreciate the concerns that have been  
18 expressed through this process and in this room tonight  
19 as this is a huge project and will certainly affect  
20 lives of many. Some questions, however, are likely to  
21 remain unanswered as they undoubtedly were when the dams  
22 were built.

23 I am grateful to the woman from Washington who  
24 traveled here tonight to speak to the success of the  
25 restoration and of the Elwha River. When humans settled

1 in the area that is now known as Siskiyou County, rivers  
2 flowed free from the mountains to the sea for a reason.

3 The economic disadvantage and environmental  
4 crises Siskiyou County and California now face are  
5 because of overengineering, ecosystems, and demanding  
6 more from nature than we are necessarily entitled to.

7 In short, we strongly support the removal of  
8 all four dams for the many economic and environmental  
9 benefits an intact Klamath River would provide.

10 We urge the State Water Resources Control Board  
11 to approve the Draft EIR. And we encourage Siskiyou  
12 County to respect our natural heritage and embrace the  
13 economic potential of river restoration and truly  
14 renewable industries.

15 [Applause.]

16 MS. RAGAZZI: Nicholas Hendricks followed by  
17 Alex Watts-Tobin followed by Stefan Dosch followed by  
18 Vikki Preston.

19 MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you very much.

20 I want to thank everyone who came before us to  
21 make this project possible.

22 My name is Nicholas Hendricks.

23 N-I-C-H-O-L-A-S, H-E-N-D-R-I-C-K-S.

24 I currently live on Wintu and Shasta territory.  
25 I'm also a citizen of Northern California and Siskiyou

1 County. And as an outdoorsman, a fisherman, a farmer, I  
2 strongly support the Klamath dam removal.

3 Combined with reduced industrial forestry,  
4 increased restorative forestry and wetland restoration,  
5 we can rebuild the legacy of a wild and flowing Klamath  
6 River. The Klamath -- the project is essential in  
7 preventing disastrous environmental incidents like the  
8 2002 Klamath fish kill, which killed between 40,000 and  
9 70,000 adult fish. They died of disease and was the  
10 largest fish kill in history.

11 As far as removal as to limited short-term  
12 implications, the long-term benefits of the removal will  
13 greatly outweigh the dangers of not removing the dams.

14 THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please.

15 MR. HENDRICKS: There are over 13,000 dams in  
16 the state. Depending on who you ask, there's only one  
17 to five undammed waterways inside the state.

18 We do not need to save the dams. We need to  
19 save the fish. We need to protect the traditional way  
20 of life for the many tribes of the Klamath River and  
21 restore the wild and scenic aspect of the Klamath.

22 I also personally support with clear desires of  
23 the greater and of the majority of the first persons in  
24 indigenous nations whom have had historical and rightful  
25 control of the past and the future of the Klamath River.

1 The actions of those three to four generations of  
2 settlements have run their course and it's their time to  
3 end.

4 Thank you.

5 [Applause.]

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Alex.

7 MR. WATTS-TOBIN: Good evening.

8 My name is Alex Watts-Tobin, A-L-E-X, last name  
9 W-A-T-T-S, hyphen T-O-B-I-N.

10 I live with the Karuk tribe which is on record  
11 as strongly advocating for dam removal.

12 And I just wanted to remind them -- the board  
13 in my remark tonight that the Klamath Basin is a very  
14 large constituency, certainly including this area but  
15 all -- but also in fact all the way from Crater Lake  
16 roughly down through Klamath Falls down through here and  
17 the downriver communities. And everybody who's living  
18 here is part of that community that depends on that  
19 river and always has.

20 It's part of my job to advocate for people to  
21 listen to the native people, of course, who live on the  
22 river. And I will be -- I have some -- in my job, I  
23 have some reservations about the DEIR and I will be  
24 making some comments on that.

25 But to speak personally now, as part of that

1 big constituency, I really would like to invite some of  
2 the people from this town to come down to the hearings  
3 in Orleans and Arcata because, frankly, they get very  
4 boring when you just let -- listen to people that are  
5 always "Take the dams down, take the dams down." I come  
6 up to Yreka for an interesting discussion.

7           The big picture of this, I think, is I --  
8 personally, I would -- I'm in favor of dam removal and  
9 that I think that the DEIR has -- has done a very good  
10 job of assessing the impacts.

11           Some of the things which I noticed in it, even  
12 if you're not inclined to listen to the native people  
13 that much, you need to listen to just the white  
14 settlers -- a majority of the white settlers. Look at  
15 the Siskiyou Pioneer from the 1960s, fish were extremely  
16 abundant on this river prior to that dam removal, and  
17 that is very much on record. If you look at that, some  
18 of the comments have relied on a large amount of cherry  
19 picking this data.

20           The impacts also, in -- it was good to see that  
21 the impacts from the drawdown of the JC Boyle Reservoir,  
22 I don't think, will have much -- too much impact on the  
23 stretch of the river between JC Boyle and Copco  
24 Reservoir. It's something like calculations from  
25 JC Boyle being 381 acres, it would be only about a



1 thousand cubic feet per second which is also well within  
2 a normal range.

3 So overall, I would like to amend the report  
4 and -- and recommend taking out the dams.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you.

7 Stefan Dosch followed by Vikki Preston followed  
8 by Isabella Tibbetts followed by Grace Warner.

9 MR. DOSCH: My name is Stefan Dosch, that's  
10 S-T-E-F-A-N, D-O-S-C-H.

11 Okay. Hi. I'm Stefan Dosch. I'm at settler  
12 living on the Karuk ancestor land, and I live in  
13 Orleans. And I work with youth in our area and we spend  
14 a great deal of time in the Klamath and Salmon Rivers  
15 counting salmon and carcasses with the kids -- actually,  
16 count salmon carcasses. We also count living fish. And  
17 we understand through hands-on experience, it's an  
18 amazing, incredible keystone species.

19 So this can be a really depressing job  
20 sometimes and -- but the kids themselves have a whole  
21 lot of hope. And they're hope is that they know that  
22 the dams are coming down soon.

23 There has been a seam in human history, humans  
24 upstream neglecting to think of those who live  
25 downstream of themselves. And I think this picture will

1 be incredibly clear as you move this discussion down the  
2 river. This has been an incredible movement to get to  
3 where we are right now, and it's high time for these  
4 dams to come down.

5 People have mentioned how there will still be  
6 water quality issues after dam removal and I think this  
7 is an interesting point. And I do think we should look  
8 into where all of that nutrient loading and  
9 eutrophication comes from as well.

10 As for sediment, the salmon survived a period  
11 of unregulated hydrologic mining. The fish will  
12 recover.

13 I support this dam removal project and if any  
14 of you have clots or dams in your bloodstreams, I'd  
15 advocate for their removal as well.

16 [Applause.]

17 MS. RAGAZZI: Vikki Preston -- Vikki Preston,  
18 Isabella Tibbetts, Grace Warner, Wayne Hammar,  
19 Taylor Tupper.

20 MS. PRESTON: Thank you.

21 My name is Vikki Preston and I am from Orleans.  
22 I grew up in Orleans my whole life.

23 I grew up the mouth of Red Cap Creek, which is  
24 the -- a major tributary to the Klamath River. So I  
25 guess you can say that my first experience with this is

1 just being a person who would go to the river constantly  
2 every day and that -- I feel like even in the short time  
3 I feel like I've been alive, I have noticed changes  
4 along the river and the way that the changes have  
5 impacted my family personally with the amount of salmon  
6 that we're able to get and -- you know, year to year.  
7 And I -- I think that -- firstly, I think of my own  
8 family, you know, being impacted, you know, physically,  
9 emotionally by -- by the health of the river  
10 specifically.

11           So just to speak on where I'm coming from, I --  
12 I feel like the -- there are many significant long-term  
13 benefits from the proposed project and the Draft EIR  
14 does include that dam removal really improves water  
15 quality. It also says that the sediment impacts will be  
16 temporary while the long-term benefits are stronger runs  
17 of salmon and better water quality.

18           It also clarifies that dam removal will not  
19 affect irrigated agriculture. None of the dams we are  
20 removing provide agricultural diversions. The DEIR  
21 clarifies that dam removal will not affect Salmon River  
22 flow. That's controlled further upstream by the BOR  
23 Irrigation Project.

24           With salmon, the Karuk tribe agrees with the  
25 key findings of this document. And we support the

1 proposed project to undam the Klamath.

2           And I would really -- I really appreciate the  
3 very empowering things that people have said today  
4 regarding the youth, because we were -- I was in the  
5 classroom today with some of the kids in Orleans and  
6 working on an old tradition of how salmon and acorns was  
7 given to the people. And I think the importance behind  
8 this story is to remind ourselves without salmon,  
9 without acorns, without these places and taking care of  
10 these places that we're not taking care of ourselves.  
11 And I think that, you know, the kids feel this.

12           And it is really empowering to have them --  
13 like, this is their sense of identity and the sense of  
14 identity that I have grown up with my entire life. And  
15 it is directly tied to the health of the river. And  
16 these are the things that are being impacted negatively  
17 by the dams. But to speak to this -- to speak to the  
18 hope that the kids have, just because of the hope the  
19 community has to the benefits of this happening, I think  
20 is the stronger point to be made here today.

21           So thank you very much.

22           [Applause.]

23           MS. RAGAZZI: Isabella Tibbetts, Grace Warner,  
24 Wayne Hammar, Taylor Tupper, Susan Miller and  
25 Bruce Reynolds.

1 MS. TIBBETTS: My name is Isabella Tibbetts,  
2 I-S-A-B-E-L-L-A, T-I-B-B-E-T-T-S.

3 I'm a private citizen and an indigenous woman.  
4 I traveled from Southern Oregon in support of  
5 the mov- -- of the removal of these four dams. The  
6 lower four Klamath dams blocks hundreds of miles of  
7 historic spawning grounds while creating -- for salmon  
8 while creating conditions that cause fish diseases and  
9 parasites.

10 The dam reservoirs will host -- most -- massive  
11 blooms of toxic algae each year posing health risks to  
12 people and animals who rely on these rivers.

13 I agree with the Draft EIR of -- of the removal  
14 of these dams, that is -- it is the only alternative  
15 that complies with California's Clean Water Law.

16 Removal of these dams will help bring salmon back to the  
17 Yurok, Klamath, Karuk, and Hoopa Valley tribes and help  
18 restores the coastal fishing industry.

19 I am here as an ally with all people who are  
20 impacted by these dams. Help restore the salmon to our  
21 streams. Remove these dams for the people, the water,  
22 and the salmon.

23 Thank you.

24 [Applause.]

25 MS. RAGAZZI: Grace.

1 MS. WARNER: Hi. My name is Grace Warner,  
2 G-R-A-C-E, W-A-R-N-E-R.

3 I live in Josephine County, Oregon, and I  
4 traveled down here to voice my strong support for the  
5 full removal of all four dams. I believe and support  
6 the Karuk, Yurok, Klamath and Hoopa Valley tribes in  
7 their position that the removal of these dams is what is  
8 best for the health of the river, the salmon, and their  
9 people.

10 I also want to express gratitude to all the  
11 people who have fought to bring us to this moment and  
12 thank you to you all for being here.

13 Thanks.

14 [Applause.]

15 MS. RAGAZZI: Wayne?

16 MR. HAMMAR: Hi. My name is Wayne Hammar,  
17 W-A-Y-N-E, H-A-M-M-A-R.

18 I'm the Siskiyou County tax collector. I'm by  
19 no means an expert on water quality, but my questions  
20 that I would like answered have to do with some of the  
21 property taxes it will take in this county.

22 PacifiCorp is the largest single tax payer in  
23 the county to the tune of about \$2 million which, you  
24 know, might be chump change in the Federal Government  
25 and the State Government but very important to this

1 county.

2           Seventy percent of those dollars go directly to  
3 our schools, so whatever loss we'll take by the removal  
4 of the three dams and their infrastructure will directly  
5 hit our schools. Also, it will affect public safety.

6           And so I -- I would just like to know what  
7 realistically those -- those estimates would be on those  
8 property tax losses.

9           I've also heard -- and I know it's hearsay, I  
10 can't say for a fact that -- that it's been said that  
11 there's a minimal impact on property tax values in  
12 Siskiyou County, and I just don't believe that.

13           You can probably talk to anybody at Copco  
14 lakefront property and ask them what's going to happen  
15 when that lake disappears. I'm sure that will have some  
16 impacts. And again, in the bigger scheme of things, it  
17 may not -- it may not seem large but, to our account,  
18 those are very important revenues.

19           So that's really my question is what,  
20 realistically, will have an affect on the property tax  
21 values here and what the removal of those dams will mean  
22 to that.

23           Thank you.

24           [Applause.]

25           MS. RAGAZZI: Taylor Tupper, Susan Miller, and

1 Chris -- Susan Miller and Chris Reynolds.

2 MS. TUPPER: Hello. My name is Taylor Tupper,  
3 T-A-Y-L-O-R, T-U-P-P-E-R.

4 I'm an enrolled member of the Klamath tribes of  
5 Oregon. I traveled here tonight with my elder and my  
6 father Rayson Tupper, who is also a Modoc elder of the  
7 Klamath tribes.

8 My tribe has been here since time immemorial.  
9 And we have always been at the forefront in providing  
10 leadership and support towards this monumental effort of  
11 dam removal.

12 I would like to be here to say -- as a  
13 reminder, I'm here to state that the Klamath tribes won  
14 their FERC relicensing process in 2006. This is a key  
15 component to that effort. We know those dams block our  
16 promised 1864 Treaty right resource. It re- -- it  
17 blocks c'iyaaals, that's in our tribal language which  
18 means salmon.

19 We know that the Federal Government has a trust  
20 and responsibility to the tribes as stated in the  
21 Constitution of the United States, Article 6. On  
22 January 31st, 2007, my tribe was notified that two  
23 federal agencies ruled that PacifiCorp must install the  
24 fish ladders at the four Klamath dams to receive the new  
25 license for operating the hydro facilities: Iron Gate,



1 Copco 1, Copco 2, and -- and JC Boyle.

2 After a -- after they did their own feasibility  
3 studies, they determined that dam removal was cheaper  
4 than the ladders. So that's when this came about and we  
5 were asked that question.

6 The win in 2007 was both instrumental and  
7 monumental to these 2019 dam removal efforts. That win  
8 will -- was upheld to our treaty rights for the tribes  
9 of Oregon.

10 Our journey has spanned almost two decades. We  
11 recall traveling and marching with the lower river  
12 tribes to the shareholders meeting in Scotland and then  
13 to the other parts of the nation, including the capitals  
14 in Oregon, California, and Washington, D.C., all in  
15 support of salmon recovery.

16 My people and myself and my father refuse to  
17 walk away. Our efforts in these past few decades help  
18 contribute and pave the way to the California State  
19 legislative actions that now support dam removal.

20 They are fish and water people and we have been  
21 waiting for over a hundred years for the return of the  
22 salmon for our treaty right to be upheld. Still today  
23 over 100 years since Iron Gate was built in 1917, the  
24 c'iyaals have continued to travel towards their home in  
25 Klamath. And still today they break themselves at

1 Iron Gate. My people will continue to fight to see  
2 these salmon return. We know all things come full  
3 circle.

4 Remove the dams as mandated in the FERC 2006  
5 process.

6 Thank you.

7 [Applause.]

8 MS. RAGAZZI: Here, we have Susan Miller.

9 I also want to check. Is Jake Reed here?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Susan left.

11 MS. RAGAZZI: Oh, Susan left. Okay. Thank  
12 you.

13 And is Jake Reed here?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He left.

15 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Because I called his name  
16 earlier and he wasn't here so I just wanted to make  
17 sure.

18 And then is there -- before -- Chrissie has  
19 requested additional time so I just want to make sure.  
20 Is there anybody else that wants to speak this evening  
21 before we close the public comment period?

22 So Chrissie is going to speak but -- so I don't  
23 have speaker cards for each either of you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I put mine up there.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, yours is there.

1 MS. RAGAZZI: I misunderstood that.

2 Okay. Sammi Jo Goodwin. Is that right? Okay.

3 So Sammi Jo Goodwin.

4 Is there anybody else that wants to speak  
5 besides Chrissie? Who are we pointing at? Al. Okay.

6 Chrissie, just a moment. Sorry.

7 MS. GOODWIN: Hello. My name is  
8 Sammi Jo Goodwin, S-A-M-M-I, J-O, G O-O-D-W-I-N.

9 I am a -- I am an indigenous woman who lives  
10 here in Siskiyou County who grew up on the Klamath  
11 River. And I am here as a water protector. I come  
12 before just to testify because living here knowing the  
13 devastation of what dams have done, you know, I am all  
14 for dam removal and anything that promotes dam remov- --  
15 removal.

16 Being close to home and having it hit home is a  
17 little bit different. You know, growing up, you know,  
18 like my father was a cultural -- you know, he believes  
19 in cultural preservation. So that's what I believe in.  
20 I come from a strong legacy of that. He was a  
21 archaeologist/anthropologist, so he was out looking for  
22 artifacts, he was out scoping looking for villages, he  
23 was out scoping looking for acorns, water, and, of  
24 course, preserving our villages on the Klamath River.

25 I come from two very big villages on the

1 Klamath River: The Inam, Innova Panaminik [phonetic]  
2 villages. I grew up on in Somes Bar, California, and  
3 that is where our tribe's fishery is at. That's the  
4 main fishery.

5           And with that, I've watched the devastation of  
6 salmon go from hundreds from pictures -- seeing  
7 pictures, having big hogs and they're, like, two feet  
8 fish down to we don't have any salmon coming up. And if  
9 they are, they're tired and they're diseased and the  
10 algae from the water is in their gills.

11           I've also seen with my own eyes a fish kill.  
12 I've also seen devastation of elders not having their  
13 natural foods, something that was given from the Creator  
14 to our people for all to like -- for all to want and all  
15 to have.

16           As I testify, I also testify for my children  
17 who I would love them to also have the legacy of our  
18 natural food. And being indigenous doesn't necessarily  
19 mean that I'm tied to one certain spot because my spirit  
20 is very strong. And most of our spirits are very strong  
21 as long as we pray. So each year we pray at our  
22 ceremonies and we pray for salmon and we pray for the  
23 fish and -- of all kinds, the trout, the suckers, the  
24 eels. It's not just one. It's all. And it all affects  
25 us. Steelhead. For those sport fisherman, it affects

1 you, too. Once it's gone, it's gone for all.

2 So when will we know that water's life and when  
3 will we not know that money cannot feed us? So I stand  
4 just here saying I testify as a Karuk indigenous woman,  
5 and I am for dam removal.

6 [Applause.]

7 MS. RAGAZZI: Malcolm Chichicola.

8 And then is there anybody else out there who  
9 has a speaker card?

10 MS. GANGL: One more, Erin.

11 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. So all Al Khart is after  
12 Malcolm.

13 MR. CHICHICOLA: Save the salmons. Destroy the  
14 dams. Oh, whatever, whatever.

15 Save the creatures and all sick or the creek  
16 anywhere that has water except for the one that you  
17 drink.

18 [Applause.]

19 MS. CHICHICOLA: Is that it? By the way, this  
20 is maybe the tenth time Malcolm has testified for dam  
21 removal. He's been doing it since he could hardly  
22 speak, and he's not even done, I hope.

23 MS. RAGAZZI: Okay. Al.

24 I apologize I missed some speaker cards. Thank  
25 you all for being patient with me.

1           MR. KHART:  Al, A-L, K-H-A-R-T, and I'm a  
2  resident of Copco Lake.

3           I worked in science for more than 20 years, and  
4  I think the project is not grounded -- grounded  
5  correctly.  So it's -- it requires more feasibility  
6  study.  I wrote mathematical model and a risk model.  
7  And I would like to say that nothing was done to measure  
8  the risk of removal of dams.

9           And topics which I've heard, they are like --  
10 they are very similar.  It's like somebody wrote the  
11 template and there was people who are for removal of  
12 dams, spoke in the same manner.

13           So let me say now as a -- as a human being from  
14 planet Earth and as a resident of Copco Lake, I think 77  
15 years, they stream in Copco Lake and the river every  
16 summer.  Sometimes, my skin is green, but I haven't had  
17 any diseases, so the health issue with dams is not  
18 correct.  So it looking like we -- we don't have this  
19 kind of issue.

20           Second, you say people say that about fires.  I  
21 was witnessing two fires, and my house survived only  
22 because of Copco Lake.  Is it amazing?  Yes.

23           And just imagine if Paradise would have Copco  
24 Lake.  Those -- those 86 people probably be alive --  
25 alive, you know.

1           And the last point, if you know that -- that  
2 science -- the history of the science is about future.  
3 So, historically, dams or Copco Lake dam existed several  
4 hundred years ago.

5           I -- I read about archaeological research and  
6 they say that this dam was like 8- or 700 years ago and  
7 engineers 100 years ago just restored the dam, because  
8 it was damaged by earthquake. So lake existed many,  
9 many years ago. So American engineers returned back  
10 lake which existed before.

11           So what if we remove dams? And then again, in  
12 many years people will decide, hey, it was not actually  
13 a good idea. Let's return dams back. It might happen.  
14 So I think at least the dam removal project is not  
15 grounded very nicely. And I'm against removal of the  
16 dams.

17           [Applause.]

18           MS. RAGAZZI: Thank you, all.

19           So Chrissie, if you would like to come up. I'm  
20 going to confirm that was -- everybody's gotten the  
21 opportunity they were looking for this evening. I'm  
22 going to let Chrissie use the remainder of this period.  
23 Okay. So Chrissie, 15 minutes.

24           MS. REYNOLDS: My name is Chrissie Reynolds,  
25 C-H-R-I-S-S-I-E, Reynolds, R-E-Y-N-O-L-D-S.

1           There isn't a day that this issue of dam  
2 removal has not impacted me, my life, my health, and  
3 well-being mentally and spiritually and physically over  
4 the last almost two decades but most especially over the  
5 last four years most dramatically.

6           I live at Copco Lake. I was, in fact, probably  
7 created here. My parents along with my mom's parents  
8 bought a small A-frame cabin adjoining my three aunts  
9 and two uncles A-frame cabin back in the early 1960s. I  
10 was born in 1966. These two original properties were  
11 the premier cover properties -- properties on the  
12 brochure of Copco Lake that showcased the Sportsman's  
13 Paradise and an ideal lake getaway with country life  
14 abounding.

15           My family saved and sacrificed to purchase  
16 these properties as a somewhat close retreat from the  
17 Bay Area hustle and bustle and thought it a great place  
18 to bring their kids and families; to teach them how to  
19 fish, both river and lake fishing -- I'm just going to  
20 make this shorter.

21           Every one of my elder family members was  
22 interned in concentration camps after the Presidential  
23 Executive Order 9066 in 1942. My family was given a few  
24 days to settle their businesses and homes, employment  
25 and families, pack and put what they could carry in two



1 suitcases and be ready for transport where they were  
2 taken to Topaz, Utah, after being at the Tanforan Race  
3 Track. My mom was 13. My dad was 17.

4 I give this historical background here because  
5 I -- I feel it's vitally important to my ancestors to  
6 honor them and help protect what they worked so hard  
7 for -- they were interned, they came back, they saved,  
8 they sacrificed, they bought property as a retreat for  
9 themselves -- to help protect what they worked for, to  
10 defend against enemies foreign and domestic. These  
11 liberties that are self-evident must be protected at all  
12 costs. My family fought to defend these principals and  
13 I will do no less.

14 I came up every school break and, 20 years ago,  
15 I moved here permanently -- over 21 years ago. The  
16 smear campaign against the negative health impacts needs  
17 to stop. The State Water Resources Board has been a  
18 major contributor to the spread of mis- and  
19 disinformation about the safety of the reservoirs. I  
20 have over the last almost 20 years been to meetings,  
21 interviewed local doctors, vets, the county health  
22 department, our county supervisors, and our factual  
23 evidence does not support the intimidating and often  
24 misleading information your postings have. And in fact,  
25 to me, your postings have caused more harm than the

1 algae itself.

2 I was part of the studies conducted, and the  
3 amount of money that was spent is shameful. The reports  
4 came back inconclusive, and yet more studies are what  
5 were called for by the ones who get a paycheck to  
6 conduct these studies. The people are the ones that are  
7 paying for these studies and the people are the ones who  
8 are most affected. And yet the people are being  
9 undermined, ignored, disrespected and lied to again and  
10 again.

11 I've been to the above-mentioned sources to  
12 discuss the effects of geoengineering and the operations  
13 being carried about above our heads every day and the  
14 denial is criminal on the health impacts -- effects.  
15 Now, the powers that are on their way out are finally  
16 admitting that they are conducting these experiments  
17 beginning this year.

18 Why? They've been doing it for years; why come  
19 out in the open now? And that's how I feel about this  
20 process going before the Water Board.

21 For years, the board is one that I have felt  
22 that we needed to defend ourselves from. With their  
23 postings claiming the harmful, deadly effects that these  
24 toxins might or could have on human and animal health  
25 impacts. I know the negative health effects on human

1 and animal life and what it has been to property values,  
2 our local economy, the psyche, and human -- and human  
3 perception.

4           There's maybe a campaign and a blast about the  
5 toxic blue-green algae. You know, it's a natural health  
6 supplement that's in direct threat to Big Pharma.  
7 Cattle -- cattle ranchers here are a big threat to  
8 Big Ag, rural sustainable living are the big threat to  
9 the ones promoting Agenda 1 [sic]. One could say these  
10 were intentional attacks.

11           Our local government elected by the people has  
12 told the states and the feds no over and over. A  
13 bi-state water compact was signed in 1957 and is being  
14 ignored.

15           With the drawdowns of the lake, I see the  
16 exposed land, I think of the clams and the mussels and  
17 other aquatic life that is left to dry out and die off.  
18 I see the eagles and the herons, and I'm filled with  
19 guilt and shame at our -- at my own species and  
20 powerlessness as I see the planes dumping toxic payloads  
21 over us day and night.

22           Can you please explain to me how the aluminum  
23 got in the reservoirs that you have i- -- identified in  
24 the draft document?

25           My research also showed that the U.S. Military

1 weaponized algae decades ago. Why wouldn't it be  
2 logical to conclude that some of these weren't also  
3 created by the very ones who stand to gain? I question  
4 the authenticity of the origins of the c. shasta. It  
5 isn't in my nature to be confrontational, even negative,  
6 but this dam removal issue has turned me into a person  
7 who has had to research, go to meetings, be involved,  
8 had my eyes opened to the absolute corrupt and evil  
9 nature of the operations being done against people every  
10 day by their own government.

11 I have met through this process a beautiful  
12 Shasta elder named Betty Hall. Her ancestors were Civil  
13 War veterans, Civil War veterans buried under these  
14 reservoirs. In this process, I was disgusted to hear  
15 some official ask her if she could just pick two of the  
16 ancestors to mark somehow. Seriously? These veterans  
17 were a part of the very beginning of our history as a  
18 nation, and this is the disrespect we get from the  
19 government official?

20 This process introduced me to Rex Cozzalio who  
21 is one of the most articulate, intelligent, well-spoken  
22 men I've ever met. It's been an honor learning from him  
23 about his family's history since his ranch is first in  
24 line since before and after the dams were put in.

25 I'm deeply grateful to Richard Marshall and

1 others of the Siskiyou Water Users for their activism  
2 and actions. I got -- I've gotten to know so many  
3 people united and protecting our water, and I am honored  
4 and humbled and extremely grateful.

5           We want what is best for all life, not just  
6 salmon. Of course, we want what benefits the salmon but  
7 not at the cost of everything else. For years, we have  
8 asked to include offshore effects to salmon such as  
9 ocean fishing from international commercial fishermen,  
10 ocean degradation, changing water temperatures due to  
11 geoengineered weather and, of course, radiation  
12 poisoning from Fukushima. Somehow, these questions just  
13 never get answered. The blame is always the dams.

14           The so-called solution is also dam removal.  
15 Alternatives have been offered. Objections have been  
16 raised. The process just continues to roll on out like  
17 5G. It doesn't seem to matter what the negative health  
18 impacts will be to all life.

19           Dam removal is the be all end all, and it is a  
20 complete fraud and will, in fact, destroy life up and  
21 down the river for years and in places perhaps forever.  
22 I know what it has done to -- to me and yet still we  
23 fight.

24           This July, I was under mandatory evacuation for  
25 the second time in four years. Please wrap your head

1 around that sentence. The day after I walked my  
2 daughter in the Fourth of July parade from the R Ranch  
3 stables in the little town of Hornbrook, it was on fire.  
4 For several years now, we have brought up over and over  
5 again the importance of these reservoirs for fire  
6 suppression.

7           For over nine years, I was on the volunteer  
8 fire department. My husband was awarded Siskiyou County  
9 Firefighter of the Year in 2008. My daughter was just a  
10 few months old then. We live literally right next door  
11 to the fire station.

12           My daughter is ten. She has had to be  
13 evacuated twice in her life. First, four years ago when  
14 she was six and again this summer.

15           As a mom, this lake has saved my life both  
16 times. I need you to understand that at a very basic  
17 level. We've gone through so many fires in the past few  
18 years and just in the past few months. Paradise being  
19 the latest, deadliest, and most horrifying.

20           Since then, Jon Lopey, our sheriff, wrote an  
21 article on the front page of the Siskiyou Daily News  
22 outlining what to do in the event of a fire in response  
23 to a need to help save lives. In that article, he tells  
24 people what specific actions to take. He validated my  
25 survival instinct when he told people to go into bodies

1 of water if they can.

2 I had that in my head just less than six months  
3 ago. I was figuring out how to protect my two cats, dog  
4 and daughter if the fire came as close as it did four  
5 years ago. I was going to take her and the animals down  
6 under the bridge and put a fire shelter over our heads  
7 and stay there if we needed to.

8 When the lake was drained as far down as I've  
9 ever seen it in December, I realized I would no longer  
10 be able to do that if they took the dams out. It's one  
11 thing to go and try to be submerged in a large body of  
12 water like a lake for the sustained period of time but  
13 altogether different in a swift moving river. How is  
14 that going to keep us altogether in that scenario?

15 I was filled with anxiety and post traumatic  
16 stress while driving from just around the corner where I  
17 live into my job into Yreka which is 40 minutes away.  
18 This is my life. All these thoughts that occurred to me  
19 while I try to go to work, homeschool my daughter, and  
20 just be a wife, mother, and daughter myself.

21 I've turned into some always-on-guard, hyper  
22 vigilant activist trying to make a difference in this  
23 upside down world while we -- that has become the new  
24 normal.

25 I worked as a waitress in town. And the amount

1 of fire firefighters that I've fed over the past year  
2 and talking to them about dam removal, they all comment  
3 how insane it is to remove these reservoirs. None of  
4 them can say anything publically because they jobs limit  
5 them but, personally, all of them have been against it.

6           They know the difference between fighting fires  
7 with a limited water source to an unlimited water  
8 source. They know the difference between a few single  
9 holding tanks versus a large, open body of water. They  
10 know the difference between being able to dip water out  
11 of the lake or a swift moving river with fluctuating  
12 water levels, bank and slope stability, dusty  
13 conditions, wind conditions, et cetera.

14           There is no way to replace the ability to fight  
15 fires without added loss to lives and property without  
16 these reservoirs. It's a no-brainer. No science can be  
17 spun to say that these reservoirs didn't play an  
18 irreplaceable part of the ability of these fire fighters  
19 to deal with these catastrophic life-threatening events.

20           People died. Water is life. Water is  
21 protection against loss of life.

22           As a human being walking on this planet, if you  
23 are not affected by the basic understanding of a  
24 family's loss due to fire, don't you -- and that you  
25 would knowingly reduce a person's ability to protect



1 life by lowering their accessibility to water, then I  
2 would argue that one is not human, which I think is  
3 often the case in processes like this. We go before a  
4 board of people who did not know us, who have no idea  
5 where we live or how we live, yet are making decision  
6 that affect our everyday lives.

7 I finally overcame the pain to begin to read  
8 the draft document that is supposed to be a prelude to  
9 the definitive word on this process. And, again, the  
10 stress and anger and frustration rears up from zero to  
11 60 in nothing flat. I read the part about the roads and  
12 I can feel my eye twitching.

13 Look, there's only one road in and one road  
14 out, Ager Beswick. That road is our lifeline literally.  
15 It is the road for the school bus, emergency vehicles,  
16 ambulances, doctors appointments which, for our elderly  
17 community, is huge; kids after-school sports practices,  
18 games, cheer, dance and music lessons, shopping and  
19 going to and coming home from work.

20 It is our everything road. It's a 40-minute  
21 drive to town. Any delay is unacceptable.

22 If the KRRC was serious about being a good  
23 neighbor and improving the quality of our lives, it  
24 would have chosen to improve Copco Road, a dirt road  
25 where it would not impact anyone's life and it would

1 have improved it for everyone by creating a more usable  
2 road for -- for all. And this is my problem with the  
3 whole dam scam by the KRRC and all the stakeholders  
4 trying to improve our lives.

5           You don't know us, you don't know who we are,  
6 you don't know how we work, you don't know how it will  
7 impact us. You don't think of how much of our money you  
8 spend. You don't count how many hours, years, and  
9 finances we have lost due to this ongoing environmental  
10 threat to our very well-being. The arguments are  
11 exhaustive. The stresses and stressors have been huge.  
12 The toll has been negative to life.

13           Friends who believe the newspaper, the TV, and  
14 the reports all just tell us, "Hey, it's a done deal,  
15 get used to it, the dams are coming out."

16           What effect do you think this has on us? What  
17 health impacts do you think it has? What do you think  
18 it does to water quality when the river and the lake is  
19 lied about, the science spun, the facts denied, the  
20 properties devalued, the river -- the people ignored,  
21 the government betrayal obvious and the disrespect  
22 blatant?

23           We're going through PTSD from the Boles fire,  
24 from the Oregon Gulch fire, the Delta fire, the  
25 Klamathon fire, the fires downriver, the Paradise fire,

1 and all the other fires from our friends and relatives  
2 outside the area in Santa Rosa, Santa Barbara, Malibu,  
3 and out of state. Serious life-threatening issues are  
4 being faced by the people. And we're having to take  
5 time out of our lives and days and nights and meeting  
6 after meeting and public comment period after public  
7 comment period.

8           Are you listening? No dam removal. Our  
9 sheriff has told you, our supervisors have told you, the  
10 residents have told you, the people have told you, "no,  
11 no, no dam removal."

12           It makes me angry. It makes me crazy. It  
13 makes me the kind of person I don't like to be having to  
14 go through this one more freaking time.

15           The impacts to my life, to the lives of the  
16 fish, the animals, the wildlife, the warm water  
17 ecosystem, the birds that come every year, the plant  
18 life, all life is impacted by you who are reading this.

19           We have been told by our governor that these  
20 fires are the new normal. It is completely unacceptable  
21 to keep putting our men and our women on the front lines  
22 in harm's way when they're up geoengineered intentional  
23 fires created with directed energy weapons like Athena  
24 by Lockheed Martin and other DOD and not yet revealed to  
25 the public technologies.

1           Historically, the U.S. Military and its  
2 corporate benefactors have used weapondry [sic] far in  
3 advance of its enemies such as with rifles against the  
4 Native Americans, Howitzers against Japanese Swords,  
5 biotechnology against an unsuspecting public and with  
6 nano particulates and heavy metal toxins and biological  
7 agents being sprayed every day, our firefighters need  
8 our help in protecting themselves against these new  
9 horrific advances in weather warfare as outlined in the  
10 military manual Owing the Weather by 2025.

11           These heroes are our husbands, wives, fathers,  
12 mothers, aunts, uncles, grandparents, sons and daughters  
13 and nieces and nephews. Fire season is now year round.  
14 That is time away from their homes, their families,  
15 children while their live- -- while they fight all over  
16 the state and country and are not there to protect their  
17 own home.

18           The Water Board should no longer be complicit  
19 in denial of these realities and be doing their job in  
20 protecting the water quality by going after the real  
21 terrorists who are using these toxins in our everyday  
22 environment. Water sampling shows these things are in  
23 our environments as well as soil samples. There are lab  
24 results from all over the globe showing this but,  
25 specifically to California and Siskiyou County, the

1 results are conclusive.

2           Why hasn't the Water Board addressed any of  
3 these public health concerns? Why is denial and  
4 suppression the agenda rather than truly fulfilling  
5 public safety?

6           We know for a fact that there have been several  
7 omissions in the draft document as to the exact number  
8 of wells sampled, which clearly if there's any  
9 incomplete information will lead to an incomplete  
10 conclusion. We also know that these reservoirs provide  
11 a large natural firebreak that a free-flowing river  
12 cannot protect against.

13           I experience that firsthand in the Oregon Gulch  
14 fire as we moved from our home on Mallard Road to my  
15 parent's cabin on Ager Beswick on the south side of the  
16 lake. The north side was completely engulfed because --  
17 but because we were at a wide part of the lake at my  
18 parent's cabin, it provided sanctuary for us.

19           Like I said, we live right next door to the  
20 fire station. Station 210 was the incident command  
21 center for the Oregon Gulch fire. Theoretically, I  
22 should have felt the safest there. Apparatus, fire  
23 personnel equipment were all staged right next door, but  
24 that fire was outside my living room window. Our front  
25 door facing the raging fire. Heavy winds picked up at

1 10 o'clock that night and there were four humble heroes  
2 from Santa Barbara in wildland gear protecting my home.  
3 I chose to go to the cabin the next day because it was  
4 too terrifyingly close.

5           At the time, we had four cats, two dogs and my  
6 six-year-old daughter and it was too much to try and  
7 manage. You need to realize that for people to evacuate  
8 what that entails. Maybe it's an epigenetic trigger,  
9 but you have to focus on the essentials and what you can  
10 carry or keep contained in the event of pets or small  
11 children. Flames are coming at you. The trees and the  
12 mountains you love are burning alive.

13           I was thinking of my neighbors who are all over  
14 70 with a few exceptions in their 60s. Phil and I are  
15 the younger ones here. Few are able to afford to go to  
16 a hotel. Sleeping in a gym or on the fairgrounds with  
17 pets and livestock? Come on.

18           Friends with chickens, goats, horses, sheep and  
19 cattle, ducks and dogs are not able to just stand around  
20 and just round them up at an instant and do what? Go  
21 where? For how long?

22           People are going to stand. They're going to  
23 shelter in place. They're going to fight for their  
24 survival. Are you standing with us? Are you protecting  
25 the water truthfully?

1           The water quality is bad coming in from Oregon.  
2   It leaves cleaner after the reservoirs.   These  
3   reservoirs provide habitat for many species that will  
4   simply cease to exist going from a warm water  
5   environment to a free-flowing river.   The bass, crappie,  
6   yellow perch, catfish, bluegill, pumpkinseed, frogs and  
7   other amphibians and reptiles, the migratory birds like  
8   the osprey, the arctic and Caspian terns, the gulls, the  
9   turkey vulture, the white pelicans, the swan, the  
10  specks, the mergansers, spoon-billed beak, wood ducks,  
11  mallard and sandhill crane are -- and large mammals like  
12  the bighorn sheep, elk, deer, bear and mountain lion,  
13  all of God's creatures that come -- have become  
14  dependent on this water system.

15           Yes, many of them were introduced.   Most people  
16  in America were introduced.   It's a fact.   It's what  
17  makes America what it is.   We are a melting pot  
18  protected by -- we're all supposed to be free.   We're  
19  supposed to be protected by the Constitution.   We're  
20  supposed to care for one another.

21           MS. RAGAZZI:   Do you want to --

22           [Applause.]

23           MS. RAGAZZI:   Thank you, everyone.

24           I really appreciate everyone sticking around so  
25  they can hear all the various comments that we got

1 tonight. I encourage you to provide written comments if  
2 there's something else that you want us to take care  
3 into consideration with respect to the Draft EIR.

4 I'll reiterate the comment deadline concludes  
5 on February 26th at noon. And grab a Notice of  
6 Availability when you leave if you don't have one,  
7 because that has all the information on how to submit  
8 those comments.

9 So thanks again for everybody coming out  
10 tonight. And if anybody wants to come up and talk to  
11 us, we are right here so...

12 (The proceedings concluded at 8:07 p.m.)  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER  
2

3  
4 I, Carol J. Chase, CSR 13538, hereby certify  
5 that the proceedings in the within-entitled cause was  
6 taken down in shorthand by me, a Certified Shorthand  
7 Reporter and a disinterested person, at the time and  
8 place herein stated, and that the proceedings were  
9 thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my  
10 direction and supervision;

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
12 attorney for either or any of the parties to the said  
13 proceedings, nor in any way interested in the outcome of  
14 this cause, and that I am not related to any of the  
15 parties thereto.

16 I hereto declare under penalty of perjury that  
17 the foregoing is true and correct. I have hereunto set  
18 my hand on February 21, 2019.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Carol J. Chase, CSR #13538